

Kauel

MINUTES

of the

TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

of the

**PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN AMERICA**

Part I

DIRECTORY

Of General Assembly
Committees and Agencies

Part II

JOURNAL

Part III

APPENDICIES

Part IV

**CORRECTIONS OF
PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Part V

INDEX

**June 15-18, 1992
Roanoke, Virginia**

The *Minutes of the General Assembly* are published by the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly and distributed by the Committee for Christian Education and Publications.

Order from:

The Committee for Christian Education and Publications
PCA Bookstore
1852 Century Place, Suite 101
Atlanta, Georgia 30345
[1-800-283-1357]

**TIME AND PLACE OF THE NEXT MEETING OF
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:**

Monday, June 7, 1993 through Friday, June 11, 1993
Columbia, South Carolina

FUTURE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES:

June 6-10, 1994	-- Atlanta, Georgia
June 1995	-- Dallas, Texas
June 1996	-- Fort Lauderdale, Florida
June 1997	-- Atlanta, Georgia (tentative)
June 1998	-- Jackson, Mississippi
June 1999	-- Baltimore, Maryland
June 2000	-- Tampa, Florida

**20th GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTIONS SENT TO PRESBYTERIES
AND SESSIONS:**

- I. Proposed Amendments to *BCO*:
 - * *BCO* 14-1 See 20-51, p. 100
 - * *BCO* 15-4 See 20-51, p. 99
 - * *BCO* 24-5 See 20-51, p. 116
 - * *BCO* 34-1 See 20-51, p. 116

- II. Study paper on "Divorce and Remarriage", p. 513

MINUTES
OF THE
TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

PART I	DIRECTORY	3
PART II	JOURNAL	19
PART III	APPENDICES	270
Appendix A	Stated Clerk.	271
Appendix B	Board of Directors.	299
Appendix C	Administrative Committee	303
Appendix D	Christian Education.	357
Appendix E	Covenant College	366
Appendix F	Covenant Theological Seminary.	370
Appendix G	Insurance, Annuities & Relief	371
Appendix H	Interchurch Relations.	379
Appendix I	Investor's Fund for Building and Development	387
Appendix J	Mission to North America.	396
Appendix K	Mission to the World	424
Appendix L	Nominating Committee	469
Appendix M	PCA Foundation.	494
Appendix N	Ridge Haven	510
Appendix O	Ad Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage.	513
Appendix P	Ad Interim Committee on PCA Communications.	637
PART IV	CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS MINUTES.	639
PART V	INDEX	641

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SUCCESSION OF MODERATORS

ASSEMBLY	YEAR	NAME	PLACE OF ASSEMBLY
1st	1973	Hon. W. Jack Williamson	Birmingham, AL
2nd	1974	Rev. Erskine L. Jackson	Macon, GA
3rd	1975	Judge Leon F. Hendrick	Jackson, MS
4th	1976	Rev. William A. McIllwaine	Greenville, SC
5th	1977	Hon. John T. Clark	Smyrna, GA
6th	1978	Rev. G. Aiken Taylor	Grand Rapids, MI
7th	1979	Hon. William F. Joseph, Jr.	Charlotte, NC
8th	1980	Rev. Paul G. Settle	Savannah, GA
9th	1981	Hon. Kenneth L. Ryskamp	Ft. Lauderdale, FL
10th	1982	Rev. R. Laird Harris	Grand Rapids, MI
11th	1983	Hon. L. B. Austin III	Norfolk, VA
12th	1984	Rev. James M. Baird, Jr.	Baton Rouge, LA
13th	1985	Hon. Richard C. Chewning	St. Louis, MO
14th	1986	Rev. Frank M. Barker, Jr.	Philadelphia, PA
15th	1987	Hon. Gerald Sovereign	Grand Rapids, MI
16th	1988	Rev. D. James Kennedy	Knoxville, TN
17th	1989	Hon. John B. White, Jr.	La Mirada, CA
18th	1990	Rev. Cortez A. Cooper, Jr.	Atlanta, GA
19th	1991	Hon. Mark Belz	St. Louis, MO
20th	1992	Rev. W. Wilson Benton, Jr.	Roanoke, VA

SUCCESSION OF STATED CLERKS

YEARS	NAME
1973 - 1988	Rev. Morton H. Smith
1988 -	Rev. Paul R. Gilchrist

DIRECTORY

PART I

**DIRECTORY OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY
COMMITTEES AND OFFICES**

I. OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Moderator

TE W. Wilson Benton, Jr.
12928 Ladue Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
Phone: 314-434-0753

Stated Clerk, Coordinator for Administration

TE Paul R. Gilchrist
1852 Century Place, Suite 190
Atlanta, GA 30345
Phone: 404-320-3366
FAX: 404-320-7219

OFFICES OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY AGENCIES

Coordinator of Christian Education and Publications

TE Charles H. Dunahoo
1852 Century Place, Suite 101
Atlanta, GA 30345
Phone: 404-320-3388
FAX: 404-320-7964

Coordinator for Mission to North America

TE Terry L. Gyger
1852 Century Place, Suite 205
Atlanta, GA 30345
Phone: 404-320-3330
FAX: 404-982-9108

Coordinator for Mission to the World

TE John E. Kyle
1852 Century Place, Suite 201
Atlanta, GA 30345
Phone: 404-320-3373
FAX: 404-636-5733

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

President Covenant College
RE Frank A. Brock
Covenant College
Lookout Mountain, Georgia 30750
Phone: 706-820-1560
FAX: 706-820-0672

President Covenant Theological Seminary
TE Paul D. Kooistra
12330 Conway Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
Phone: 314-434-4044
FAX: 314-434-4819

Director of Insurance, Annuities and Relief
RE James L. Hughes
1852 Century Place, Suite 170
Atlanta, GA 30345
Phone: 404-320-3377
FAX: 404-634-6186

Director of Investor's Fund for Building and Development
TE Cecil A. Brooks
1852 Century Place, Suite 204
Atlanta, GA 30345
Phone: 404-320-3311

Director of the Presbyterian Church in America Foundation
RE John W. S. Hudson
1852 Century Place, Suite 180
Atlanta, GA 30345
Phone: 404-320-3303

Director of Ridge Haven
P. O. Box 565
Rosman, North Carolina 28772
Phone: 704-862-3916

Director of the PCA Historical Center
RE Jerry Kornegay
12330 Conway Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
Phone: 314-469-9077

DIRECTORY

II. PERMANENT COMMITTEES

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Teaching Elders:

William S. Henderson, Northeast
6 Pine Brook Drive
Ballston Spa, NY 12020

Robert S. Hornick, Gulf Coast
406 S. Navy Blvd
Pensacola, FL 32507

L. Roy Taylor, Grace
4901 Hardy Street
Hattiesburg, MS 39402-2326

William C. Hughes, MS Valley
1390 N. State
Jackson, MS 39202

Donald J. MacNair, Missouri
480 Brightspur Lane
Ballwin, MO 63011

William A. Fox, Jr., Calvary
1300 India Hook Road
Rock Hill, SC 29730

Richard C. Trucks, Evangel
617 South 22nd Street
Birmingham, AL 35233-3111

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996

William H. (Bingy) Moore, IV, Potomac
2902 Taylor Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21234

Class of 1995

Harold E. Whitlock, Heritage
437 Stella Drive
Hockessin, DE 19707

William Bonner, New Jersey
625 Robert Fulton Highway
Quarryville, PA 17566

Class of 1994

David S. Huggins, Jr., TN Valley
942 Van Leer Drive
Nashville, TN 37220

Class of 1993

William A. Rocap, Jr., C. Carolina
Route 3, Box 687
Conover, NC 28613

Alternates

William F. Joseph, Jr., SE Alabama
3152 Rolling Road Circle
Montgomery, AL 36111

Chairman of Committee or Board or his designate

TE J. Render Caines, CC
RE L. B. (Pete) Austin, MTW
RE John B. White, Jr., MNA
TE Loren V. Watson, PCAF
RE G. Paul Jones, Jr., CTS
RE Ralph Mittendorff, CE & P
RE Ralph Paden, IAR
RE Irving Wicker, IFBD
RE Lindsey Tippins, RH

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE FOR CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND PUBLICATIONS

Teaching Elders:

Arthur Ames, Rocky Mountain
3780 Inspiration Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80917

James R. McKee, Potomac
3252 Pine Bluffs Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21042

J. Alan Carter, Evangel
5120 Hollow Log Lane
Birmingham, AL 35244

Paul Settle, Calvary
P.O. Box 565
Rosman, NC 28772

Robert Smallman, N. Illinois
1007 E. Third Street
Merrill, WI 54452

P. Legree Finch, South Texas
3333 Oak Ridge Drive
Bryan, TX 77802

John R. Riddle, Palmetto
212 Sherwood Drive
Conway, SC 29526

L. Byron Snapp, Westminster
P.O. Box 871
Cedar Bluff, VA 24609

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996

Marvin Padget, TN Valley
4012 Hillsboro Road
Nashville, TN 37215

Nelson Perret, Louisiana
1635 Worsham
Zachary, LA 70791

Class of 1995

Rodney A. Andrews, SE Alabama
108 Shadowlawn Drive
Dothan, AL 36303

Ralph Mittendorff, S. Florida
6678 Tiburon Drive
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Class of 1994

Julian Davis, C. Georgia
1806 Double Gate Court
Augusta, GA 30904

Steve Fox, SE Alabama
P. O. Box 11425
Montgomery, AL 36111

Class of 1993

John Van Voorhis, Calvary
26 Mountainbrook Trail
Greenville, SC 29609

Alternates

George Harris, Philadelphia
2438 Norwood Avenue
Roslyn, PA 19001

Advisory Members

Director of Ridge Haven

Frank Brock, President of Covenant College

Paul Kooistra, President of Covenant Theological Seminary

DIRECTORY

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA

Teaching Elders:

James C. Bland, South Texas
4215 Crownwood Drive
Seabrook, TX 77586

Andrew Silman, Louisiana
5314 Newell
Zachary, LA 70791

Kenneth A. Smith, New Jersey
545 Meadow Road
Princeton, NJ 08543

Lewis Ruff, N. California
3410 Vermont Place
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Harry Reeder, C. Carolina
305 Pineville-Matthews Road
Matthews, NC 28105

W. Wilson Benton, Missouri
12928 Ladue Road
St. Louis, MO 63141

Cortez A. Cooper, SE Alabama
1728 South Hull Street
Montgomery, AL 36104

Philip D. Douglass, Missouri
12273 N. Forty Drive
St. Louis, MO 63141

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996
James Hanemaayer, Pacific
1551 W. Via Bello Drive
Rialto, CA 92376

John Jardine, Jr., Heritage
1963 Mitten Street
Dover, DE 19901

Class of 1995
Eugene Betts, Philadelphia
108 Rock Rose Lane
Radnor, PA 19087-3736

Class of 1994
John B. White, Jr., N. Georgia
1490 Montevallo Circle
Decatur, GA 30033

John Wheeler, Calvary
2553 East Georgia Road
Simpsonville, SC 29681

Class of 1993
R. Arthur Williams, SW. Florida
2218 Pinewood Blvd
Sebring, FL 33870

James C. Turner, C. Georgia
719 Valley Trail
Macon, GA 31204

Alternates

Tim Gleeson, E. Canada
121 Lytton Blvd
Toronto, Ont M4R 1L5
CANADA

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO THE WORLD

Teaching Elders:

Dominic A. Aquila, S. Florida
8485 SW 112 Street
Miami, FL 33156

John W. P. Oliver, C. Georgia
642 Telfair Street
Augusta, GA 30901

Shelton Sanford, Calvary
1300 India Hook Road
Rock Hill, SC 29732

Robert F. Auffarth, Heritage
505 Woodlawn Avenue
Newark, DE 19711

Jerram Barrs, Missouri
280 Amber Jack Drive
Ballwin, MO 63021

Frank M. Barker, Evangel
2200 Briarwood Way
Birmingham, AL 35243

Jack B. Scott, MS Valley
1530 Sherman Avenue
Jackson, MS 39211

R. Lynn Downing, S. Florida
P.O. Box 1623
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996

Charles W. Burns, Heritage
2509 Dorval Road
Wilmington, DE 19810

Don W. Cole, North Texas
5408 Heritage Circle
Sachse, TX 75048

Class of 1995

L. B. (Pete) Austin, TN Valley
1703 Crestwood Drive
Chattanooga, TN 37405

James Banks, W. Carolina
Christ School
Arden, NC 28704

Class of 1994

Gerald Sovereign, Gulf Coast
3992 Baypoint Drive
Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

James Wright, Palmetto
2209 Raven Trail
West Columbia, SC 29169

Class of 1993

Loyd Strickland, N. Georgia
Crystal Farms
Chestnut Mountain, GA 30502

Alternates

John B. Noble, SE Alabama
1720 Pineneedle Road
Montgomery, AL 36106

DIRECTORY

III. AGENCIES

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT COLLEGE

Teaching Elders:

Lane G. Adams, Potomac
3350 McCue, #2003
Houston, TX 77056

Dan Kim, North Georgia
748 Rollingwood Drive
Stone Mountain, GA 30087

Arthur C. Broadwick, C. Georgia
108 Rose DHU Way
Savannah, GA 31419

William S. Barker, Philadelphia
163 Lismore Avenue
Glenside, PA 19038

Robert S. Rayburn, Pacific NW
818 South M Street
Tacoma, WA 98405

Lonnie Barnes, New River
5526 Twilight Road, NW
Roanoke, VA 24019

Thomas G. Kay, Sr., Warrior
P. O. Box 174
Aliceville, AL 35442

C. Al Lutz, Great Lakes
975 Charwood Drive
Lexington, KY 40515

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996

Kenneth E. Avis, Covenant
176 Gorham Place
Germantown, TN 38138

Joel Belz, W. Carolina
392 Old Haw Creek Road
Asheville, NC 28805

David Edling, South Coast
472 Blueridge Place
Escondido, CA 92026

G. Richard Hostetter, TN Valley
1602 Lula Lake Road
Lookout Mountain, GA 30750

James Roberts, SW Florida
100 N. Starcrest Drive
Clearwater, FL 34618

Class of 1995

Hugh O. Maclellan, Sr. TN Valley
109 East Brow Road
Lookout Mountain, TN 37350

Robert A. Watts, Northeast
17 Briarwood Drive
Barrington, RI 02806

Robert G. Avis, Missouri
1706 Warson Estates Drive
St. Louis, MO 63124

Dwight L. Allen, N. Georgia
7284 Milam Road
Winston, GA 30187

Class of 1994

Richard C. Chewning, North Texas
P. O. Box 430
Hewitt, TX 76643

C. H. Crews, Jr., Calvary
140 Glenbrooke Way
Greenville, SC 29615

Robert L. Frederick, TN Valley
9133 Pleasant Lane
Ooltewah, TN 37363

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Board of Trustees of Covenant College - continued

Donald E. Rittler, Potomac
506 Chadwick Road
Lutherville, MD 21093

Class of 1993

Allen Mawhinney, C. Florida
Reformed Theological Seminary
1015 Maitland Center Commons
Maitland, FL 32751

Charles E. Carraher, S. Florida
5760 NW 71 Terrace
Parkland, FL 33067

J. Render Caines, TN Valley
Route 8, 114 Larry Drive
Ringgold, GA 30736

John C. Wright, SE Alabama
3524 Royal Carriage Drive
Montgomery, AL 36116

Whaley Barton, Palmetto
3 Turtle Cove Lane
Irmo, SC 29063

Mark Van Gilst, Heritage
308 Possum Park Road
Newark, DE 19711

J. Robert Fiol, James River
1520 Narbonne Court
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Teaching Elders:

Stephen Bostrom, E. Carolina
7121 East Ridge Road
Apex, NC 27502

Charles Green, C. Florida
1300 W. Maitland Blvd
Maitland, FL 32751

Stephen Smallman, Potomac
1164 Wimbledon Drive
McLean, VA 22101

Hudson T. Armerding, Susq. Valley
16 Fairway Drive
Quarryville, PA 17566

David Alexander, Calvary
105 E. Hearne Street
Albemarle, NC 28001

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996

Samuel Bartholomew, W. Carolina
26 Hampstead Road
Asheville, NC 28804

Lanny Moore, SW Florida
3095 Kennesaw Street
Fort Myers, FL 33916

Rudolph Schmidt, TN Valley
5 Frontier Bluff
Lookout Mountain, GA 30750

Class of 1995

Robert Burrows, Ascension
6772 St. James Circle
Hudson, OH 44236

Art Stoll, N. Illinois
750 E. Main Street
S. Elgin, IL 60177

DIRECTORY

Board of Trustees of Covenant Seminary - Continued

Robert E. Morrison, Potomac
208 North Royal Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

John J. Reed, Missouri
633 Hickory Lane
St. Louis, MO 63131

William G. Hay, Evangel
2287 Crest Drive
Birmingham, AL 35209

Michael N. Malone, Great Lakes
1305 Raintree Place
Winter Park, FL 32789

Class of 1994

Richard P. Ellingsworth, South Texas
33 Hickory Meadow Road
Cockeysville, MD 21030-1619

Vernon Pierce, SW Florida
13906 Tern Lane
Clearwater, FL 34622

James B. Orders, Jr., Calvary
1502 Parkins Mill Road
Greenville, SC 29607

James Reynolds, Missouri
419 Conway Lake Drive
St. Louis, MO 63141

Richard W. Tyson, Heritage
246 Smallwood Court
West Chester, PA 19382

William Spink, Jr., Covenant
1191 Saddle Ridge Drive
Germantown, TN 38138

Class of 1993

Edward S. Harris, Great Lakes
920 Canterbury Trail
Richmond, IN 47374

G. Paul Jones, C. Georgia
P. O. Box 6838
Macon, GA 31213

Robert B. Hezlep, Jr., Evangel
104 Davis Drive
Odenville, AL 35120

Allen L. Knox, Jr. SE Alabama
3652 Gaylord Place
Montgomery, AL 36105

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSURANCE, ANNUITY, AND RELIEF FUNDS

Class of 1996

Bruce B. Howes, Heritage
140 Airport Road
New Castle, DE 19720

Ralph Paden, TN Valley
14 Bartram Road
Lookout Mountain, TN 37350

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Insurance, Annuity and Relief - Continued

J. Allen Wright, N. Georgia
894 Banford Court
Marietta, GA 30068

Class of 1995

Denny Carew, Rocky Mountain
6406 Dewsbury Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80918

Ronald W. Horgan, Mid-America
7441 S. Atlanta Avenue
Tulsa, OK 74136

John Mardirosian, New Jersey
101 E. Miami Avenue
Cherry Hill, NJ 08034

Class of 1994

James E. Shipley, C. Georgia
1907 Tucker Road
Perry, GA 31069

Dudley M. Barnes, Covenant
909 Oakhurst
Clarksdale, MS 38614

William T. Clarke, Louisiana
915 Holly Street
Lake Charles, LA 70601

Class of 1993

Earle Morris, Jr., Palmetto
159 Lake Murray Terrace
Lexington, SC 29072

Gordon W. Frost, S. Florida
9311 NW 38th Place
Sunrise, FL 33321

Thomas J. Stein, Great Lakes
6646 Plantation Way
Cincinnati, OH 45224

Advisory Member: Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk

DIRECTORY

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE INVESTOR'S FUND FOR BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT

Teaching Elders

Taylor McGown, C. Carolina
1608-3D Charleston Pl Ln
Charlotte, NC 28212

Manuel Salabarría, S. Florida
175 SW 120 Avenue
Miami, FL 33184

Ruling Elders

Class of 1996

Henry Darden, SW Florida
614 Beverly Drive
Brandon, FL 33510

Mark Thompson, Louisiana
607 Morrow
Zachary, Louisiana 70791

Class of 1995

Ben Coombs, Pacific
5353 Sadring Avenue
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Class of 1994

Charles E. Simpson, C. Georgia
Star Route, Box 30 A3
Harlem, GA 30814

Irv Wicker, SE Alabama
132 Eswick Drive
Prattville, AL 36037

Class of 1993

Neil Adams, Pacific
5594 Jed Smith Road
Hidden Hills, CA 91302

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA FOUNDATION

Teaching Elders

Ruling Elders

Class of 1996

Wallace M. Campbell, Northeast
11 Bruce Street
Scotia, NY 12302

Harry S. Morris, Louisiana
Route 2, Box 47C6
Jackson, Louisiana 70748

Class of 1995

John N. Albritton, SE Alabama
3113 Jamestown Drive
Montgomery, AL 36111

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PCA Foundation - continued

Jean Owens, SW Florida
13003 Waterford Run Drive
Riverview, FL 33569

Loren V. Watson, TN Valley
3539 Valley High Lane
Chattanooga, TN 37415

Class of 1994

David B. Sincere, S. Florida
819 B Shelton Court
Lake Worth, FL 33467

Randy H. Kimbrough, Grace
P. O. Box 148
Mt. Olive, MS 39119

Class of 1993

Robert C. Eberst, S. Florida
9715 SW 142 Drive
Miami, FL 33176

Advisory Member
Paul R. Gilchrist, Stated Clerk

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF RIDGE HAVEN

Teaching Elders:

Malcolm M. Griffith, Gulf Coast
P. O. Box 606
Montrose, AL 36559

F. Rhett Sanders, W. Carolina
220 Grove Circle
Brevard, NC 28712

Robert F. Brunson, Grace
P.O. Box 425
Centreville, MS 39631

Richard O. Smith, N. Georgia
445 Chase Drive
Fayetteville, GA 30214

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1997

Class of 1996

C. Gene Parks, Sr., C. Carolina
2232 Wilkins Street
Burlington, NC 27115

Class of 1995

Howard Hokrein, C. Georgia
396 White Oak Estates Circle, SE
Thomson, GA 30824

Class of 1994

Newton Brooks, Gulf Coast
413 Main Street
Chattahoochee, FL 32324

Don L. Lloyd, W. Carolina
RT #2, Box 517
Brevard, NC 28712

DIRECTORY

Ridge Haven - continued

J. Allen Herrington, E. Carolina
4709 Waterbury Road
Raleigh, NC 27604

Class of 1993

Lindsey Tippins, N. Georgia
139 Midway Road
Marietta, GA 30064

Advisory Member
Charles H. Dunahoo, Coordinator
Christian Education and Publications

IV. SPECIAL COMMITTEES

ASSEMBLY THEOLOGICAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Teaching Elders:

R. Laird Harris, Heritage
9 Homewood Road
Wilmington, DE 19803

D. Clair Davis, Philadelphia
300 Wenner Way
Ft. Washington, PA 19034

Robert Reymond, S. Florida
5748 NE 16th Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33334

Wayne Herring, Covenant
4738 Walnut Grove Road
Memphis, TN 38117

David Miner, New Jersey
15 Ashwood Terrace
Port Orange, NJ 07052

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Roger D. Schultz, Westminster
612 Fairmount
Bristol, VA 24201

Class of 1994

Roy Gamble, SE Alabama
14 Creek Drive
Montgomery, AL 36117

Class of 1993

Bruce Kitchen, C. Georgia
11 Summerville Lane
Augusta, GA 30909

Alternates

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS

Teaching Elders:

Ron Steel, Potomac
3201 Robin Hood Court
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996

Stuart A. Miller, Westminster
Route 1, Box 330A
Rural Retreat, VA 24368

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Committee on Constitutional Business - continued

Craig Childs, Evangel
1026 Mohring Place
Leeds, AL 35094

Roland Barnes, C. Georgia
119 College Blvd
Statesboro, GA 30458

E. Crowell Cooley, N. Illinois
6709 Arizona Avenue
Hammond, IN 46323

Bryan Chapell, Illiana
12262 Conway Road
St. Louis, MO 63141

Class of 1995

Daniel Domin, S. Florida
20821 Soneto Drive
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Class of 1994

Richard Springer, New Jersey
896 Cindi Court
Lakewood, NJ 08701

Class of 1993

David C. Lachman, Philadelphia
127 Woodland Road
Wyncote, PA 19095

Alternates

Samuel J. Duncan, Grace
P.O. Box 1951
Hattiesburg, MS 39403-1951

COMMITTEE ON INTERCHURCH RELATIONS

Teaching Elders:

Tim Fortner, Covenant
1503 Lawndale Drive
Tupelo, MS 38801-6133

Henry L. Smith, SE Alabama
585 Upper Kingston Road
Prattville, AL 36067

Robert Vasholz, Missouri
1019 Orchard Lakes
St. Louis, MO 63146

K. Eric Perrin, Palmetto
5637 Bush River Road
Columbia, SC 29212

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Wilson Barbee, C. Carolina
P. O. Box 192
Locust, NC 28097

Class of 1994

George H. Gulley, Jr., Grace
505 Storm Ave.
Brookhaven, MS 39601

Class of 1993

Jack Merry, Northeast
21 Helen Drive
Queensbury, NY 12804

Alternates

David Wyatt, So. Florida
1951 NE 60th Street
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308

Ex-Officio

Paul R. Gilchrist, TN Valley, Stated Clerk
Carl Wilhelm, North Georgia, MTW

DIRECTORY

V. STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION

Teaching Elder

David W. Hall, TN Valley
115 Bradley Avenue
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

John Montgomery, C. Florida
P.O. Box 950340
Lake Mary, FL 32795

L. Roy Taylor, Grace
4901 Hardy Street
Hattiesburg, MS 39402-1327

Michael D. Bolus, C. Georgia
P. O. Box 398
Thomson, GA 30824

John Sartelle, Covenant
4738 Walnut Grove Road
Memphis, TN 38117

Paul Kooistra, Warrior
12330 Conway Road
St. Louis, MO 63141

Dewey Roberts, Gulf Coast
758 Vintage Circle
Destin, FL 32541

LeRoy Ferguson III, Palmetto
3100 Covenant Road
Columbia, SC 29204

Robert Stuart, S. Florida
2651 Oak Park Circle
Davie, FL 33328

Robert M. Ferguson, Pacific
6627 Churchill Street
San Bernardino, CA 92407

Dominic A. Aquila, S. Florida
8485 SW 112 Street
Miami, FL 33156

John S. Ragland, South Texas
3333 Oak Ridge Drive
Bryan, TX 77802

Ruling Elder

Class of 1996

John Barnes, Calvary
652 Sedgewood Drive
Rock Hill, SC 29730

Eugene Friedline, James River
9601 Shiloh Drive
Richmond, VA 23237

Ed Robeson, W. Carolina
P.O. Box 1096
Rosman, NC 28772

Class of 1995

Mark Belz, Missouri
7777 Bonhomme, Suite 1710
St. Louis, MO 63105

W. Jack Williamson, SE Alabama
P. O. Box 467
Greenville, AL 36037

Gerald Sovereign, Gulf Coast
3992 Baypoint Drive
Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

Class of 1994

Harrison Brown, Susq. Valley
RD 1, Box 520
Palmyra, PA 17078

Frank Horton, MS Valley
704 East Leake Street
Clinton, MS 39056

John B. White, Jr., N. Georgia
1490 Montevallo Circle
Decatur, GA 30033

Class of 1993

John E. Spencer, Evangel
3500 Mill Run Road
Birmingham, AL 35223

John W. Lane, New Jersey
15 Potter Street
Haddonfield, NJ 08033

William N. Brown, North Texas
4214 Asheville Drive
Garland, TX 75041

VI. AD INTERIM COMMITTEES

AD INTERIM COMMITTEE ON PCA COMMUNICATIONS

RE John D. Holmes, James River
4625 Centralia Road
Chester, VA 23831

RE Rod Gragg, Palmetto
1520 Forest View Road
Conway, SC 29526

RE Edward Harris, Great Lakes
920 Canterbury Trail
Richmond, IN 47374

RE W. Jack Williamson, SE Alabama
P. O. Box 467
Greenville, AL 36037

TE Paul G. Settle, W. Carolina
Chairman
P.O. Box 565
Rosman, NC 28772

RE John B. White, Jr., N. Georgia
1490 Montevallo Circle
Decatur, GA 30033

RE John B. Prentis, III, Missouri
12330 Conway Road
St. Louis, MO 63141

AD INTERIM COMMITTEE ON POLICY QUESTIONS OF IAR

TE Robert Ferguson, Pacific
6627 Churchill Street
San Bernardino, CA 92407

RE John Barnes, TN Valley
3 Turnberry Lane
Lookout Mountain, GA 30750

TE Collins D. Weeber, S. Florida
Convener
14401 Old Cutler Road
Miami, FL 33158

RE Robert Graham, Missouri
654 Office Parkway Drive
St. Louis, MO 63141

PART II
JOURNAL

TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

June 15, 1992

First Session

20-1 Assembly Called to Order and Opening Worship

The Twentieth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America was convened by the moderator, RE Mark Belz, at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, June 15, 1992, in the Civic Center, Roanoke, VA. The moderator began with prayer, and the Assembly joined in the worship of God following the printed order:

Organ Prelude: <i>"Marche Religieuse"</i>	<i>Guilmant</i>
Convening of the Assembly	
Call to Worship: Responsive Reading	<i>Psalm 24</i>
Choral Introit: <i>"Come We That Love The Lord"</i> arr: Bass	
Covenant Singers	
Invocation	
Hymn: <i>"The Church's One Foundation"</i>	No. 347
Prayer for the Work of the Assembly	
Anthem: <i>"The Tree Of Life"</i>	<i>Scott</i>
Covenant Singers	
Scripture: 2nd Kings 5	
Solo: <i>"Take My Life"</i>	<i>Courtney</i>
Mrs. Janet Sugg	
Exhortation: "Gehazi's Sermon"	
Moderator RE Mark Belz	
Hymn: <i>"Amazing Grace"</i> (Stanzas 1-4)	No. 460
Sacrament of the Lord's Supper	
- Words of Institution and Invitation	
- Prayer of Consecration	
- Distribution of the Elements	
- The Bread: <i>"Let us Break Bread Together"</i>	arr: Hopson
- The Cup: <i>"O God, Unseen Yet Ever Near"</i>	arr: Hopson
Covenant Singers	
Prayer of Thanksgiving	
Hymn: <i>"Christ Is Made the Sure Foundation"</i>	No. 343
Benediction	
Choral Response: <i>"Jesus, the Very Thought of Thee"</i>	<i>Goodyear</i>
Covenant Singers	
Organ Postlude: <i>"O Sons and Daughters Let Us Sing"</i>	<i>Willan</i>

Following the benediction the Assembly recessed for ten minutes at 9:20 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

20-2 Reconvening for Business

At 9:30 p.m. the Assembly reconvened for business, being led in prayer by TE Kennedy Smartt. The moderator declared a quorum to be present, the enrollment so far being 376 ruling elders, 674 teaching elders, and 8 alternates.

ASCENSION PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Pennsylvania, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Akron, OH	Faith	Carl Bogue	Jeff Brotherton
Akron, OH	Faith		Robert Oldaker
Aliquippa	New Life	Robert Bradbury	
Beaver Falls	Christ	Larry Elenbaum	
Butler	Westminster	John Grauley	Jack Miller
Butler	Westminster		W. Ihlenfeld
Butler	Westminster		Jay McCasin
Carmichaels	Greene Valley	Nick Protos	
Carmichaels	Greene Valley	Michael DeLozier	
Cumberland, MD	Faith	LeRoy Capper	
Darlington	Darlington Ref	Jeffrey Noyes	
Eighty-Four	View Crest Ref	Gary Baker	Kerry Black
Ellwood City	Berean	Bruce Gardner	
Erie	Faith Ref	Leon Ben-Ezra	Ken Peterson
Harrison City	New Life	Scott Johnston	
Harrisville	Rocky Springs	David Currence	
Hudson, OH	Grace	Gil Odendaal	
Johnstown	Trinity	David Karlberg	Louis Karlberg
Leechburg	Kiski Valley	William Saadeh	
Ligonier	Pioneer	Don Kistler	
McKees Rocks	Providence	John Koelling	Robert Alouise
McKees Rocks	Providence		Howard Donahoe
Pitcairn	PC of Pitcairn	James Spitzel	
Port Allegany	Grace	Jeffrey Black	
Steubenville, OH	Covenant	Larry Roff	
Volant	Hillcrest	Jerry Maguire	Frederick Neikirk
Will'ville, NY	Church/Savior		Jerry Knight
Will'ville, NY	Church/Savior		Paul Slish
		Chris Bennett	
		Jerry Mead	
		Robert Peterson	
		Michael Wolter	
		Warren West	

CALVARY PRESBYTERY (All towns are in South Carolina)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Abbeville	Lebanon	Daniel Smyth	
Abbeville	New Hope	Charles Champion	

JOURNAL

Calvary Presbytery - continued

Clemson	Clemson	John Hall	David Woodard
Clinton	Westminster	David Bryan	Bruce Senn
Clover	Bethel	John Gess	Robert Richards
Conestee	Reedy River	Ken Gentry	Kim Conner
Edgefield	Edgefield	Richard Barbare	
Gaffney	Beech Street	Scott Carter	
Greenville	Mitchell Road	John Crawford	
Greenville	Mitchell Road	Russell Louden	
Greenville	Second	Rodney Clay	
Greenville	Second	Steve Wallace	Stuart Patterson
Greenville	Second		Ligon Duncan
Greenville	Shannon Forest	Michael Potts	
Greer	Fulton	Grover Timms	
Greer	Immanuel	Michael Mang	
Greenwood	Rock	Curt Rabe	
Lake Wylie	Scherer Mem.	Rick Lindsay	Richard Robertson
Lake Wylie	Scherer Mem.		Hugh Love
Laurens	Friendship	Glen McClung	John Amrstrong
Newberry	Smyrna	Gaynor Phillips	
Rock Hill	Hopewell	Daren Russell	
Rock Hill	Westminster	Shelton Sanford	Smith Barnette
Rock Hill	Westminster	William Fox	Frank Limerick
Rock Hill	Westminster	Chris Ehlers	Wilbur Livingston
Roebuck	Mt. Calvary	David Alexander	
Sharon	Bullock Creek		Oscar Sadler
Simpsonville	Woodruff Road	Rod Mays	Doug Patton
Spartanburg	Providence	Dan Coleman	
Spartanburg	Trinity	Raymond Hellings	
Woodruff	Antioch	Jerry Crick	Mack Carlton
York	Filbert	Wallace Tinsley	John Anderson
York	Filbert		Otis Mitchell
		David Alexander	
		Tom Cross	
		Samuel Joyner	
		Reuben Wallace	

CENTRAL CAROLINA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in North Carolina.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Belmont	Goshen	Gilbert Moore	
Burlington	Northside		Bennett Richardson
Burlington	Northside		John Harris
Cameron	Countryside	William Bivans	
Charlotte	Faith	Taylor McGown	
Charlotte	Prosperity	Stephen Stout	

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Central Carolina Presbytery - continued

Charlotte	Prosperity	Darrell Arnold	
Charlotte	Univ. City	Wayne Zaepfel	
Concord	Bible	Scott Willet	
Denver	Lakeshore	Joel McCall	Bill Rocap
Ellerbe	First	Dewey Murphy	Richard Henderson
Ellerbe	Mt. Carmel	David Frierson	
Fayetteville	Cross Creek	James Braden	
Harrisburg	Grace	Doug Agnew	Wayne Allen
Lexington	Meadowview	Gary Cox	John Hudson
Lexington	Meadowview		Tom Owen
Matthews	Christ Covnt	Harry Reeder	Bernard Lawrence
Matthews	Christ Covnt	Tom Henry	Robert Dyar
Matthews	Christ Covnt		Michael Moore
Mt. Ulla	Back Creek	Alex Cobientz	Robert White
Stanley	First	Dan King	Mike Dixon
Stanley	First		George Robinson
Winston-Salem	Redeemer	Richard Downs	
Winston-Salem	Redeemer	Stuart Stogner	
		John Ottinger	
		Gregg Singer	
		Robert Wilcox	

CENTRAL FLORIDA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Florida.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
DeLand	Immanuel	David Boxerman	
Eustis	New Hope	Charles McArthur	
Gainesville	Faith		Gary Hodge
Jacksonville	Christ	John Hutchinson	Bill Coggins * John DuBose
Jacksonville	Northshore	Tom Ellis	
Jacksonville	Ortega	Ben Taylor	
Jacksonville	Westminster	Anthony Dallison	
Lake Mary	River Oaks	John Montgomery	
Live Oak	Community	James Walkup	
Maitland	Orangewood	Charles Green	Milton Clement
McIntosh	Community	Benson Cain	
Middleburg	Pinewood	Rod Whited	
Ocala	Grace	Neil Gilmour	Charles Black
Ocala	Grace	Michael Gordon	Daniel Standish
Palm Bay	Covenant	Maurice Sikes	
Palm Bay	Covenant	Patrick McDaniel	
Ponte Vedra Bch	Ponte Vedra	Alan Scott	
Port Orange	Spruce Creek	Ray Kruntorad	
Spring Hill	Day Spring	Phil Stogner	
Winter Park	Howell Branch	Jack Arnold	

JOURNAL

Central Florida Presbytery - continued

Winter Park	Howell Branch	Tom Sidebotham
Winter Park	St. Paul's	Mike Malone
		David M. Gordon
		Allen Mawhinney

CENTRAL GEORGIA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Georgia.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Augusta	Cliffwood	Tim Stewart	Jim Weathers
Augusta	First	Michael Russell	John Bailie
Augusta	First	John Nordan	
Augusta	Lakemont	Jack Jagoditsch	
Columbus	Westminster	Douglas Tilley	
Forsyth	Dayspring	John Browne	Erik Leonhard
Garden City	Chapel/Gardens	Tommy Carr	
Macon	First	Sam Cappel	John Clark
Macon	First	Joseph Wolstencroft	Donald Comer
Macon	First	Paul Jones	
Macon	North Macon	David Todd	
Martinez	Westminster	Archie Moore	Julian Davis
Milledgeville	Covenant	John Kinser	Doug Pohl
Perry	Perry	Jim Shipley	John Blythe
Perry	Perry		Jack Smith
Savannah	Eastern Hts	Stephen Jackson	
Savannah	Providence	Scott Reiber	
Statesboro	Trinity	Roland Barnes	John Marshall
St. Simons Isle	Golden Isles	Richard Burguet	Gordon Thompson
Sylvania	Liberty	Tommie Knowles	
Thomson	Thomson	Michael Bolus	Charles Hill
Thomson	Thomson		Charles Simpson
Tifton	New Life	Ronald Clegg	
		Wayne Curles	
		Art Broadwick	
		Craig Higgins	
		Terry Johnson	
		Jim Knight	
		Charles Morrison	

COVENANT PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Mississippi, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Arlington, TN	Hickory Withe	Kenneth Camp	
Carrollton	Carrollton	Grover Gunn	
Clarendon, AR	First	Mack Plunket	

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Covenant Presbytery - continued

Clarksdale	First	Thomas Kay	Robert Traylor
Cleveland	Covenant	Tim Starnes	Doug Wheeler
Cleveland	Covenant		Foster Wilkinson
Columbus	Main Street	Darwin Jordan	Jack Brown
Columbus	Main Street		Eric Beardslee
Dyersburg	First	Werner Mietting	Bill Tanner
Greenville	Covenant	James Holland	Collins Brent
Greenwood	Westminster	George Coxhead	
Grenada	Grenada	James Perry	
Houston	Houston	Robert Penny	
Indianola	First		Marion Johnson
Indianola	First		Howard Davis
Jackson, TN	Grace	Ford Williams	
Little Rock, AR	Covenant	Tim Reed	
Memphis, TN	Grace Evan.	James Young	
Osceola, AR	First	Joe Grider	P.D. Johnson
Sardis	Sardis	David Smith	
Starkville	Grace	Brad Stewart	
Water Valley	First	John Wingard	
		Paul Bankson	
		Mike Biggs	
		Richard Cannon	
		Ray Cross	
		Samuel Downing	
		David Hamilton	
		Wayne Herring	
		Al Mersman	
		Bill Rose	

EASTERN CANADA PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Guelph, On	Willow West	Stephen Christian	

EASTERN CAROLINA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in North Carolina.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Cary	Peace	Stephen Bostrom	Austin Leake
Cary	Peace		Peter Shedor
Chapel Hill	Good Shepherd	David Bowen	Charles Heinmiller
Fremont	White Oak	Randy Jenkins	
Goldsboro	Antioch	Lewis Baker	
Greenville	Christ		Tom Lamprecht
New Bern	Pamlico		Steve Miller
New Bern	Village Chapel	James Routszong	John Leigh

JOURNAL

Eastern Carolina Presbytery - continued

Raleigh	Calvary	John Warren	
Raleigh	New Covenant	James O'Brien	Charles Leverett
Wilmington	Trinity	Norman Evans	
		Al Herrington	

EVANGEL PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Alabama.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Birmingham	Altadena Valley		Phil Anderson * Charles Gibson
Birmingham	Briarwood	Frank Barker	Tom Leopard
Birmingham	Briarwood	Tom Cheely	George Moss
Birmingham	Briarwood	George Mitchell	Crawford Nevins
Birmingham	Briarwood	Phillip Reddick	Thomas Saunders
Birmingham	Briarwood		DeVan Ard
Birmingham	Briarwood		Thomas Harris
Birmingham	Briarwood		Don Harrison
Birmingham	Briarwood		Douglas Haskew
Birmingham	Briarwood		John Spencer
Birmingham	Covenant	Bill Hay	Bruce Bailey
Birmingham	Covenant	Craig Boden	
Birmingham	Covenant	Grady Simpson	
Birmingham	PC/Hills	Jeff Carlton	
Birmingham	Ref. Heritage	Peter Leithart	
Birmingham	Third		Robert Hezlep
Birmingham	Third		Eugene Hill
Courtland	Courtland	William Cooper	
Decatur	Decatur	Joey King	
Gadsden	Rainbow	Calvin Frett	Sam Brewer
Helena	Evangel	Jeff Lowman	
Huntsville	Ebenezer	James Daughtry	
Huntsville	Southwood	Barney Heyward	
Huntsville	Westminster	Paul Alexander	Ross Blankley
Madison	Community	Keith Lorick	
Moody	Community	Burt Boykin	J. Sullivan
Moody	Community	Craig Childs	
Pleasant Grove	Pres. Ref. Ch.	Carl Russell	
Tuscumbia	First	R.W. Markert	
		Jimmy Lyons	

GRACE PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Mississippi, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Bay Springs	Bay Springs	Philip McRae	
Brookhaven	Faith	Thomas Shields	Julian Cameron

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Grace Presbytery - continued

Centerville	Bethany		* Richard Mayfield
Centreville	Thomson Mem	Robert Brunson	
Crystal Springs	First	Wilson Smith	Walt Lagerwey
Ellisville	Ellisville		Charlie Probst
Ellisville	Ellisville		Randy Martin
Gulfport	First	William Lyle	Charles Brueck
Gulfport	First	Don Huyser	
Hattiesburg	Bay Street	Paul Honomichl	G.O. Runnels
Hattiesburg	First	Roy Taylor	Samuel Duncan
Hattiesburg	First		William R. Starway
Hattiesburg	Woodland	David Jussely	
Hazlehurst	First	John Apel	
Heidelberg	Heidelberg	Ray Bobo	
Laurel	Covenant	Steven Shuman	
Leakesville	Leakesville	James Watson	Gordon Rounsaville
Magee	Magee	John McArthur	
Magee	Sharon	Dale Linton	
Moss Point	Moss Point	Norman Bagby	Chester Deas
Mount Olive	Mount Olive	Randy Kimbrough	Winton Miller
Prentiss	Prentiss	F.W. Tripp	
Slidell, LA	Trinity	Merle Messer	
Waynesboro	Philadelphus	Lee Bloodworth	
Woodville	First	E.C. Case	
		William Mosal	
		William J. Starway	

GREAT LAKES PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Bad Axe, MI	First	Dennis Slack	Howard Lane
Bloomington, IN	Grace Covenant	John Peoples	
Cincinnati, OH	Church/Covenant	Mark Dalbey	Tom Stein
Cincinnati, OH	Faith	Daniel Perrin	
Dublin, OH	Northwest	Larry Allen	
Indianapolis, IN	Grace	Dave McKay	
Lexington, KY	Dayspring	Andrew Adams	
Lexington, KY	Tates Creek	Skip Gillikin	
Louisville, KY	Community	David Dively	
Medina, OH	Harvest	Michael Van Arsdale	
Richmond, IN	Christ		Ed Harris
		Corbett Heimburger	
		Donald Remillard	

JOURNAL

GULF COAST PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Florida, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Cantonment	Pinewoods	Gordon Lewis	
Chattahoochee	Chattahoochee		Newton Brooks
Destin	Safe Harbor	Dewey Roberts	
Ft. Walton Bch.	Westminster	Bill Tyson	Chip Bennett
Ft. Walton Bch	Korean Comm.	Joshua Jea	
Gulf Breeze	Concord	Robert Herrmann	Gerry Sovereign
Gulf Shores, AL	Grace Flwship	John Thompson	
Gulf Shores, AL	Grace Flwship	Richard Fennig	
Madison	Grace	James Cavanah, II	Julian Gibson
Madison	Grace		Kirby Reichmann
Milton	Westminster	Mark Rowden	
Mobile, AL	Christ	Bruce Longstreth	
Panama City	Covenant	Robert Hayes	
Panama City	First	Brian Johnston	Howard Meyer
Pensacola	Mcllwain Mem.	Ronald Parrish	John Woodward
Pensacola	Northeast	Jack Waller	
Pensacola	Warrington	Robert Hornick	Paul White
Quincy	New Phil.	Randy Wilding	Robert Smith
Tallahassee	Wildwood	Mike Khandjian	
		Don Dunkerley	
		Arnie Maves	

HEARTLAND PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Ackley, IA	Faith	Timothy Diehl	
Holland IA	Colfax Center	Larry Hoop	
Olathe, KS	Olathe	Robert Baxter	Charles Meador
Olathe, KS	Olathe		Michael Milton
Omaha, NE	Trinity	Phil Kayser	
Walker, IA	Bible	Walter Gienapp	
Wichita, KS	Evangel	David Burke	
		Paddy Cook	
		Kenneth Remer	

HERITAGE PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Boothwyn, PA	Reformed	Dwight Dunn	
Dover, DE	Grace	Jonathan Seda	John Jardine
Dover, DE	Grace	Gareth Tonnessen	
Elkton, MD	Evangelical	Michael Chastain	Floyd Veatch

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Heritage Presbytery - continued

Exton, PA	Immanuel	Rick Tyson	
Hockessin, DE	Berea	Richard Horner	Gene Wentling
Media, PA	Calvary Ref	Ernest Breen	Jim Albary
Media, PA	Calvary Ref		George Deibert
New Castle, DE	Heritage	Bruce Howes	Doug Latimer
New Castle, DE	Manor Ref	Timothy von Duyke	
Newark, DE	Evangelical	Bob Auffarth	Don Mutter
Newark, DE	Evangelical	Mark VanGilst	Walter Walstrum
Salisbury, MD	Christ's Comm.	Dallard Stanton	
W. Chester, PA	Reformed	Stanley Gale	
West Grove, PA	Gethsemane	Chris Tindall	
Wilmington, DE	Faith	Edd Cathey	Rick Olson
Wilmington, DE	Faith		Wilhelmus Schaffers
		Laird Harris	
		John McNicoll	
		Lynden Stewart	

ILLIANA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Illinois, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Edwardville	Cov. Ref.		Scott Levy
Sparta	Bethel RPC	Robert Ellis	
Waterloo	Concord	Daniel Dermeyer	
		Bryan Chapell	

JAMES RIVER PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Virginia.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Charlottesville	Trinity	Mike Sharrett	
Charlottesville	Trinity	John Kuebler	
Charlottesville	Trinity	Tony Giles	
Charlottesville	Trinity	Tom Darnell	
Chester	Centralia	John Holmes	Gene Friedline
Chester	Centralia		Rick Mattes
Culpeper	Christ Cov.	James Creech	
Hampton	Calvary Ref	Kerry Hurst	
Harrisonburg	Covenant		Gary Shickel
Hopewell	River's Edge	Raymond Good	
Hopewell	West End	Robert Wilson	
Hopewell	W. Hopewell	Ira Staley	Cary Shelton
Lexington	Grace	Paul Carter	
Midlothian	Sycamore	Harry Long	Walter Lastovica
Norfolk	Calvary		Bob Fingleton
Norfolk	Immanuel	William Harrell	Dale White

JOURNAL

James River Presbytery - continued

Norfolk	Immanuel		James Barr	
Richmond	All Saints Ref	Howard Griffith	John Waddill	* William Ivey
Richmond	Stony Pt. Ref	Frank Crane	Rick Trumbo	
Richmond	Stony Pt. Ref	Steve Shelby	Phil Soldan	
Richmond	Stony Pt. Ref		Gary Johnson	
Virginia Beach	New Covenant	Joseph Mullen		
Virginia Beach	New Life	Wallace Sherbon		
Virginia Beach	Eastminster		Reece White	
Williamsburg	Grace Covenant	Robert Hopper		
		Robert Becker		
		Robert Fiol		
		Douglas Kittredge		
		Linwood Wilkes		

KOREAN CENTRAL PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Chicago, IL	Holy Nation	Ki Baek Shin	
Chicago, IL	Korean Bethel	Daniel Choe	
Springfield, MO	First	Sang Ho Nam	

KOREAN EASTERN PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Edison, NJ	Korean PC	Eui Chul Shin	
Parsippany, NJ	Ephesus	Daniel Song	
Philadelphia, PA	Emmanuel	Henry Koh	
Philadelphia, PA	Emmanuel	John Lee	
St. College, PA	State College	Sang-Kee Eun	
Woodside, NY	Korean	Samuel Park	

KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Burke, VA	Korean PC/Wash	Taek Yong Kim	
McLean, VA	McLean Korean	Sang Mook Kim	
Woodbridge, VA	KPC of So. Wash	Myung K. Kim	

KOREAN SOUTHERN PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Houston, TX	Korean PC	Edward Kim	
Phila, PA	Ko Hallelujah	Young-Hwan Kim	

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

KOREAN SOUTHWEST PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Los Angeles, CA	Victory	Chang Seh Kim	
Sierra Vista, AZ	United Korean	Dong Sik Chon	
Reseda, CA	West Valley	Hui-Chu Chong	

LOUISIANA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Louisiana.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Alexandria	Jackson Street	Robert Vincent	
Clinton	Faith	Shane Sunn	Martin Stott
Clinton	Faith		Guy Kent
Delhi	Delhi	Paul Lipe	
Lake Charles	Bethel	Ron Davis	
Monroe	Auburn Avenue	Steve Wilkins	Hewitt Carter
Monroe	Auburn Avenue		Dale Peacock
New Orleans	Orleans	John Keen	
Opelousas	Westminster	Mark Duncan	
Zachary	Plains	Andrew Silman	Mark Thompson
Zachary	Plains		Edwin Hackenberg
Zachary	Plains		Nelson Perret

Jim Meek

MID-AMERICA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Oklahoma, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Lawton	Beal Hts	John Butler	
Moore	Prairie Winds		Fred Muse
Springfield, MO	Immanuel Ref.	Michael Obel	
Tulsa	Christ	Robert Petterson	George O'Dell
Tulsa	Christ	Craig Weaver	Lyle Fogle

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Mississippi.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Bailey	Bailey	Alton Phillips	Ken Covington
Brandon	Lakeland	William Whitwer	Thomas Sillers
Carthage	Carthage	Daniel Gilchrist	
Clinton	Providence	John Reeves	Louis Lavallee
Clinton	Mt. Salus	Basil Albert	A.D. Owings
Jackson	Alta Woods	Steve Jussely	Gilbet Ford
Jackson	Alta Woods		Gabe Green
Jackson	First	James Baird	Robert Cannada
Jackson	First	William Hughes	Homer Lee Howie

JOURNAL

Mississippi Valley Presbytery - continued

Jackson	First	Jeffrey Elliott	Edmund Johnston
Jackson	First	Brister Ware	James Elkin
Jackson	First		James Moore
Jackson	North Park	Jim Shull	Roy Lawrence
Kosciusko	First	James Barnes	Gary Holdiness
Louisville	First	Bob Schwanebeck	
Macon	Macon	Michael Howell	
Madison	First	Robert West	
Pearl	Pearl		George Powe
Philadelphia	Carolina	Philip Blevins	
Philadelphia	First	Joel Beezley	
Raymond	Raymond		Douglas Vinzant
Ridgeland	Pear Orchard	Charles Frost	Jack Treloar
Ridgeland	Pear Orchard	Billy Davies	
Union	First	Mike Ahlberg	
Vicksburg	Westminster		Jackson Ables
Yazoo City	Second		Will Thompson
		Don Caviness	
		John Kyle	
		Mark Lowrey	
		Fred Marsh	
		Don Patterson	

MISSOURI PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Missouri.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Ballwin	Twin Oaks	Rodney Stortz	
Ballwin	Twin Oaks	Albert Moginot	
Hazelwood	Hazelwood Ref	Scott Churnock	
St. Louis	Covenant	George Robertson	
St. Louis	Kirk/Hills	Wilson Benton	John Reed
St. Louis	Kirk/Hills	Michael Preg	John Prentis
St. Louis	Kirk/Hills	Jon Atkins	Bruce Owens
St. Louis	Memorial	Paul Woodard	Mark Belz
St. Louis	Olive Branch	James Gray	
Washington	New Port	Robert Allyn	
Webster Grove	Old Orchard	Ron Lutjens	
		Philip Douglass	
		Howard Eyrich	
		Roger Hunt	
		Donald MacNair	
		Leon Pannkuk	

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NEW JERSEY PRESBYTERY (All towns are in New Jersey.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Brick	Calvary	Ken Klett	
Cape May	Covenant Bible	Daniel Barr	
Cherry Hill	Covenant		William Bonner
Columbia	Knowlton	Stephen Clark	
Fairton	Fairfield	Allan Story	
Middletown	New Life	John Light	
Princeton	Princeton	Ken Smith	
Short Hills	Covenant		David Miner
Somerset	Mt. Carmel	Robert Cameron	
Somerville	Grace Comm	Worth Carson	
Star Cross	Evangel	James Chestnut	
		Bill Greenwalt	
		James Smith	

NEW RIVER PRESBYTERY (All towns are in West Virginia, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Barboursville	Providence Ref	Richard Thomas	Don Wahlman
Barboursville	Providence Ref		Virgil Roberts
Blacksburg, VA	Grace Covenant	Don Clements	Cal Ribbens
Charleston	Faith	Charles McNutt	James Jarvis
Charleston	R. Littlepage	William Hall	Harry Musser
Cloverdale	Valley Ref.		Douglas Hart
Cloverdale	Valley Ref.		Brian Zimmerman
Fairmont	Faith Ref	Ken Robinson	Carl Johnson
Floyd, VA	Harvestwood	Riley Ware	Bob Miller
Malden	Kanawha Salines	John Smith	Ralph Harris
Narrows	Valley	Steven Leonard	
New Martville	Trinity	Timothy Dye	Richard Ferguson
Roanoke, VA	Westminster	Lonnie Barnes	Jim Harrell
Roanoke, VA	Westminster		Bane Coburn
St. Albans	Covenant	Rodney King	Jim Williams
St. Albans	Covenant		* Paige Melton
Wheeling	Faith Ref.	Samuel Gibb	* Keith Ferrell
		David McCarty	

NORTH GEORGIA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Georgia.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Atlanta	Intown Community	Greg Perry	Earl Witmer
Atlanta	Westminster	Oliver Claassen	John White
			*Larry Allen

JOURNAL

North Georgia Presbytery - continued

Atlanta	Westminster	David Robinson	John Underwood
Carrollton	Covenant Comm	Donald Jones	
Cedartown	Grace		Eddie Johnston
Chestnut Mt	Chestnut Mt	John Batusic	Ray Jones
Decatur	Chapel Woods		John Osborne
Duluth	Old Peachtree	Michael Plunket	Elliott Bayne
Fayetteville	Covenant	Dale Welden	Ross Cook
Gainesville	Westminster	Lee Lovett	Loyd Strickland
Jonesboro	Emmanuel	Clifford Brewton	Willis Smith
Lilburn	Perimeter East		Carl Wilhelm
Marietta	Christ	David Swicegood	
Marietta	Hope	James Powell	Neil Nelson
Norcross	Perimeter	Walter Wood	Harvey Anderson
Norcross	Perimeter	Bob Burns	James Jacobs
Peachtree City	Carriage Lane	Doug Griffith	
Powder Springs	Midway	Todd Allen	Don Barnett
Powder Springs	Midway	Gene Hunt	Lindsey Tippins
Smyrna	Smyrna	Grady Love	Ross Jerguson
Snellville	Our Saviors		Marc Kyle
Stockbridge	The Rock	Donald Musin	James White
Stone Mountain	Grace		John Rollo
Watkinsville	Faith	Terry Mercer	
Woodstock	Cherokee	James Lester	
Woodstock	Cherokee	John Maphet	

Richard Aeschliman
 Charles Dunahoo
 Robert Edmiston
 Rod Entrekin
 Terry Gyger
 Jim Hatch
 Dan Kim
 Henry Patton
 Kennedy Smartt
 Henry Thigpen
 Allen Thompson
 Robert Valentine

NORTH TEXAS PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Texas.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Bedford	Westminster	William Bomer	
Carrollton	Metrocrest	Ron Dunton	
Colleyville	Colleyville	Clarence Mays	
Dallas	New Covenant	Robert Palmer	

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

North Texas Presbytery - continued

Dallas	New Covenant		G. Dutton
Dallas	New Covenant		M.C. Culbertson
Dallas	Park Cities	Joseph Ryan	James Chenoweth
Dallas	Park Cities	Donald Riley	William Farrell
Dallas	Park Cities		Robert Mighell
Dallas	Park Cities		Harry Hargrave
Dallas	Town East	Charles Cobb	
Gainesville	Westminster		T. John Mulkey
Greenville	Westminster	Thomas Barnes	Raiford Stainback
Lewisville	Christ	David Sherwood	
Richardson	Town North	David Clelland	Ralph Shay
Richardson	Town North		Don Cole
Rowlett	First	Richard Bacon	David Seekamp
Plano	Trinity		Mike Dillow
Tyler	Fifth Street	Ronald Brady	
		Jim Pancoast	

NORTHEAST PRESBYTERY (All towns are in New York, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Ballston Spa	Hope	William Henderson	
Coventry, CT	PC of Coventry	Brad Evans	
Duanesburg	Reformed PC	Chris Baker	
Lincolndale	Affirmation	Frank E. Smith	
Lincolndale	Affirmation	Frank J. Smith	
Manchester, CT	Manchester PC	Richard Gray	
Nashua, NH	Christ	T. David Gordon	
New York	Redeemer	Timothy Keller	
New York	Redeemer	Jeffrey White	
New York	Redeemer	Scot Sherman	
Rock Tavern	Westminster	John Vance	
W. Springfield	W. Springfield	Alfred LaValley	Michael Ernst
W. Springfield	W. Springfield		James Whalen

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA (All towns are in California)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Fremont	New Life	David Brown	
Paso Robles	Covenant Comm.	Bill Hawk	
San Ramon	Canyon Creek	Lewis Ruff	
		Gary Nantt	

JOURNAL

NORTHERN ILLINOIS PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Illinois, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Elgin	Westminster		Craig Burdett
Hammond, IN	Covenant	Crowell Cooley	Bob Rathburn
Hammond, IN	Pine Street	Bruce Stanek	Norman White
LaCross, WI	Covenant	Jeff Buikema	
Lake Forest	North Shore	David Geib	
Merrill, WI	Bible	Robert Smallman	
Milwaukee, WI	Lakeside	Stephen Bickley	James Collins
Pardeeville, WI	Grace	Nathan Kline	Joel Staveness
Paxton	Westminster	Don Rackley	
Peoria	Grace	Edward Gray	Thurmond Hall
Peoria	Grace	Bruce Dunn	Robert Randolph
		Timothy Bayly	

PACIFIC PRESBYTERY (All towns are in California.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Artesia	Cornerstone	Bruce McRae	
Glendale	Calvary		Arch Hardymont
Sepulveda	Valley	Ronald Svendsen	Robert Taylor
Sepulveda	Valley	Rondell Shaw	
		Donald Aven	
		Robert Ferguson	

PACIFIC NORTHWEST PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Washington, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Calgary, Alb	Covenant Evan.	James Richwine	
Poulsbo	Liberty Bay	Andrew Krasowski	
Olympia	South Sound	Bob Cassis	
Seattle	Green Lake	Curtis Young	
Seattle	Hillcrest	Robert Bruhn	
Tacoma	Faith	Robert Rayburn	Richard Hannula
Tacoma	Faith	Kevin Skogen	
		John Smed	

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PALMETTO PRESBYTERY (All towns are in South Carolina.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Aiken	Grace	James Hope	MacLellan Cash
Aiken	New Covenant	Ron Shaw	
Blythewood	Pres. Chapel	Albert Wright	
Charleston	Church Crk Ref	James Simoneau	
Charleston	Metro North	Thomas Wood	
Cheraw	Faith		Claude Vernon
Cheraw	Faith		Hollis Gaddy
Chester	Trinity	John Tinsley	Len Gwin
Chester	Trinity		Jim Frierson
Columbia	Calvary		Charles Taber * Wm Simoneau
Columbia	Cornestone	Eric Perrin	
Columbia	Covenant	Lee Ferguson	
Columbia	Eau Claire	Harold Patteson	
Columbia	Northeast	George Crow	John Goodman
Columbia	Northeast	Julian Riddle	Wil Lear
Columbia	Rose Hill	Craig Wilkes	Eugene Henderson
Conway	Grace	John Riddle	
Dillon	First	John Baumgardner	
Florence	Faith	Jim Ferguson	
Hilton Head	Hilton Head	Clenton Iderton	
Lexington	Lexington	Joseph Novenson	
Lexington	Lexington	Brian Skelly	
Irmo	St Andrews	Whaley Barton	Richard Hilton
Irmo	St Andrews	Emory Watson	Johnny Moore
Kingstree	Kingstree	John Dodd	
N. Augusta	N. Augusta	Dan Wren	
Orangeburg	Trinity	Tom Anderson	Dan Steffen
Orangeburg	Trinity		Danny Sibley
Ridgeway	Aimwell	Karl McCallister	Walter Ruff
Salters	Union	Ted Martin	
Sardinia	Sardinia	Bob Korn	
White Rock	Faith	Bill Powis	
Winnsboro	Lebanon	James Riley	John Ramsey
Winnsboro	Union Mem	George Busch	
		Albert McCallister	
		Jack Spears	

PHILADELPHIA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Pennsylvania.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Allentown	Leigh Valley	Donald Stone	John Harley
Allentown	Leigh Valley		Royce Seifert
Amber	Phila Soh Mang	David Kang	
Ft. Washington	New Life	Ronald Lutz	

JOURNAL

Philadelphia Presbytery - continued

Glenside	New Life	John Yenchko	
Harleysville	Covenant	Stephen Ford	
Hatboro	Covenant	Erwin Morrison	George Harris
Hatboro	Covenant		Frank Richards
Havertown	Beechwood Ref	Paul Karlberg	
Havertown	Beechwood Ref	Robert Swayne	
Lansdale	Lansdale	John Clark, Sr.	Ken Rush
Lansdale	Lansdale		John Clark, Jr.
Levittown	Evangelical	Steve Parker	Bob Sexton
Philadelphia	Ch.w/o Walls	Anees Zaka	
Philadelphia	Korean United	Ken Wendland	Paul Kim
Philadelphia	Tenth	James Boice	Eugene Betts
Philadelphia	Tenth		Manfred Garibotti
Philadelphia	Third Ref	Frank Moser	Samuel Grillo
Warminster	Korean Saints	Sung Kyun Na	
Wayne	Proclamation	Peter Lillback	Grant McCabe
Willow Grove	Calvary	Carl Derk	David Lachman
		Will Barker	
		Bill Edgar	
		Fred Klett	
		Thomas Patete	

POTOMAC PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Maryland, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Abingdon	New Covenant	Larry Wanaselja	Dennis Baxter
Annapolis	Evangelical	Jim Ferguson	Samuel Elder
Baltimore	Evangelical	Tom Nicholas	
Baltimore	Inverness	Bill Jones	Charles Rockey
Baltimore	White Marsh	Ronald Standiford	
Bowie	Reformed	Michael Coleman	
California	Cornerstone	Terry Baxley	Jim Mansfield
Chantilly, VA	Chantilly	Allan Dayhoff	
Fairfax	New Hope	David Coffin	Einar Nelson
Frederick	Faith Ref	George Miller	
Gambrills	Severn Run Evan		John Van Devender
Germantown	Shady Grove	Gary Yagel	Ira Ward
Germantown	Shady Grove		Bill Ingram
Gainesville, VA	Gainesville	John Lash	Steve Davis
Hunt Valley	Hunt Valley	Frank Boswell	
Hyattsville	Wallace Mem	Palmer Robertson	Richard Larson
Hyattsville	Wallace Mem	William Smith	Bob Lukens

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Potomac Presbytery - continued

Hyattsville	Wallace Mem	Julian Dusenbury	Philip Fanara
Lutherville	Valley	Drew Derreth	William Moore
Lutherville	Valley	Michael Rogers	
Manassas, VA	Cornerstone	Steve Dawson	
Marriottsville	Chapelgate	Ron Steel	Charles Suter
Marriottsville	Chapelgate	Jim McKee	
Marriottsville	Chapelgate	Dan Faber	
Martinsburg, WV	Pilgrim	Robert Thompson	David MacCormack
Martinsburg, WV	Pilgrim		Gene Grove
McLean, VA	McLean	Stephen Smallman	Kirk Bentson
McLean, VA	McLean	Edward Satterfield	
McLean, VA	McLean	Marlin Hardman	
Owings Mills	Liberty Ref	David Bryson	Jim O'Karmus
Owings Mills	Liberty Ref		William Sparks
Pasadena	Severna Park	Jerry McFarland	
Pasadena	Severna Park	Tom Wenger	
Reisterstown	Covenant/Grace	Herbert Ruby	
Reston	Reston	John Stringer	
Silver Spring	W'ton Japanese	Takashi Uehara	
Springfield, VA	Harvester	Ronald Bossom	Larry Pratt
Warrenton, VA	Heritage	James Brown	Thomas Dizer
Westminster	Westminster Ref.	Thomas Shields	
Woodbridge, VA	Grace Ref		John Strain
Woodbridge, VA	Grace Ref		Dean Kennedy
		John Barber	
		Eugene Boyer	
		Ronald Jenkins	

ROCKY MOUNTAIN PRESBYTERY (All towns in Colorado, except as indicated)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
CO. Springs, CO	Grace	Rick Fite	
CO. Springs, CO	Village Seven		Denny Carew
		Bill Leonard	

SIouxLANDS PRESBYTERY (All towns are in South Dakota, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Chancellor	Germantown	Stan Sundberg	

JOURNAL

SOUTH COAST PRESBYTERY (All towns are in California, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Encinitas	North Coast	Don Seltzer	
Moreno Valley	Grace	Larry Conard	

SOUTH TEXAS PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Texas.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Beaumont	First Ref	Ronald Rowe	
Bryan	Westminster	Legree Finch	
Harlingen	Covenant	Terry Traylor	
Houston	Bay Area	James Bland	
Houston	Covenant	Jeff Meyers	Tom Hartnett
Houston	Northwest		Harold Cobb
Houston	Oaklawn	David Moran	
Houston	PC/Covenant	Bailey Cadman	
Houston	Southwest	David Wakeland	Harold Adam
Spring	Spring Cypress	Kent Hinkson	
Sugar Land	Providence	Alan McCall	
		Chris Yates	

SOUTHEAST ALABAMA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Alabama.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Andalusia	Covenant	Benny Powell	
Clanton	Clanton	Lamar Davis	
Clayton	Clayton	Jack Hoff	
Clio	Pea River	David Gilleran	
Dothan	First	William Thompson	William Langford
Dothan	First		Charles McAllister
Enterprise	First	David Silvermail	
Floralia	First		Rupert Greene
Greenville	First		Ted Aven *Jim Tate
Greenville	First		Jack Williamson
Hayneville	Hayneville	William Mason	
Monroeville	Monroeville	Larry Gilpin	Armistead Harper
Montgomery	Covenant	Henry Bishop	Mac Gardner
Montgomery	Covenant		Robert Shaw
Montgomery	Eastwood	Aaron Fleming	
Montgomery	Faith	Steven Jakes	
Montgomery	First		Jack Hornady
Montgomery	First		Meade Guy
Montgomery	Oak Park	Terry Crahen	
Montgomery	Trinity	Cortez Cooper	William Joseph
Montgomery	Trinity		Allen Knox
Montgomery	Trinity		Jack Noble

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Southeast Alabama Presbytery - continued

Montgomery	Trinity		Steve Fox
Montgomery	Trinity		John Albritton
Opelika	Trinity	Peter Doyle	Bryan Duncan
Prattville	First	Henry Smith	
Troy	First	Milton Cutchen	Osbourne Griffin
		Phil Howell	
		Gary Litchfield	

SOUTHERN FLORIDA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Florida.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Boca Raton	Spanish River	David Nicholas	John Slavic
Boca Raton	Spanish River		Ronald Tobias
Boca Raton	Spanish River		James Clopton
Boca Raton	West Boca Raton	Jan Sattem	
Coral Gables	Granada	Jim Smith	Forrest Patterson
Coral Gables	Granada	Jim Brown	Robert Travis
Coral Gables	Granada		Gary Rupp
Delray Beach	Seacrest	Ron Siegenthaler	Lane Anderson
Ft. Lauderdale	Coral Ridge	James Kennedy	Joe High
Ft. Lauderdale	Coral Ridge	Andrew Boswell	Ralph Mittendorf
Ft. Lauderdale	Coral Ridge		Mortimer Weis
Ft. Lauderdale	Coral Ridge		Daniel Domin
Ft. Lauderdale	Coral Ridge		Herman Hinz
Hollywood	St. Andrews	Paul Fowler	
Jupiter	Jupiter	William Thompson	
Key Biscayne	Key Biscayne	Jared Reed	Roland Smith
Lake Worth	Lake Osborne	Steve Jones	Blair LittleJohn
Lake Worth	Lake Osborne		Dennis Clark
Miami	Immanuel	Al LaCour	
Miami	Kendall	Dominic Aquila	Robert Staples
Miami	Kendall	John Swisher	
Miami	Korean Ban Suk	Young Pal Cho	
Miami	Old Cutler	Collins Weeber	Ed Walker
Miami	Shenandoah	C.M. Salabarria	
Miami	Trinity	Franklin Knowles	
Plantation	First	Robert Stuart	
Stuart	Grace	James Bowen	
Wellington	Wellington	Jose Ortega-Betancourt	
		Cecil Brooks	
		George Knight	
		Robert Reymond	

JOURNAL

SOUTHWEST PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Arizona, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Alamogordo, NM	Westminster	Rick Smith	
Phoenix	Calvin		Bill Montgomery
Scottsdale	Trinity	Gerrit DeYoung	
Sun City West	Covenant	Don Esty	Ralph Hahn

SOUTHWEST FLORIDA PRESBYTERY

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Bradenton	Hope	Randy Greenwald	
Brandon	Westminster	Jack Graham	Henry Darden
Brandon	Westminster		David Crabtree
Cape Coral	Evangelical	Randy Thompson	Herbert Mitchell
Clearwater	Christ Comm.	Rod Culbertson	
Ft. Myers	Westminster		Henry McClain
Lakeland	Covenant	David McWilliams	
Lakeland	Covenant	Tim Spilman	
Lutz	Cornerstone	Peter LaPointe	
Marco Island	Marco	Bruce Fiol	
North Port	First	George Crocker	Gerard Berghoef
Pinellas Park	Grace	Robert Burrige	Randy Dunlap
Tampa	Seminole	David O'Dowd	Vernon Pierce
Tampa	Tampa Bay	James Saxon	
Venice	Auburn Road	Dwight Dolby	
Wauchula	Faith		Joe Vance
Winter Haven	Covenant	Ed Ouimette	Bill Eken
		William Faires	
		Carlton Heil	
		Russell Toms	

SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Pennsylvania.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Cochranville	Faggs Manor	Charles Cummings	Geo. Robinson * Earl Moessner
Dillsburg	First Korean	Paul Kim	
Ephrata	Reformed PC	Stephen Beck	Fred Gaston
Hershey	Church/Servant		Harrison Brown
Lancaster	Westminster	Robert Williamson	Leonard Mollenkof
Lancaster	Westminster	Tom Myers	Robert Hayward
Lancaster	Westminster		Walter Watkins
New Freedom	Christ Ref.	Harold Kelley	
Quarryville	Faith Ref	John MacRae	Willard Lutz
Quarryville	Faith Ref		Herb Marsh

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Susquehanna Valley Presbytery - continued

Shippensburg State College	Hope Ref Oakwood	David Fidati Freddy Fritz
		Hudson Armerding John Buswell Harold Hight Nelson Malkus

TENNESSEE VALLEY PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Tennessee, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Chattanooga	Covenant	Render Caines	Steve McIlvaine
Chattanooga	East Ridge	Tom Schneider	
Chattanooga	First		Bill Hartshorn
Chattanooga	First		Lat Latimer
Chattanooga	First		Roger Ingvalson
Chattanooga	First		Winborn Willingham
Chattanooga	New City		Rudolph Schmidt
Chattanooga	Red Bank	Everett Gossett	
Chattanooga	St. Elmo	Cal Boroughs	
Columbia	Zion	Arch Warren	Jimmy Couch
Dalton, GA	Grace	Mark Cushman	Eugene Hayes
Flintstone	Chattanooga Vly	James Thornton	
Franklin	Christ Comm	Mike Smith	Bob Payne
Franklin	Christ Comm.	Scott Smith	
Fl. Ogleth., GA	First	Robert Berger	
Harriman	West Hills	Clyde Cobb	Terry Futrell
Hixson	Hixson	Art Wood	
Knoxville	Cedar Springs	John Wood	Joe B. Johnson
Knoxville	Cedar Springs	Vernon Holstad	Seaton Garrett
Knoxville	Cedar Springs	Gerald Morgan	Leland Sayers
Knoxville	Ebenezer	David Howe	Bill Huxtable
Knoxville	West Hills	Fred Fowler	
LaFayette,GA	Highlands	Robert Haymes	
Lookout Mt	Lookout Mt	Sanders Willson	Fred Schumpert
Lookout Mt	Lookout Mt	Frank Hitchings	Ralph Paden
Lookout Mt	Lookout Mt		Bob Holt
Lookout Mt	Lookout Mt		Arthur Klem
Maryville	Trinity	Tim Stigers	
Murfreesboro	Trinity	Leonard Hendrix	
Nashville	Christ	Charles McGowan	Marvin Padgett
Nashville	Christ	Richard Jennings	
Oak Ridge	Covenant	David Hall	*D. Goodin
Oak Ridge	Covenant		Henry Quinn

JOURNAL

Tennessee Valley Presbytery - continued

Sevierville	Evergreen	Randy Davis	G.R. Stradley
Signal Mt.	Wayside	Marshall St. John	
Sweetwater	Alto Vista	John Boles	
Sweetwater	Sweetwater Vly	Robert Clarke	David Cleveland
		Charles Anderson	
		William Brooks	
		King Counts	
		William Ferris	
		Paul Gilchrist	
		George Long	
		Henry Schum	
		Dana Stoddard	

WARRIOR PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Alabama.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Aliceville	First	Eddie Spencer	Claude Robinson
Aliceville	First		J.V. Park
Camden	First	Dennis Nolen	
Centerville	First	Tim Bonds	
Demopolis	First	William Gleason	
Eutaw	First	Wayne Fair	
Eutaw	Pleasant Ridge		Richard Owens
Linden	Linden	[REDACTED]	
Marion	Marion	Bruce Garris	
Selma	Woodland Hghts	Fredric Mau	
Tuscaloosa	Riverwood	John Robertson	John Graham
Tuscaloosa	Riverwood	William Joseph	Billy Jollit
		Tom Kay	
		Paul Kooistra	

WESTERN CAROLINA PRESBYTERY (All towns are in North Carolina, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Andrews	Andrews	Frank Hamilton	
Arden	Arden	Ed Graham	Wm. van der Hoeven
Arden	Arden	Gus Schill	Jim Warren
Asheville	Covenant Ref.	Robert Drake	Joel Belz
Asheville	Malvern Hills	Bill Clark	John Tyndall
Asheville	Trinity	Bill Laxton	Michael Everhart
Asheville	Trinity		Elliott Baron
Black Mtn.	Lakey Gap	James Edwards	Mitchell Beddingfield

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Western Carolina Presbytery - continued

Boone	Westminster	George Norris	
Boone	Westminster	Erick Allen	
Brevard	Grace Covenant	Rhett Sanders	
Franklin	Emmanuel	Thomas Schmitt	
Hazelwood	Hazelwood	Larry Wilson	William Green
Hendersonville	Covenant	John Neville	John Sullivan
Hendersonville	Covenant		Barton Brown
Hickory	New Covenant	John Kelley	Wayne Nearing
Hickory	New Covenant		Bob Hart
Marion	Landis	Ted Mahaffey	
Morganton	Faith	John Evans	
Newland	Fellowship	James Bordwine	
Swannanoa	Swannanoa Valley	Dan Sulc	
Waynesville	Covenant	Philip Eval	
Weaverville	First	Samuel McGinn	
		Michael Beates	
		Richard Gillen	
		George Ridgeway	
		Paul Settle	
		Morton Smith	
		Robert Sweet	

WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERY (All towns are in Tennessee, except as indicated.)

City	Church	Teaching Elder	Ruling Elder
Abingdon, Va	Abingdon	Bruce Sinclair	
Coeburn, VA	Coeburn	James Reedy	Ronald Jenkins
Birchleaf, VA	Sandlick	Daniel Foreman	
Bristol	Edgemont	Tom Osterhaus	Larry Mullins
Bristol	Edgemont		Gene Gross
Cedar Bluff, VA	Covenant	Carl Howell	
Cedar Bluff, VA	Covenant	Byron Snapp	
Elizabethton	Memorial	Steven Meyerhoff	David Slagle
Glade Spg, VA	Seven Springs	Thomas Sullivan	
Greenville	Meadow Creek	David Longacre	
Johnson City	Asbury	Joe Wolfe	
Johnson City	Princeton	John Myers	
Johnson City	Westminster	Ben Konopa	
Jonesborough	Midway	Ross Lindley	Sam Lindley
Jonesborough	Midway		Neil Smith
Kingsport	Arcadia	Larry Stallard	
Kingsport	Bridwell Hgts	Larry Ball	John Thompson
Kingsport	Bridwell Hgts		Mark Hecht
Kingsport	Harmony	Bert Edwards	
Kingsport	Westminster	Brent Bradley	Roger Schultz

JOURNAL

Westminster Presbytery - continued

Kingsport	Westminster		Joe Reynolds
Pulaski, VA	Pulaski	Stanley Armes	
Seven Mile Ford	Seven Mile Ford	George Wingard	Stewart Miller
Seven Mile Ford	Seven Mile Ford		Elmer Rouse
Tazewell, VA	Trinity	Henry Johnson	Larry Hambrick

* Ruling Elder Alternates

Teaching Elders	748
Ruling Elders	397
[Ruling Elder (Alt.)	[12]
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	1145
Churches Represented	608

20-3 Adoption of Docket

On motion the docket was adopted as presented in its third draft in the *Handbook*, with the following changes:

1. the *Ad Interim* Committee on Communications to report following the Nominating Committee report Wednesday afternoon; and
2. notation that all worship services are special orders.

At the same time, the Assembly granted permission to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures to be excused from the floor Tuesday at 10:30 a.m. for necessary business.

20-4 Seating of Commissioners of Presbyteries Cited

The stated clerk, TE Paul Gilchrist, announced that the Committee on Constitutional Business had certified to him that Heartland, Pacific, and Philadelphia Presbyteries had satisfactorily responded to previous citations on their respective minutes. The commissioners from these presbyteries were thus permitted to be seated.

20-5 Election of Moderator

Two nominations were received for moderator of the Assembly: TE W. Wilson Benton and TE Donald B. Patterson. TE Patterson's request that his name be withdrawn from nomination was permitted. On motion the nominations were closed and TE Benton was elected by acclamation. He assumed the chair and requested the prayers of the brethren.

20-6 Recognition of Retiring Moderator

Moderator Benton recognized RE Scott Levy, chairman of the Administrative Committee, who presented to Retiring Moderator Belz, on behalf of the Assembly, a plaque in appreciation of his service as moderator.

20-7 Adoption of *Roberts Rules of Order*

The moderator posed the question if the Assembly were willing to be governed by *Roberts Rules of Order*. The Assembly affirmed their willingness by voice vote.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

20-8 Recording Clerks, Assistant Parliamentarians

On nomination by the stated clerk, TE David R. Dively, TE J. Robert Fiol, and TE Frank D. Moser were elected recording clerks. RE Walter Lastovica and TE H. S. (Hank) Schum were appointed timekeeper and overhead operator, respectively. TE Robert M. Ferguson and RE John B. White, Jr. were appointed assistant parliamentarians.

20-9 Recess

The Assembly was recessed with prayer by TE Donald B. Patterson at 10:05 p.m.

MINUTES--TUESDAY MORNING

June 16, 1990

Second Session

20-10 Assembly Reconvened

The Assembly reconvened for business at 8:05 a.m. Tuesday with the singing of "*Come, Dearest Lord, Descend and Dwell*" and prayer led by TE Timothy P. Diehl.

20-11 Report of Stated Clerk

TE Paul Gilchrist, stated clerk, presented his report (see Appendix A, pp. 271). He then called the roll of churches added to the denomination since the last Assembly.

CHURCHES ADDED TO THE DENOMINATION IN 1991 AND THROUGH MAY, 1992

(Not Previously Reported To General Assembly)

Presbytery	Church	Address	Date Rec.	Source
Calvary	Grace Community	Greenville, SC	08/18/91	Organized
Central Carolina	Back Creek	Mt. Ulla, NC	07/20/91	PCUSA
	Mount Carmel	Ellerbe, NC	05/01/91	PCUSA
Central Florida	Community	McIntosh, FL		Organized
	Day Spring	Spring Hill, FL	11/17/91	Organized
	Ponte Vedra	P. Vedra Bch, FL	08/04/91	Organized
	Spruce Creek	Port Orange, FL	11/24/91	Organized
Central Georgia	Crawfordville	Crawfordville, GA	07/20/91	PCUSA
	Golden Isles	St. Simon Island, GA	05/24/92	Organized
Great Lakes	South Dayton	Dayton, OH	05/19/91	Organized
	White River Ref.	Anderson, IN	12/08/91	Organized
Korean Southeastern	Calvary	Cockeysville, MD	10/07/91	Organized

JOURNAL

Korean Southwest	High Desert Sa-Rang Korean	Victorville, CA Cerritos, CA	12/13/91	Independency Organized
Louisiana	Faith	Clinton, LA	03/22/92	Organized
Mid-America	Prairie Winds	Moore, OK	10/20/91	Organized
New Jersey	Comunidade Crista Presbyteriana	Newark, NJ	11/17/91	Organized
New River	Faith Reformed	Benwood, WV	01/06/92	Organized
North Georgia	Carriage Lane	Peachtree City, GA	04/12/92	Organized
North Texas	Park Cities Christ the King	Dallas, TX Fort Worth	10/25/91 05/15/92	PCUSA Organized
Northeast	New Life Redeemer Redeemer Ref.	Ithaca, NY New York, NY Glens Falls, NY	05/18/91 04/21/91 10/13/91	Organized Organized Organized
Northern California	Canyon Creek	San Ramon, CA	10/20/91	Organized
Northern Illinois	Grace Willowbeech	Pardeeville, WI Bloomington, IL	11/21/91 05/17/92	PCUSA Organized
Pacific	Spring Meadows	Las Vegas, NV	05/05/91	Organized
Pacific Northwest	English Hill North Ridge	Redmond, WA Calgary AB, CAN	05/19/91 10/06/91	Organized Organized
Philadelphia	Phila Soh Mang	Ambler, PA	04/22/91	Organized
Potomac	Comerstone	California, MD	04/26/92	Organized
South Coast	Chaparral Hills	San Diego, CA	05/19/91	Organized
South Texas	Southwest Christ	Houston, TX New Braunfels, TX	01/19/92 04/03/92	Organized Organized
Southeast Alabama	First	Brewton, AL	02/28/91	PCUSA
Susquehanna Valley	Oakwood Christ Reformed Kirkwood	State College, PA New Freedom, PA Kirkwood, PA	05/07/91 05/20/92 05/17/92	Independency Organized OPC
Western Carolina	Whiteside	Cashiers, NC	08/25/91	Organized

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

20-12 Voting on *Book of Church Order Amendments*

The Assembly proceeded to consideration of the proposed amendments to the *BCO* which had been sent down for the advice and consent of the presbyteries. Items were acted upon as follows:

ITEM 1. That *BCO* 10-3 be amended:

The Committee on Constitutional Business recommends that *BCO* 10-3 be amended to read as follows:

"The Pastor is, for prudential reasons, moderator of the Session. The moderator of the Presbytery may be elected at each stated meeting of the court, or for a period of time up to one year. The Moderator of the General Assembly shall be chosen at each stated meeting; he, or in the case of his absence....."

Adopted

PRESBYTERY	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	VOTE
ASCENSION	29	6	1	+
CALVARY	70	0	0	+
CENTRAL CAROLINA	56	1	10	+
CENTRAL FLORIDA	40	1	3	+
CENTRAL GEORGIA	63	0	3	+
COVENANT				
EASTERN CANADA	7	0	1	+
EASTERN CAROLINA	23	0	1	+
EVANGEL	40	0	0	+
GRACE	54	1	0	+
GREAT LAKES	25	6	2	+
GULF COAST	30	0	0	+
HEARTLAND	32	0	0	
HERITAGE	32	0	1	+
ILLIANA	29	0	0	+
JAMES RIVER	25	0	6	+
KOREAN CENTRAL	12	0	0	+
KOREAN EASTERN	16	0	0	+
KOREAN SOUTHERN	8	2	2	+
KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN	16	0	1	+
KOREAN SOUTHWEST				
LOUISIANA	17	0	2	+
MID-AMERICA	10	0	1	+
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY				
MISSOURI	34	0	1	+
NEW JERSEY	20	0	5	+
NEW RIVER	21	0	2	+
NORTH GEORGIA	55	1	0	+
NORTH TEXAS	25	2	0	+
NORTHEAST	33	0	0	+
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	15	0	0	+
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	28	0	4	+

JOURNAL

PACIFIC	16	0	2	+
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	24	0	0	+
PALMETTO	64	0	0	+
PHILADELPHIA	35	0	0	+
POTOMAC	63	0	1	+
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	18	0	0	+
SIOUXLANDS	12	0	1	+
SOUTH COAST	15	0	2	+
SOUTH TEXAS	16	0	6	+
SOUTHEAST ALABAMA	39	0	0	+
SOUTHERN FLORIDA	53	0	0	+
SOUTHWEST	29	0	0	+
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	31	0	1	+
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	26	0	0	+
TENNESSEE VALLEY	77	0	0	+
WARRIOR	24	0	0	+
WESTERN CAROLINA	51	0	0	+
WESTMINSTER	42	0	1	+

FOR 47 AGAINST 0

ITEM 2. Amend BCO 42-11 to read as follows:

An appellant shall be considered to have abandoned his appeal if he fails to appear before the higher court, in person or by counsel, for a hearing thereof, after he has been properly notified; but an appellant may waive, in writing, his right to appear with permission of the court and not be considered to have abandoned his case. In case of such failure to appear, the judgment of the lower court will stand unless the appellant gives to the court a prompt and satisfactory explanation.

Adopted

PRESBYTERY	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	VOTE
ASCENSION	32	2	2	+
CALVARY	70	0	0	+
CENTRAL CAROLINA	50	0	17	+
CENTRAL FLORIDA	44	0	1	+
CENTRAL GEORGIA	68	0	0	+
COVENANT				
EASTERN CANADA	8	0	0	+
EASTERN CAROLINA	23	0	1	+
EVANGEL	39	1	0	+
GRACE	59	0	1	+
GREAT LAKES	32	0	1	+
GULF COAST	29	0	0	+
HEARTLAND	32	0	0	+
HERITAGE	28	2	2	+
ILLIANA	29	0	0	+
JAMES RIVER	30	0	1	+

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

KOREAN CENTRAL	12	0	0	+
KOREAN EASTERN	15	0	1	+
KOREAN SOUTHERN	10	0	2	+
KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN	16	0	1	+
KOREAN SOUTHWEST				
LOUISIANA	17	0	1	+
MID-AMERICA	10	0	1	+
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY				
MISSOURI	35	0	0	+
NEW JERSEY	20	1	4	+
NEW RIVER	20	0	4	+
NORTH GEORGIA	55	1	0	+
NORTH TEXAS	24	1	1	+
NORTHEAST	35	0	0	+
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	15	0	0	+
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	34	0	2	+
PACIFIC	17	0	2	+
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	24	0	2	+
PALMETTO	65	0	0	+
PHILADELPHIA	30	2	1	+
POTOMAC	62	0	0	+
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	17	1	4	+
SIOUXLANDS	14	0	0	+
SOUTH COAST	13	1	3	+
SOUTH TEXAS	27	0	2	+
SOUTHEAST ALABAMA	39	0	0	+
SOUTHERN FLORIDA	48	2	2	+
SOUTHWEST	29	0	0	+
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	31	1	1	+
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	26	0	0	+
TENNESSEE VALLEY	76	0	1	+
WARRIOR	21	3	0	+
WESTERN CAROLINA	51	0	0	+
WESTMINSTER	0	43	2	-

FOR 46 AGAINST 1

ITEM 3. Delete the last sentence of BCO 42-5 and substitute therefor the following:

Should new evidence come to light while the case is pending, the higher court (a) would ordinarily remand the case to the lower court for rehearing, or (b) may consider, admit or refuse the new evidence, or (c) shall receive the new evidence if all parties stipulate, in writing, agreeing to the new evidence. (See BCO 35-14)

Failed to receive approval of two-thirds of the presbyteries

JOURNAL

PRESBYTERY	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	VOTE
ASCENSION	30	4	2	+
CALVARY	71	0	0	+
CENTRAL CAROLINA	50	3	14	+
CENTRAL FLORIDA	39	1	6	+
CENTRAL GEORGIA	68	0	0	+
COVENANT				
EASTERN CANADA	8	0	0	+
EASTERN CAROLINA	23	0	1	+
EVANGEL	34	14	1	+
GRACE	58	2	0	+
GREAT LAKES	29	3	1	+
GULF COAST	15	11	3	+
HEARTLAND	31	1	0	+
HERITAGE	27	1	4	+
ILLIANA	0	28	1	-
JAMES RIVER	28	2	4	+
KOREAN CENTRAL	12	0	0	+
KOREAN EASTERN	16	0	0	+
KOREAN SOUTHERN	11	0	1	+
KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN	4	10	3	-
KOREAN SOUTHWEST				
LOUISIANA	0	16	0	-
MID-AMERICA	0	13	0	-
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY				
MISSOURI	2	33	0	-
NEW JERSEY	12	4	9	-
NEW RIVER	22	0	3	+
NORTH GEORGIA	55	1	0	+
NORTH TEXAS	24	1	0	+
NORTHEAST	1	24	3	-
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	15	0	0	+
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	10	10	12	-
PACIFIC	16	0	2	+
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	26	0	0	+
PALMETTO	24	33	8	-
PHILADELPHIA	34	0	3	+
POTOMAC	0	63	3	-
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	0	21	1	-
SIouxLANDS	12	1	1	+
SOUTH COAST	0	15	1	-
SOUTH TEXAS	21	3	3	+
SOUTHEAST ALABAMA	36	2	0	+
SOUTHERN FLORIDA	48	0	1	+
SOUTHWEST	29	0	0	+
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	4	30	3	-
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	2	19	8	-
TENNESSEE VALLEY	70	7	1	+

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

WARRIOR	24	0	0	+
WESTERN CAROLINA	50	0	1	+
WESTMINSTER	1	38	5	-

FOR 32 AGAINST 15

ITEM 4. Amend BCO 43-7 to read as follows:

The complainant shall be considered to have abandoned his complaint if he fails to appear before the higher court, in person or by counsel, for a hearing thereof, after he has been properly notified; but a complainant may waive, in writing, his right to appear with permission of the court and not be considered to have abandoned his case. In case of such failure to appear, the judgment of the lower court will stand unless the complainant gives to the court a prompt and satisfactory explanation.

Adopted

PRESBYTERY	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	VOTE
ASCENSION	35	0	1	+
CALVARY	70	0	0	+
CENTRAL CAROLINA	51	0	16	+
CENTRAL FLORIDA	45	0	1	+
CENTRAL GEORGIA	68	0	0	+
COVENANT				
EASTERN CANADA	7	0	1	+
EASTERN CAROLINA	23	0	1	+
EVANGEL	45	0	1	+
GRACE	61	0	0	+
GREAT LAKES	32	0	1	+
GULF COAST	29	0	0	+
HEARTLAND	32	0	0	+
HERITAGE	31	0	2	+
ILLIANA	29	0	0	+
JAMES RIVER	33	0	2	+
KOREAN CENTRAL	12	0	0	+
KOREAN EASTERN	16	0	0	+
KOREAN SOUTHERN	9	1	0	+
KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN	16	0	1	+
KOREAN SOUTHWEST				
LOUISIANA	18	0	0	+
MID-AMERICA	10	1	0	+
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY				
MISSOURI	35	0	0	+
NEW JERSEY	19	2	4	+
NEW RIVER	22	0	2	+
NORTH GEORGIA	55	1	0	+
NORTH TEXAS	24	1	0	+
NORTHEAST	35	0	0	+
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	15	0	0	+
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	30	0	2	+

JOURNAL

PACIFIC	17	0	2	+
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	26	0	0	+
PALMETTO	64	0	0	+
PHILADELPHIA	36	0	2	+
POTOMAC	65	0	2	+
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	18	0	1	+
SIouxLANDS	14	0	0	+
SOUTH COAST	15	1	1	+
SOUTH TEXAS	24	0	2	+
SOUTHEAST ALABAMA	39	0	0	+
SOUTHERN FLORIDA	48	2	2	+
SOUTHWEST	29	0	0	+
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	33	0	1	+
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	26	0	0	+
TENNESSEE VALLEY	81	0	2	+
WARRIOR	21	3	0	+
WESTERN CAROLINA	51	0	0	+
WESTMINSTER	0	46	0	-

FOR 46 AGAINST 1

ITEM 5. Amend *BCO 43-3* by deleting from the first sentence the words "or fails to act on the complaint" and add as the second sentence the following:

If the court fails to consider the complaint by or at its next stated meeting, the complainant may make complaint to the next higher court.

Adopted

PRESBYTERY	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	VOTE
ASCENSION	33	1	2	+
CALVARY	72	0	0	+
CENTRAL CAROLINA	51	2	14	+
CENTRAL FLORIDA	41	3	4	+
CENTRAL GEORGIA	68	0	0	+
COVENANT				
EASTERN CANADA	8	0	0	+
EASTERN CAROLINA	23	0	1	+
EVANGEL	51	0	0	+
GRACE	61	0	1	+
GREAT LAKES	29	5	0	+
GULF COAST	28	0	2	+
HEARTLAND	32	0	0	+
HERITAGE	32	0	3	+
ILLIANA	29	0	0	+
JAMES RIVER	33	0	3	+
KOREAN CENTRAL	12	0	0	+
KOREAN EASTERN	16	0	0	+
KOREAN SOUTHERN	12	0	0	+

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN	16	0	1	+
KOREAN SOUTHWEST				
LOUISIANA	18	0	0	+
MID-AMERICA	12	0	1	+
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY				
MISSOURI	35	0	0	+
NEW JERSEY	18	1	6	+
NEW RIVER	0	24	2	-
NORTH GEORGIA	55	1	0	+
NORTH TEXAS	25	0	0	+
NORTHEAST	35	0	2	+
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	15	0	0	+
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	27	1	4	+
PACIFIC	17	0	2	+
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	26	0	0	+
PALMETTO	60	2	0	+
PHILADELPHIA	38	0	3	+
POTOMAC	20	63	12	-
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	19	0	1	+
SIOUXLANDS	12	0	1	+
SOUTH COAST	17	0	0	+
SOUTH TEXAS	24	0	1	+
SOUTHEAST ALABAMA	39	0	0	+
SOUTHERN FLORIDA	56	0	0	+
SOUTHWEST	29	0	0	+
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	32	0	2	+
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	26	0	0	+
TENNESSEE VALLEY	78	1	4	+
WARRIOR	24	0	0	+
WESTERN CAROLINA	51	0	0	+
WESTMINSTER	9	35	3	-

FOR 44 AGAINST 3

ITEM 6. That BCO 58-4 be revised to read as follows (continued from 19th GA):

That the third paragraph of *BCO 58-4* be revised to read as follows:

Since by our Lord's appointment, this sacrament sets forth communion of the saints, it is fitting to welcome to the table of the Lord not only those who have confessed His name in our fellowship and oversight, but also those who have professed the true religion in the fellowship and discipline of other churches that proclaim the gospel. Before the observance begins, the Minister, at the discretion of the Session, may either

- (1) invite all such communicants present to participate in the ordinance with the communicant members of the church; or
- (2) invite all such communicants present to participate who have been examined and approved by the Session.

JOURNAL

In either case the Minister shall clearly state the Scriptural conditions for partaking of the sacrament, welcoming penitent sinners to the table of the Lord, but warning the impenitent and undiscerning against unworthy participation, in accord with I Corinthians 11:27-32. It is proper to give a special invitation to non-communicants to remain during the service.

Defeated by the presbyteries

PRESBYTERY	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAIN	VOTE
ASCENSION	36	5	13	+
CALVARY	55	23	0	+
CENTRAL CAROLINA	12	45	10	-
CENTRAL FLORIDA	33	5	6	+
CENTRAL GEORGIA	3	60	3	-
COVENANT	7	13	0	-
EASTERN CANADA	12	0	0	+
EASTERN CAROLINA	1	18	1	- *
EVANGEL	10	41	2	-
GRACE	36	6	2	+
GREAT LAKES	29	1	4	+
GULF COAST	28	0	2	+
HEARTLAND	20	5	3	+
HERITAGE	29	3	0	+
ILLIANA	29	0	0	+
JAMES RIVER	10	17	9	-
KOREAN CENTRAL	12	0	0	+
KOREAN EASTERN	16	0	0	+
KOREAN SOUTHERN	7	2	3	+
KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN	16	0	1	+
KOREAN SOUTHWEST				
LOUISIANA	8	10	0	-
MID-AMERICA	1	10	2	-
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY	58	6	1	+
MISSOURI	33	1	1	+
NEW JERSEY	12	9	2	+
NEW RIVER	1	19	1	-
NORTH GEORGIA	53	2	1	+
NORTH TEXAS	15	10	2	+
NORTHEAST	13	22	7	-
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	18	0	1	+
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	21	7	4	+
PACIFIC	21	0	1	+
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	33	0	4	+
PALMETTO	31	36	1	-
PHILADELPHIA	37	5	1	+
POTOMAC	20	63	12	-
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	--	--	--	- *
SIOUXLANDS	11	0	2	+

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SOUTH COAST	17	0	0	+	
SOUTH TEXAS	5	9	0	-	*
SOUTHEAST ALABAMA	14	22	2	-	
SOUTHERN FLORIDA	49	3	1	+	
SOUTHWEST	29	0	0	+	
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	19	14	1	+	
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	23	1	2	+	
TENNESSEE VALLEY	83	1	1	+	
WARRIOR	22	2	0	+	
WESTERN CAROLINA	19	31	1	-	
WESTMINSTER	2	36	1	-	*

FOR 32 AGAINST 17

* STATED CLERK'S NOTE: Several changed votes of presbyteries were challenged from the floor. Upon reviewing the minutes of those presbyteries, it was verified they had voted against the amendment in 1990-91. However, in changing their vote in 1991-92 they had not voted to reconsider their previous action so the changed vote was disqualified. (see 20-20, p. 62)

20-13 Overtures and Communications Received

- OVERTURE 1 From Presbytery of Southern Florida** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 20-1 To Clarify Calls" (See 20-51, 1, p. 98)
- OVERTURE 2 From Missouri Presbytery** (to AC)
 "Print RAO to Fit in looseleaf *BCO*" (See 20-63, VI, 7, p. 130)
- OVERTURE 3 From Missouri Presbytery** (to B&O) (See 20-51, 2, p. 99)
 "Have the Committee of Commissioners Serve a 2-Year Term"
- OVERTURE 4 From New Jersey Presbytery** (to AC)
 "Worship Services at General Assembly" (See 20-63, VI, 9, p. 131)
- OVERTURE 5 From Potomac Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 15-4 to Limit Membership on *SJC*" (See 20-51, 3, p. 99)
- OVERTURE 6 From Covenant Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 14-1 by Inserting RAO 13-1" (See 20-51, 4, p. 100)
- OVERTURE 7 From Northeast Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 43-2 and 43-3" (See 20-51, 5, p. 101)
- OVERTURE 8 From Central Georgia Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Study Committee to Encourage Psalm Singing" (See 20-51, 6, p. 102)
- OVERTURE 9 From Korean Southeastern Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Divide Korean Southeastern Presbytery" (See 20-23, 2, p. 72)

JOURNAL

- OVERTURE 10 From Korean Southeastern Presbytery** (to MNA)
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (See 20-23, 1, p. 71)
- OVERTURE 11 From Western Carolina Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 13-1 and 14-2 to Permit All Ruling Elders to Serve
at Presbytery and General Assembly" (See 20-51, 7, p. 103)
- OVERTURE 12 From Korean Southern Presbytery** (to MNA)
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (See 20-23, 1, p. 74)
- OVERTURE 13 From Louisiana Presbytery** (to MNA)
"Divide Louisiana Presbytery" (See 20-23, 3, p. 73)
- OVERTURE 14 From Potomac Presbytery** (to B&O)
"Amend *SJC* Manual 7.3 (c)" (See 20-51, 8, p. 104)
- OVERTURE 15 From Presbytery of Southern Florida** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 32-2 and 32-3 to Clarify" (See 20-51, 9, p. 106)
- OVERTURE 16 From Presbytery of New River** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 43-3 To Clarify it, if Current Amendment is Adopted"
(See 20-51, 10, p. 107)
- OVERTURE 17 From Heritage Presbytery** (to IRC)
"Reporting on the Work of NAE" (See 20-22, 7, p. 66)
- OVERTURE 18 From the Korean Eastern Presbytery** (to MNA)
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (See 20-23, 1, p. 72)
- OVERTURE 19 From the Korean Central Presbytery** (to MNA)
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (See 20-23, 1, p. 72)
- OVERTURE 20 From the Korean Southwestern Presbytery** (to MNA)
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (See 20-23, 1, p. 72)
- OVERTURE 21 From Grace Presbytery** (to B&O)
"Instruct AC to Appoint Committee to Revise RAO" (See 20-51, 11, p. 108)
- OVERTURE 22 From Western Carolina Presbytery** (to B&O)
"Objection to Using Cult Facilities" (See 20-51, 12, p. 109)
- OVERTURE 23 From New River Presbytery** (to B&O & CCB)
"Amend *BCO* 16-3 to Require Grounds for Not Approving Ordination Exam"
(See 20-51, 13, p. 110)
- OVERTURE 24 From the Presbytery of the Ascension** (to MNA)
"Divide Ascension Presbytery into Two" (See 20-23, 4, p. 74)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- OVERTURE 25 From Pacific Presbytery** (to B&O)
"Evangelism of Jewish People" (See 20-51, 14, p. 111)
- OVERTURE 26 From Korean Southwest Presbytery** (to MNA)
"Divide Korean Southwest Presbytery" (See 20-23, 5, p. 75)
- OVERTURE 27 From the Central Georgia Presbytery** (to IAR)
"Make PCA Health Plan Mandatory" (See 20-47, 7, p. 93)
- OVERTURE 28 From Central Georgia Presbytery** (to B&O)
"Study Clergy Burnout, Stress, etc. in PCA" (See 20-51, 15, p. 112)
- OVERTURE 29 from Evangel Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Restatement of *BCO* 38-2." (See 20-51, 16, p. 113)
- OVERTURE 30 from New River Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 15-4 to permit General Assembly to Adjudicate." (See 20-51, 17, p. 114)
- OVERTURE 31 from Westminster Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* Preface II, to avoid Pluralistic Interpretation." (See 20-51, 18, p. 115)
- OVERTURE 32 from Ascension Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 34-1 so Neighboring Presbytery may adjudicate case." (See 20-51, 19, p. 116)
- OVERTURE 33 from New River Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend 24-5 to Permit Session to Ordain Elders and Deacons." (See 20-51, 20, p. 116)
- OVERTURE 34 from New River Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 15-4 So as to limit membership on *SJC*" (See 20-51, 21, p. 118)
- OVERTURE 35 From Heritage Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 37-4 to Apply to Presbyteries as Well as Sessions" (See 20-51, 22, p. 118)
- OVERTURE 36 From Central Carolina Presbytery** (to IAR & B&O)
"Require IAR to Produce Legal Opinions and GA to Appoint Interim Board" (See 20-47, 8, p. 94)
- OVERTURE 37 From Southeast Alabama Presbytery** ((to B&O)
"Have GA Meet Only Every Two Years" (See 20-51, 24, p. 120)
- OVERTURE 38 From Philadelphia Presbytery** (to B&O)
"Regarding Evangelism of Jewish People" (See 20-51, 14, p. 112)

JOURNAL

OVERTURE 39 From Philadelphia Presbytery (to MNA)
"Regarding Endorsement of CHAIM" (See 20-23, 6, p. 76)

OVERTURE 40 From Eastern Carolina Presbytery
"Appoint Study Committee: 'Are Drama and Liturgical Dance Consistent with Doctrine of Worship?'" (See 20-25, 1, p. 79)

OVERTURE 41 From Northeast Presbytery (See 20-25, 2, p. 79)
"Establish Ad Interim Committee to Plan 350th Anniversary of WCF"

COMMUNICATIONS

COMMUNICATION 1 From Grace Presbytery (to MNA)
"Concur with Overture 13 from Louisiana to Divide" (See 20-23, 3, p. 74)

COMMUNICATION 2 From Westminster Theological Seminary (to AC)
"Appoint Observer to Westminster Theological Seminary Board"
(See 20-63, VI, 11, p. 132)

COMMUNICATION 3 From the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (to IRC)
"Consider Merger, not J & R" (See 20-22, III, 1, p. 63)

COMMUNICATION 4 From Westminster Presbyterian Synod, Australia
"Thanks for Relation Through MTW; Request Fraternal Relationship"
(to IRC) (See 20-22, 11, p. 66)

COMMUNICATION 5 From the Reformed Presbyterian Church of India
"Greetings to the 20th General Assembly of the PCA, 1992"
(to IRC) (See 20-22, 11, p. 66)

COMMUNICATION 6 From the Evangelical Free Church in America
"Greetings" (to IRC) (See 20-22, 11, p. 68)

20-14 Ad Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage

TE Paul Fowler, chairman, led in prayer and began presentation of the Committee's report (see Appendix O, pp. 513). The members of the Committee joined him at the podium. Chairman Fowler noted several minor changes which will be included in the final published text of the report. Recommendations were acted upon as follows:

1. That the General Assembly receive the report of the Ad-Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage. *Adopted*
2. That the General Assembly adopt the following conclusions regarding divorce and remarriage:
 - a. That according to both the institution of marriage and its regulation in Scripture, marital vows are to be kept until death. *Adopted*
 - b. That nevertheless, Scripture does provide for the dissolution of marriage under certain circumstances. *Adopted*

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- c. That the innocent spouse is free to divorce and remarry when the other spouse commits sexual immorality (*porneia*, Mt. 19:9), in the sense understood in the Committee report (Chapter 2, Section II.D.3.f.).
Adopted
 - d. That while divorce is permitted to the innocent spouse, divorce is not mandated in the case of *porneia*, however, and forgiveness is always to be offered to the one who has sinned (cf., e.g., Mt. 6:12, 14, 15). *Adopted*
 - e. That when believers divorce for other than Biblical grounds, they should remain unmarried or else be reconciled (1 Cor. 7:11). *Adopted*
 - f. That when an unbeliever separates from the marriage relationship with a believer, the believer is free from that marriage and free to remarry but only in the Lord (1 Cor. 7:15, 39). *Adopted*
 - g. That under extreme circumstances, a Session may properly judge that such desertion (separation) has occurred, even though the deserting spouse is still physically present in the home ("desertion" being viewed in the sense understood in the Committee report, Chapter 2, Section II.E.4.). *Adopted*
 - h. That the believer in the aforementioned cases (f, g) is free to make the Biblical divorce a legal divorce in the eyes of the State. *Adopted*
 - i. That in matters pertaining to sexual immorality and desertion, the pastor and Ruling Elders are responsible for providing counsel, direction and judgment, according to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America. *Adopted*
3. That the General Assembly propose the revision of 24.6 of the *Confession* (which could be construed as too lax at this point, but is otherwise neither too lax or too restrictive) for clarity's sake to provide a more explicit statement of the Pauline teaching by means of the following amendment:
- a. Add after the word "desertion" the words "of a believer by an unbeliever," and
 - b. Add as the concluding words of the section the sentence: "Believers who separate for reasons other than adultery must remain unmarried, or else be reconciled."

The present wording of 24.6 reads as follows:

"Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage: yet, nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church, or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage: wherein, a public and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed; and the persons concerned in it not left to their own wills, and discretion, in their own case."

Defeated

NOTE: Recommendation 3 -- By the required two-thirds majority which was also more than one-half of the registered commissioners, the Assembly on motion voted to suspend the *Rules of Assembly Operations* requiring referral of proposed changes to the Constitution to the Committee on Constitutional Business. The recommendation was then **Defeated**, due to failure to achieve the required three-fourths majority (392 affirmative 283 negative).

JOURNAL

4. That the General Assembly present to ruling and teaching elders for their careful consideration the guidelines and resources provided in Chapter 3, "Pastoral Perspective on Divorce and Remarriage." *Adopted*
5. That the Ad Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage be dismissed with gratitude. *Adopted*

During the preceding discussion the stated clerk announced that the enrollment had increased to 387 ruling elders and 713 teaching elders for a total of 1100.

20-15 Committee on Thanks

Moderator Benton announced the appointment of the Committee on Thanks: TE Henry Bishop, chairman, and RE's Ben Rook and Daniel Domin.

20-16 Worship

The Assembly moved to the order of the day for worship under the direction of Northeast Presbytery.

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

TE Frank J. Smith, Senior Pastor, Affirmation PCA, Bedford Hills, New York

*THE CALL TO WORSHIP

*THE INVOCATION

TE Brad Evans, Pastor, Presbyterian Church of Coventry, Connecticut

*HYMN 59

"Forever Settled in the Heavens"

THE OLD TESTAMENT READING

Psalm 119:97-112

TE William S. Henderson, Senior Pastor, Hope Church, Ballston Spa, New York

THE NEW TESTAMENT READING

Matthew 5:13-20

TE John L. Vance, Pastor, Westminster PCA, Rock Tavern, New York

THE SERMON

"Christian Influences"

TE Frank E. Smith, Associate Pastor, Affirmation PCA, Bedford Hills, New York

PRAYER

*HYMN 558

"That Man Is Blest Who, Fearing God"

*THE BENEDICTION

*Congregation will please stand.

20-17 Recess

Following worship the Assembly recessed for lunch at 12:10 p.m.

MINUTES--TUESDAY AFTERNOON

June 16, 1992

Third Session

20-18 Assembly Reconvened

The Assembly reconvened at 1:35 p.m. Tuesday afternoon with the singing of *"We Are God's People"* and prayer led by TE Fred Mau.

20-19 Ad Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage

The Assembly returned to the conclusion of the Committee's report, and recommendations 4 and 5 were acted upon at this time (text appears at 20-13, p. 59)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

20-20 BCO Amendment, Item 6

The stated clerk reported concerning Item 6 of the proposed amendments to the *Book of Church Order*. Eastern Carolinas, South Texas, and Westminster Presbyteries had not voted to reconsider before voting again on Item 6, thus their changed votes were out of order. Northern Illinois Presbytery had voted to reconsider and its changed vote was therefore in order. Rocky Mountain Presbytery should not have voted as that in effect gave two votes to its members who had belonged to an antecedent presbytery which had voted. The count was therefore 32 affirmative, 16 negative, and 1 abstention, and the matter was ruled not before the Assembly due to failure to achieve the constitutional percentage of affirmative votes.

20-21 Committee on Interchurch Relations (partial report)

TE Henry Smith, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's partial report consisting of presentation of fraternal delegates and official visitors.

He first introduced TE Ludgero Morais, moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Brazil, who addressed the Assembly briefly. The Assembly was informed of the presence of a Korean Church delegation in the country to comfort and encourage those affected by the Los Angeles riots. He then introduced TE Roshyama Hrangchal of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in India and TE Bon Hag Lee of the Presbyterian Church in Korea.

Fraternal delegates were introduced and addressed the Assembly:

1. TE Allen Church, Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church;
2. TE Wherein Keizer, Christian Reformed Church, following whose remarks the Assembly was led in prayer for the deliberations of the CRC Synod today and tomorrow;
3. TE James Bosgraft, Orthodox Presbyterian Church; and
4. A letter from TE Paul Martin, chairman, Interchurch Committee of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, North America, was also read.

Pastor Henry Lewis Smith
P.O. Box 146
Prattville, Alabama 36067

Dear Henry,

Please convey our greetings to the meeting of your General Assembly.
To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America:

Greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In this day of rioting, raping and general disregard for personhood it is essential that the Church of the Lord Jesus be a beacon of the love of God in a broken and decaying world. The enemies of God are organized. Evil is called good. Good is called evil. How much more urgently must the people of God proclaim the glorious redemption of the Lord Jesus in Word but especially in our life. Let the end of your debate and theological discussion be to love God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our strength and will all our mind and to love our neighbor as ourselves. May our love be a reflection of the love of the Lord Jesus for His Church. What good are we if we have glorious programs and theology and have not the love in which that theology is embedded? We are nothing.

JOURNAL

What are the issues of your meeting? I do not know but ultimately they are rooted in the glory of Christ -- How is He to be glorified. It is an hour when the church of Jesus Christ must stand firmly on the authority of the Bible and the atoning and propitiatory work of the sacrificial blood of Jesus.

Brethren, stand firm in Him maintaining that precious confession for which our father died, in the overflowing love and compassion of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Love,
Paul M. Martin
Reformed Presbyterian Church, North America

Finally, TE Robert Norris, observer from the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, brought greetings to the Assembly.

20-22 Committee of Commissioners on Interchurch Relations

RE Meade Guy, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's report. Recommendations were acted upon as follows:

I. BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

- A. Report of Permanent Committee (see Appendix H, p. 379)
- B. Minutes of Permanent Committee
July 15, 1991
June 16, 1992
March 26, 1992
- C. Overture 17 from Heritage Presbytery
- D. Communication #3, 4, 5, 6
- E. No business was carried over from previous assembly
- F. No audit reports

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES DISCUSSED

- A. Status of "Joining and Receiving" with OPC
- B. Status of PCA to World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF)
- C. Status of PCA to NAPARC with regard to the CRC

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the proposed letter be adopted by the 20th General Assembly of the PCA as its responses to the (June 10, 1991 Communication #3) letter from the 58th General Assembly of the OPC.
Rationale: Amendment makes for historical accuracy

Adopted

COMMUNICATION 3 From the Orthodox Presbyterian Church

"Consider Merger, not J & R"

Fathers and Brethren:

The recently concluded (June 6, 1991) 58th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church was informed, via the report of its Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, of the decision of your 1990 General Assembly "(to inform) the OPC that the best way that the PCA can understand the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

desire of the OPC for union is for the OPC to take their necessary constitutional steps requesting to be received into the PCA, and that the Interchurch Relations Committee continue to be available to the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for discussion of matters relating to the joining and receiving process."

It surely is no secret that many in the OPC, including some who have favored and some who have not favored the joining and receiving proposals that came before our General Assembly in 1981 and 1986, believe that the joining and receiving process itself has engendered difficulties in the OPC. For some, the joining and receiving process is an obstacle to the eventual joining of our churches on a biblical basis.

During discussion of this topic at our General Assembly it was moved and carried that "the 58th General Assembly reaffirm to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America our desire for closer union with the PCA, and plead with our brethren to reconsider their rejection of organic union by any process except J & R." This motion received a strong majority, and we trust that you will give it your prayerful consideration.

May the Lord of the church deliver all of us from all thoughts and stands that can not be substantiated from His Word, as we seek to reflect more perfectly His desire for one church.

Yours in Christ's service,
/s/ Richard A. Barker, Stated Clerk

CLERK'S NOTE: This was received too late to be acted on by 19th GA.

PROPOSED RESPONSE FOR GENERAL ASSEMBLY ADOPTION

The General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church
Ruling Elder Richard A. Barker, Stated Clerk
639 Shadowlawn Drive
Westfield, NJ 07090-3357

Fathers and Brethren,

May the rich grace of our Lord Jesus Christ strengthen and nurture your hearts in faith and love!

We have received your communication, informing "that the 58th General Assembly (OPC) reaffirm(s) to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America our desire for closer union with the PCA and plead(s) with our brethren to reconsider their rejection of organic union by any process except J & R."

Your clerk's letter concludes with this hope: "May the Lord of the church deliver all of us from all thoughts and stands that cannot be substantiated from His word, as we seek to reflect more perfectly His desire for one church."

We rejoice that your General Assembly has reaffirmed its desire for closer union with the PCA, and further rejoice that we both stand together in this desire, and have adopted the same "Guiding Principles for Ecumenical Relations." This statement introduces Section II (Developing Procedures for Removing Barriers to Unity): "No schedule of conversations, no procedures for reception or plans for

JOURNAL

union will be pleasing to the Lord or effective in his service unless his glory is the motivation of our actions."

We have abundant evidence that this spirit motivated the representatives of the OPC, PCA, RPCES, and RPCNA on September 14, 1979 when the idea of inviting other churches to join the PCA, originally proposed at the 6th General Assembly, come to fruition in the concept of "joining and receiving". After nine years of discussion and various actions relating to J & R, our 1989 General Assembly reconsidered this, and determined to enter into union discussions with the OPC. This action brought six overtures from as many presbyteries, expressing great concern that such discussions would consume inordinate amounts of our limited time, energy, manpower, commitment, emotion and financial resources, are "of debatable priority" and would yield questionable results.

In response to these overtures the 18th General Assembly (1990) directed that the OPC be informed that "the best way that the PCA can understand the desire of the OPC for union is for the OPC to take their constitutional steps, requesting to be received into the PCA, and that the Interchurch Relations Committee continue to be available to the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for discussion of matters relating to the joining and receiving process."

The representatives of our three denominations (OPC, PCA, RPCES) in 1979 saw the J & R process as a biblical, speedy and effective way to fulfill the desire of our Lord for the unity of His church, and their judgment has been confirmed by majority votes at OPC and PCA General Assemblies. We are further convinced by events since 1982, when the RPCES entered the PCA through J & R, that it is the best route to achieve unity and practice prudent stewardship.

The late Francis Shaeffer warned that the prolonged intricacies of negotiated church union can bring a drain on our limited resources that our little flocks can ill afford.

The Presbyterian Church in America lovingly assures you that we stand ready to give sympathetic consideration to your request for reception and again offer its Interchurch Relations Committee to be available for discussion of any matters relating to the joining and receiving process that may concern you.

Brethren, pray for us!

In Christ,
The General Assembly of
The Presbyterian Church in America

NOTE: TE David Coffin requested his negative vote to be recorded.

2. That the Fraternal Delegates from NAPARC churches be welcomed and invited to address the Assembly. *Adopted*
3. That the General Assembly hear Dr. Robert Norris, pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Washington and observer from the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, bring greetings and speak concerning the 1993 Westminster Assembly Commemoration. *Adopted*
4. That the General Assembly hear the chairman of the Interecclesiastical Relations Committee of the Presbyterian Church of Brazil Rev. Ludgero Morais for 3 minutes. *Adopted*
5. That the General Assembly endorse PCA participation in the NAPARC - sponsored conference marking the 350th anniversary of the Westminster

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Assembly, September 23-25, 1993, and that full participation by its ruling and teaching elders and membership in the aims of this conference be encouraged, including attendance by those who find it feasible. *Adopted*

6. That the General Assembly appropriate \$5000 for the NAPARC/Westminster Assembly Conference the PCA's share of estimated expenses. *Adopted*
Rationale: clarifies the recommendation 5 above.
7. That Overture 17 from Heritage Presbytery be answered as follows:
"The Interchurch Relations Committee accepts the responsibility as outlined in the overture. Further, that the report of the representatives to NAE will be distributed as is being done this year." *Adopted*

OVERTURE 17 From Heritage Presbytery (to IRC) "Reporting on the Work of NAE"

Concerning promoting awareness of NAE in the PCA.

Whereas, the PCA joined the National Association of Evangelicals several years ago, and

Whereas, the General Assembly has not heard much about our involvement in NAE recently,

Therefore Be it Resolved that as long as PCA remains a part of NAE, that the Interchurch Relations Committee is hereby charged with the responsibility of annually reporting upon and keeping the General Assembly aware of the work of the NAE, and also keeping the entire PCA aware through the *PCA Messenger* or other appropriate means.

Adopted at the 9th Stated Meeting of Heritage Presbytery on February 8, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Bruce B. Howes
Stated Clerk

8. That the 20th General Assembly pause to pray for God's blessing on the World Evangelical Fellowship's (WEF) 6th General Assembly and the Presbyterian and Reformed Fellowship meeting. *Adopted*
9. That TE Paul R. Gilchrist, TE K. Eric Perrin, and RE Carl Wilhelm be authorized to represent the PCA as delegates to the WEF General Assembly in Manila, Philippines (Independent funding has already been secured for travel expenses). *Adopted*
10. That the minutes of July 15, 1991; January 16, 1992; and March 26, 1992 be approved with notations. *Adopted*
11. That Communications 4,5 and 6 be received as information, and #4 and #5 be referred to the Permanent Committee for possible recommendations to the 21st General Assembly, and #6 for a response. *Adopted*

COMMUNICATION 4 From Westminster Presbyterian Synod, Australia

"Thanks for Relation Through MTW; Request Fraternal Relationship"

JOURNAL

Clerk of the General Assembly
Presbyterian Church in America
Atlanta, GEORGIA U.S.A.

15 May 1992

To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, greetings in the name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

The third Synod of Westminster Presbyterian Church, held in Perth, Western Australia this year, requested that a letter of greetings and appreciation be sent to you.

As you know, W.P.C. in Australia, came about "by accident" when WPM missionaries, David and Barbara Cross, came here in 1970 to take over the leadership of an Australian Aboriginal mission work. Of course, there are no "accidents" with God. The small work among our Aboriginal "Nyoongar" people continues and twenty other congregations calling themselves Westminster Presbyterian Church have started. Nine of these are fully constituted churches and the others are in various stages of development, four of which commenced just this year.

Three years from now the "church planting team" phase of MTW's work with WPC will cease. This is an appropriate time for us to say thank you for the fine men you sent and for all the dedicated supporters who kept them on the Australian field. Many Australians have come into God's Kingdom and many Christians have found a gospel preaching Reformed church in which to serve the Lord. Perhaps some of your men will work with us for a while, under the Co-operative Agreement we have with you, until we are more consolidated.

We have worked together for a number of years but without any formal connection except through Mission to the World. As a Reformed and Presbyterian denomination, Westminster Presbyterian Church desires to establish and maintain formal fraternal ties with you. Please inform us of how we can proceed with this.

Yours, in Christ's service,
/s/ Derek Jones, Synod Clerk

COMMUNICATION 5 From the Reformed Presbyterian Church of India

"Greetings to the 20th General Assembly of the PCA, 1992"

Reformed Presbyterian Church Office
P. Box 4, Peace-Lane
Churachandpur 795 128
Manipur State, INDIA

Dear Presbyters,

Greetings in the matchless name of Jesus Christ our Lord!

My heart leaped with joy when I opened the letter of invitation from Dr. Paul Gilchrist. To participate in such a meeting as this has been our dream in the past ten years -- to be part of the larger body of the church of Christ.

As you may have been aware, the RPCES of the North East India was formed in 1979 with the purpose of adherence to the Reformed Faith and

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Presbyterian Polity which we came to know through the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Dehradun, being the alma mater of several NE Indian Christian workers. I know the MTW missionaries personally who are in North India. They are our example and guide.

The Manipur RPCEs Presbytery operates Christian schools as a means to evangelism among the state's main inhabitants called Meitei high caste Hindus. The main advantages are that we can teach Scriptures in school; we are accepted in their society as they have a high view on those who are able to teach English; and school buildings become centers for vocational training, seminars and conferences. Four churches among the unreached areas in Manipur and one in Assam have been started. With the confidence I have in God, I can say that churches will be multiplied as we join hands!

We wish to have a better relationship with you in the future as a church body. I know that some of you have already been involved in famine relief work in the past few years. It is our calling to serve God by planting churches and training people in India. Indeed the covenant-keeping God is with us as He gives every place on which the sole of our foot treads!

May the joy of the Lord be always our strength.

Your co-worker in the kingdom of Christ,
/s/ L. Roshyama Hrangchal
Reformed Theological Seminary
Jackson, Mississippi

COMMUNICATION 6 From the Evangelical Free Church in America "Greetings"

Dear Stated Clerk Gilchrist,

Greetings to you and our brothers and sisters of the Presbyterian Church in America as you meet for your annual meeting on June 15-19 in Roanoke, Virginia.

As colleagues in ministry with you, your brothers and sisters of The Evangelical Free Church of America pray that God may bless your conference in every way. We join you, also, in praying that a great spiritual awakening may take place in our churches, our nation and around the world during this strategic decade.

It is a great joy and privilege to team in ministry with you. Again we assure you of our deep love and prayers.

Prayerfully yours--in Christ,
/s/ Paul A. Cedar, President

12. On motion the report as a whole was received with the following amendment: Resolved, that the 20th General Assembly hereby instruct the Interchurch Relations Committee to prepare documentation with regard to the Christian Reformed Church for presentation to the 21st General Assembly, such documentation to include such matters as the view of Scripture, the toleration of beliefs in evolution and homosexuality, and the treatment of brethren who have stood against these modernist trends. *Adopted*
13. The following minority report was presented:

JOURNAL

We the following ask the General Assembly to declare that the ruling of the majority was in error in not allowing discussion and review of a matter in the NAPARC minutes, since it was properly brought before the Committee of Commissioners. -- TE Robert Burridge, TE Thomas Sullivan, TE Carl Bogue, and TE Frank J. Smith. *Defeated*

/s/ RE Meade Guy, Chairman

/s/ TE Stephen Stout, Secretary

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Presbytery

Ascension
Calvary
Central Carolina
Covenant
East Carolina
Evangel
Grace
Gulf Coast
Heritage
James River
Louisiana
North Texas
North East
No. Illinois
Pacific Northwest
Philadelphia
Southeast Alabama
Southwest Florida
Tennessee Valley
Western Carolina
Westminster

Commissioners

TE Carl Bogue
RE John B. Armstrong
TE Stephen Stout, Secretary
TE Grover Gunn
RE Charles Leverett
RE Phil Anderson
TE E. C. Case
RE Chipley Bennett
TE Ernest Breen
TE Ira Staley
RE Edwin Hackenberg
TE William Bomer
TE Frank Smith
TE Bruce Stanek
TE Curtis Young
RE George Harris
RE Meade Guy, Chairman
TE Bob Burridge
RE David Cleveland
TE Larry Wilson
TE Tom Sullivan

20-23 Committee of Commissioners on Mission to North America

RE William Joseph, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's report. Chairman Joseph called on the chairman of the permanent committee, TE Cortez Cooper, to present the program portion of the report.

The Assembly acted on the Committee's recommendations as follows:

I. Business Referred To The Committee:

- A. Overtures 12, 18, 12, 19, 20, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
- B. Review the minutes of the Standing Committee
Oct 3-4, 1991; March 5-6, 1992; June 1, 1992;
- C. Recommendations of the Standing Committee
- D. Budget recommendations and review of the Audit Report.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

II. Recommendations:

A. Review of Minutes:

1. Whereas the MNA Committee had commissioned a task force to study the subject of worship, we commend the MNA Committee for the caliber and balance of the task force assembled (October 3-4, 1991 minutes - 10-91-27)
Adopted
2. Recommend that the MNA Committee General Assembly be notified upon the completion of this study. (October 3-4, 1991 minutes - 10-91-27).
Adopted
3. Recommend that the MNA Committee make this study available to people upon request and at their expense after approval by the General Assembly. (October 3-4, 1991 minutes - 10-91-27).
Adopted
4. Approve the October 3, 4, 1991, MNA minutes with notation. *Adopted*
5. Approve the March 5, 6, 1992 minutes with notation. *Adopted*
6. Approve the June 1, 1992, minutes with notation. *Adopted*

B. Overtures:

1. Answer Overture #10, 12, 18, 19, 20 in the affirmative as follows:

Whereas the PCA Korean churches have been uniquely blessed by God and are the most rapidly growing segment of the PCA, and

Whereas the 10th General Assembly approved the organization of non-geographical Korean Language Presbyteries for a ten-year period, subject to extension by the Assembly (*Minutes*, 9th GA, 10-66 III 24.b p.92), and

Whereas that ten-year period concludes in 1992, and

Whereas God has richly blessed the Korean churches with growth during this decade so that at this ten-year mark there are now five Korean Language Presbyteries with a total of forty-one churches, fifty-three missions, and one-hundred and thirty-nine teaching elders; and

Whereas the existence of language presbyteries has been a most effective means of assisting growth among Korean churches and a primary bridge between the anglo PCA and emerging second and third generation Korean leaders who come into the PCA;

Therefore, the MNA Committee of Commissioners recommends that the General Assembly extend the organization of non-geographical Korean Language Presbyteries with the following conditions (1-4 previously approved by the 10th GA):

1. The boundaries of the presbytery will be according to the needs of the Korean churches and will be superimposed on existing presbyteries.
2. The language used in the presbyteries will be Korean but it will be understood that all presbytery minutes and other documents and correspondence which the General Assembly must read will be translated into English for the benefit of the General Assembly.
3. Any Korean church will have the freedom to join the Korean Language Presbytery, or the English-speaking presbytery. Any Korean church applying for membership in the PCA may submit its application to whichever presbytery it prefers.

JOURNAL

4. Permission for separate language presbyteries will be for a period of five years. At the end of that time, permission can be extended for other five-year periods as deemed necessary.
5. Furthermore, the Committee of Commissioners recommends encouraging Presbyteries in close geographical proximity to Korean Language Presbyteries to make a concerted effort to have fellowship with Korean Presbyteries.

Adopted as amended

RATIONALE:

1. Since the Korean Language Presbyteries are composed of mostly first generation Korean churches, there remains a cultural/language need to continue language presbyteries until second generation Korean churches come into being.
2. The five Korean Language Presbyteries themselves are requesting the extension.
3. The first two sections of the *BCO* -- the Form of Government and Rules of Discipline -- have been translated into Korean and time is now needed for Korean presbyteries to adjust to the *BCO* standards.
4. Historically, it has taken churches from other subcultures three generations to assimilate into American church culture. Time and energy is needed to bring the Korean churches to a point where they feel a part of the PCA.

In answer to the concerns of the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records (*Minutes* 19th GA, 19-70-III, p. 176) the MNA Committee reports that the translation of both the *BCO* (through the Rules of Discipline) and the RAO have been completed; and the MNA Committee reports that the translation of the minutes of the five Korean presbyteries has been completed.

OVERTURE 10 From Korean Southeastern Presbytery (to MNA) "Continue Korean Southeastern Presbyteries"

The Korean Southeastern Presbytery at its stated meeting on October 7, 1991, respectfully overtures the 20th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America to continue the existence of the Korean Language Presbyteries.

Our presbytery greatly appreciates the denomination for the growth of the Korean Presbyteries. As the expiration of the Korean Presbyteries reaches, we ask the denomination for approval of continual existence of the Korean Presbyteries in the denomination.

Attested by: /s/ Rev. Paul Taek Yong Kim
Stated Clerk

OVERTURE 12 From Korean Southern Presbytery "Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (same as Overture 10)

Adopted at the Stated Meeting of the Korean Southern Presbytery on October 10, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Dong-Min Shin, Stated Clerk

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OVERTURE 18 From the Korean Eastern Presbytery
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (same as Overture 10)

Adopted at its stated meeting on September 16, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Daniel K. Song
Stated Clerk

OVERTURE 19 From the Korean Central Presbytery
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (same as Overture 10)

Adopted at its stated meeting on October 8, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Daniel Choe
Stated Clerk

OVERTURE 20 From the Korean Southwestern Presbytery
"Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" (same as Overture 10)

Adopted at the stated meeting of Korean Southwestern Presbytery on October 15, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ TE Jae Dong Yang
Stated Clerk

2. That the General Assembly respond in the affirmative to the request of the Korean Southeastern Presbytery (Overture 9) that the presbytery be divided into two.
 - a. Korean Capitol Presbytery (tentative designation) including Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia.
 - b. Korean Southeastern Presbytery (the continuing presbytery) including North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.

Adopted

OVERTURE 9 From Korean Southeastern Presbytery
"Divide Korean Southeastern Presbytery"

The Korean Southeastern Presbytery at its stated meeting on October 7, 1991 respectfully overtures the 20th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America to divide Korean Southeastern Presbytery into two.

Our Presbytery has been composed of the churches from the south of Maryland and along the boundary of Mississippi River, and separated from the Eastern Presbytery in June 1986. At that time there were 6 organized churches and 2 unorganized churches. But as of now there are 37 regular members (pastors) and 5 associate members, with 30 churches (13 organized churches, 17 unorganized) in the Korean Southeastern Presbytery.

In order to make more effective presbytery we have decided to divide the Korean Southeastern Presbytery into two presbyteries subject to the General Assembly's approval.

JOURNAL

Provisional Presbyteries:

1. Korean Capitol Presbytery (tentative designation)
including Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia
Convener: Rev. Paul Taek Yong Kim
2. Korean Southeastern Presbytery (the continuing presbytery)
including North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida
Convener: Rev. Sam Jung Suh

Rev. Won Sang Lee
Moderator, K/SE Presbytery

3. That the General Assembly respond in the affirmative to the request of Louisiana Presbytery (Overture 13) to form a new Presbytery of Southeast Louisiana, effective December 31, 1992, to include the parishes of Ascension, Assumption, East and West Baton Rouge, East and West Feliciana, Iberville, Jefferson, Lafourche, Livingston, Orleans, Plaquemines, Point Coupee, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. Helena, St. James, St. John the Baptist, Terrebonne, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa and Washington. The last three parishes are currently within the bounds of Grace Presbytery, and through Communication 1 that presbytery concurs with Overture 13 from Louisiana Presbytery. *Adopted*

OVERTURE 13 From Louisiana Presbytery "Divide Louisiana Presbytery"

Whereas, a vision for church planting, fellowship, and mutual ministry has been developed by the PCA ministers in the Southeastern Louisiana for the parishes of Ascension, Assumption, East and West Baton Rouge, East and West Feliciana, Iberville, Jefferson, Lafourche, Livingston, Orleans, Plaquemines, Point Coupee, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. Helena, St. James, St. John the Baptist, Terrebonne, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa and Washington, of which the last three parishes are currently within the bounds of Grace Presbytery, and

Whereas, the realization of the Vision 2,000 of the PCA requires aggressive church planting, and

Whereas, we believe the formation of a new Presbytery would facilitate the realization of both Vision 2,000 and our own vision for church planting, fellowship, and ministry in Southeastern Louisiana, and

Whereas, the Louisiana Presbytery is unanimously agreed concerning both the timeliness and desirability of forming a new Presbytery.

Therefore, the Louisiana Presbytery, meeting at Oakdale, Louisiana, on the 25th of January, 1992, overtures the 20th General Assembly meeting in Roanoke, VA, to form Southeast Louisiana Presbytery to include the above mentioned parishes and the following churches and to become effective December 31, 1992:

Grace Presbyterian Church, Baton Rouge; Robert Lane, pastor
Grace Presbyterian Church, Metairie; Richard Davies, pastor
Faith Presbyterian Mission, Clinton; Shane Sunn, organizing pastor
Plains Presbyterian Church, Zachary; Andrew Silman, pastor
Trinity Presbyterian Church, Slidell; Merle Messer, pastor (Grace Presbytery)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Westminster Presbyterian Church, Baton Rouge; Randy Toms, pastor

Unanimously adopted at the Winter Stated Meeting of the Louisiana Presbytery on January 25, 1992.

Attested by: Robert B. Vincent, Sr.
Stated Clerk

COMMUNICATION 1 From Grace Presbytery "Concur with Overture 13 from Louisiana to Divide"

Enclosed please find two items copied from the minutes of the Seventy-second Stated Meeting of Grace Presbytery, held in Gulfport, Mississippi, on the 14th of January, 1992. The first of these items is a highlighted abstract of the recommendation of the Presbytery Committee on Mission to North America, which recommendation was adopted by vote of the Presbytery, supporting the request of five churches and two mission works located in Southeast Louisiana for the formation of a Southeast Louisiana Presbytery. One of the Church involved, Trinity-Slidell, is presently on the roll of Grace Presbytery.

Recommendation: That Grace Presbytery support Louisiana Presbytery's desire to Overture the 20th General Assembly to form the Southeast Louisiana Presbytery composed of Grace PCA, Baton Rouge (Robert Lane, Pastor); Grace PCA, Metairie (Richard Davies, Pastor); Faith PCA (Mission) Clinton (Shane Sunn, Pastor); Orleans PCA (Mission) New Orleans (John Keen, Pastor); Plains PCA, Zachary (Andrew Sillman, Pastor); Trinity PCA, Slidell (Merle Messer, Pastor); Westminster PC, Baton Rouge, (Randy Toms, Pastor).

A motion was duly made and seconded that Grace Presbytery concur with the desire of Trinity Church Session to join in supporting Louisiana Presbytery's Overture to the 20th General Assembly to form Southeast Louisiana Presbytery. This motion was approved.

Your Servant for Christ's Sake,
/s/ Eugene C. Case, Stated Clerk

4. That the General Assembly respond in the affirmative to the request of the Presbytery of the Ascension (Overture 24) to divide the presbytery into two, with the boundary between them to be along the northern border of the following counties: in Ohio--Tuscarawas, Carroll, and Columbiana; and in Pennsylvania -- Washington, Allegheny, Westmoreland, Indiana, Cambria, and Blair. This division to be effective January 1, 1993. *Adopted*

OVERTURE 24 From the Presbytery of the Ascension "Divide Ascension Presbytery into Two"

Whereas, the Presbytery of the Ascension has, in God's grace, grown from four churches in 1975 to 39 in 1992; and

JOURNAL

Whereas, the 16th General Assembly recommended that when a presbytery reaches 30 churches it should consider dividing (*M15GA* pp. 143-144); and
Whereas, the Presbytery of the Ascension not only exceeds the guidelines for number of churches, but is also one of the larger presbyteries in terms of number of members, contains three major metropolitan areas, and has a driving radius which exceeds that recommended by the 16th General Assembly; and
Whereas, both the 17th and 19th General Assemblies asked the Presbytery of the Ascension to enter into discussions with New River and Great Lakes Presbyteries, and with GA MNA, to consider jointly presbytery boundaries within the region (*M17GA* p. 96 and *M19GA* p. 116); and
Whereas, after these discussions, both New River and Great Lakes Presbyteries indicated that they do not wish to alter their boundaries at this time; and
Whereas, the Presbytery of the Ascension believes it needs to divide for more efficient oversight and closer cooperation; and
Whereas, such a division will allow the new presbyteries better to focus their attention on areas which do not currently have a strong reformed presence;
Therefore, Be it Resolved that the Presbytery of the Ascension overtures the 20th General Assembly to divide the Presbytery of the Ascension into two presbyteries, with the boundary between them to be along the northern border of the following counties: in Ohio - Tuscarawas, Carroll, and Columbiana; and in Pennsylvania - Washington, Allegheny, Westmoreland, Indiana, Cambria, and Blair. This division to be effective January 1, 1993.
Be it further resolved that the new northern presbytery will be designated the continuing presbytery and will maintain the records of the Presbytery of the Ascension, and that each of the new presbyteries will choose its own name at its first stated meeting.

Adopted at the March Stated Meeting of the Presbytery of the Ascension, on March 14, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Frederick R. Neikirk
Stated Clerk

5. That the General Assembly respond in the affirmative to the request of the Korean Southwest Presbytery (Overture 26) to divide the presbytery into two:
 - a. Korean Southwest Presbytery -- all of the California counties south of and including the counties of Inyo, Kern, and Santa Barbara.
 - b. Korean Northern California Presbytery -- all of the California counties north of and including the counties of San Luis Obispo, Kings, Tulare, Fresno, and Mono.

Adopted

OVERTURE 26 From Korean Southwest Presbytery "Divide Korean Southwest Presbytery"

The Korean Southwest Presbytery at its Stated Meeting on April 21, 1992, respectfully overtures the 20th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America to divide Korean Southwest Presbytery into two.

Our Presbytery is composed of eleven states (California, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, Colorado

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

and Arizona). However, all member churches are in California except two: one each in Arizona and Washington. And most churches are in the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas.

Our members have found that the distance between Los Angeles and San Francisco creates difficulties in attending Presbytery meetings and difficulty in overseeing the churches.

In order to make more effective presbyteries, we have decided to divide the Korean Southwest Presbytery into two presbyteries subject to General Assembly approval.

Provisional Presbyteries:

1. Korean Southwest Presbytery: All of the California counties south of and including the counties of Inyo, Kern, and Santa Barbara.
2. Korean Northwest Presbytery: All of the California counties north of and including the counties of San Luis, Obispo, Kings, Tulare, Fresno and Mono.

Adopted at the Stated Meeting of Korean Southwest Presbytery on April 21, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Rev. Kwang Hoon Ham
Stated Clerk

6. That the General Assembly adopt Overture 39 from Philadelphia Presbytery with the change of the last paragraph. *Adopted as amended*

OVERTURE 39 From Philadelphia Presbytery "Regarding Endorsement of CHAIM"

Whereas, the church has a responsibility to bring the gospel to all peoples, and this certainly includes the Jewish people;

Whereas, the PCA embraces the Westminster Standards as expressing the doctrinal system revealed in the Holy Scriptures;

Whereas, an ordained PCA evangelist to the Jewish people has been engaged full time in Jewish ministry by directing a mission called CHAIM, which conducts ministry in several presbyteries, has been endorsed in several presbyteries and has been granted tax-exempt status;

Whereas, CHAIM also embraces the Westminster Standards as its doctrinal basis, is Reformed and Covenantal in theology, has another PCA minister as the chairman of its board and, according to its by-laws, requires 3/4 of its board members to be PCA or OPC elders;

Therefore, the 20th General Assembly, through its Mission to North America, based upon the endorsement of Philadelphia Presbytery, recognizes the spiritual ties between ourselves and CHAIM and commends CHAIM to the churches of the PCA as a valid and reformed ministry worthy of the prayers, participation, and support of churches in the Presbyterian Church in America.

Adopted by Philadelphia Presbytery at the Stated Meeting in March 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Frank D. Moser
Stated Clerk

JOURNAL

C. Other Recommendations:

1. That the General Assembly commend TE Terry Gyger for his visionary leadership as MNA Coordinator, and re-elect him for another year. *Adopted*
2. That the General Assembly express its gratitude to God for the staff and personnel of Mission to North America. *Adopted*
3. That the General Assembly further thank God for its PCA campus staff, active and reserve chaplains, mercy missionaries, multicultural missionaries, and the organizing pastors of local church, presbytery or Assembly sponsorship. *Adopted*
4. That the General Assembly reaffirm its commitment to the church, the Body of Christ, as that primary vehicle through which God seeks to receive and to display his Glory and by which He extends His kingdom; and that the Assembly call on the churches and presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church in America to seek to insure that their prayer, energy, manpower, and financial resources actually serve to enhance the building of the Church of our God and Savior. *Adopted*
5. That the General Assembly approve an offering for PCA Mercy Ministries, to be taken preferably during the Thanksgiving season for 1992. *Adopted*
6. That the General Assembly express thanks to God for the long and effective ministry of Bethany Christian Services in the area of pregnancy counseling and adoption, encourage strong support for it by the churches and presbyteries, and invite its representative to speak to the Assembly for ten minutes at this or a more appropriate time. *Adopted*
7. That the General Assembly reaffirm its absolute dependence upon Almighty God for the growth and health of the PCA and encourage its presbyteries and churches to commit to participation in the Army of Intercessors so that the ministry of church planting is undergirded by earnest and faithful prayer. *Adopted*
8. That the General Assembly encourage U.S. congregations to "adopt" a chaplain for prayer and encouragement. (Rationale: At present we have an unusually effective, competent, and godly group of chaplains ministering to our armed forces for the PCA. However, these men often feel that the denomination is unaware of them and they do not receive much tangible support from PCA members. Therefore, in much the same way that many congregations "adopt" foreign missionaries whom they do not financially support, for correspondence, encouragement, and prayer, we recommend a similar practice with respect to chaplains. This would not ordinarily include financial support.) *Adopted*
9. That the General Assembly urge every congregation to consider the possibility of participating in starting a daughter church. *Adopted*
10. Since from the time initial discussions are started it normally takes two to four years before a campus minister begins his work on a campus, and since a feasibility study is usually done in conjunction with the presbytery's MNA Committee, it is recommended that the GA encourage presbytery MNA committees presently not involved in campus ministry through the PCA's campus work (Reformed University Ministries) to contact GA MNA's campus ministries department to work with them in determining the feasibility of starting campus ministries in their areas. *Adopted*
11. That the General Assembly adopt the budget for MNA for 1993 and commit itself to its support. *Adopted*

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

12. That the report as a whole be adopted.

Adopted

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Ascension
Calvary
Central Georgia
Covenant
Eastern Canada
Eastern Carolina
Evangel
Grace
Gulf Coast
James River
Louisiana
Mississippi Valley
Missouri
New River
North Georgia
Northeast
Northern California
Pacific Northwest
Philadelphia
Potomac
Siouxlands
South Texas
Southeast Alabama
Southern Florida
Southwest Florida
Susquehanna Valley
Tennessee Valley
Warrior
Western Carolina
Westminster

Commissioner

TE Gil Odendaal
RE Oscar A. Sadler
RE Erik Leonhard
TE Mike Biggs
TE Stephen R. Christian
TE A. Herrington
RE George K. Moss
TE K. Dale Linton
RE Paul White, Jr.
TE William Harrell
RE Mark Thompson
RE J. E. Johnston, Jr.
TE Jon Atkins
TE Richard Thomas
TE James Powell
TE Frank E. Smith
TE David R. Brown
TE James Richwine
RE Samuel J. Grillo
RE Robert Lukens
TE Stan Sundberg
TE Kent T. Hinkson, Secretary
RE W. F. Joseph, Jr., Chairman
RE Dennis W. Clark
TE Carlton Heil
TE David J. Fidati
RE Robert K. Holt
TE G. Fredric Mau
TE Frank E. Hamilton
TE Joe A. Wolfe

STATED CLERK'S NOTE: Recommendation A1 through A6, B1 through B6, and C5 and 8 were acted on at 20-32, p. 81.

20-24 Personal Resolution #1

TE William Henderson presented the following resolution which was received and referred to the Administrative Committee. (See 20-63, p. 135 for disposition.)

20-25 Action on Overtures

1. On the basis of *RAO* 8-4, Moderator Benton chose to take up Overture 40, which was formerly Overture 38 to the 19th General Assembly. A motion to answer the overture in the affirmative was **Defeated**.

JOURNAL

OVERTURE 40 From Eastern Carolina Presbytery

"Appoint Study Committee: 'Are Drama and Liturgical Dance Consistent with Doctrine of Worship?'"

Regarding the practices of dance and drama in worship:

Whereas, the use of these practices, especially drama, has spread throughout the denomination; and

Whereas, these worship practices have caused great controversy and much consternation in many places in the PCA; and

Whereas, some mission churches sponsored by the MNA Committee of the General Assembly have regularly used drama as a part of worship; and

Whereas, at the 17th General Assembly, a dramatic play was made an integral part of the Sabbath morning worship service, which action was vigorously protested.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that the 20th General Assembly instruct the Nominating Committee to recommend seven names for an ad interim committee to look into the use of drama and liturgical dance in the public worship of God, specifically whether such practices are consistent with the Scriptures and with the doctrine of worship taught in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, that this committee be funded by designated gifts up to \$5,000 and that this committee report to the 20th General Assembly.

Notation: We believe this to be an issue of such significance and potential divisiveness that the Assembly should address this issue now. Particular attention should be paid to the regulative principle of worship as described in the confessional standards.

2. Overture 41, which was formerly Overture 39 to the 19th General Assembly, was taken up on the same basis. A motion to answer the overture in the affirmative, with the understanding that budget considerations would be dealt with later, was **Defeated**.

OVERTURE 41 From Northeast Presbytery

"Establish Ad Interim Committee To Plan 350Th Anniversary Of WCF"

Whereas, the year 1993 will mark the 350th anniversary of the convening of the Westminster Assembly and of the Solemn League and Covenant; and

Whereas, the Southern Presbyterian Church in 1897 marked the 250th anniversary of the completion of the Westminster Standards with special addresses at the General Assembly and the printing of those speeches in a volume; and

Whereas, we should praise God for His mighty acts in history;

Now Therefore Be it Resolved that the 19th General Assembly does the following:

1. Provide plenary addresses at each General Assembly starting in 1993 and continuing until 1997, on topics such as these:
 - a. Historical Background of the Westminster Assembly
 - b. The Solemn League and Covenant
 - c. The Westminster Assembly Itself

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- d. The Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly
 - e. The Doctrinal Contents of the Westminster Confession of Faith
 - f. The Doctrine of Worship in the Westminster Standards
 - g. The Westminster Standards and Missions
 - h. The Westminster Standards in Relation to Family and Social Life
 - i. The Westminster Standards and Civil Government
 - j. The Westminster Standards in Relation to Current Theological Issues
2. Instruct the Nominating Committee to recommend members for a special AC subcommittee of two teaching elders and two ruling elders to be elected by this General Assembly, to work with the 1993-1997 Assembly Arrangements Committees to coordinate the planning for these events.
 3. Establish the following guidelines:
 - a. Speakers shall be paid for their services, with funds for such coming from fees for General Assembly arrangements.
 - b. Consideration will be given to scheduling joint meetings with the highest judicatories of other conservative Reformed denominations to join us in these celebrations.
 - c. Consideration will be given to gathering the essays into a book to be published by CE/P.

20-26 Ad Interim Committee on Communication

TE Paul Settle, chairman, led in prayer and presented the report (see Appendix P, p. 637). He distributed a questionnaire for the commissioners to complete and return to the committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Twentieth General Assembly continue this Committee and instruct it to bring a report, with recommendations, to the Twenty-first General Assembly. *Adopted*
2. That this Assembly allow the Committee thirty minutes at this time to survey the commissioners, with a view to learning the opinions, felt needs, and personal commitments of the "grass roots" in reference to communications in the PCA. *Adopted*
3. The report as a whole was adopted. *Adopted*

20-27 Committee of Commissioners on Christian Education

TE William Hawk, chairman, led in prayer and introduced TE Ron Shaw, chairman of the permanent committee, to present the CE&P program part of the report. He yielded the floor to TE Charles Dunahoo, CE&P coordinator, who moderated the presentation. At the conclusion, a survey was distributed to commissioners.

20-28 Personal Resolution #2

RE James White presented the following personal resolution which was received, adopted, and referred to the stated clerk for implementation.

Whereas, the United States is experiencing great social ills resulting from a general decline in individual morality; and

JOURNAL

Whereas, AIDS, venereal disease, and other diseases which result from immoral acts pose threats of epidemic proportion to our society; and

Whereas, the demise of the family as the basic unit of society is occurring at a rapid rate; and

Whereas, the secular academia, secular press, and many governmental leaders scorn the biblical principles upon which the family is based; and

Whereas, Vice-President J. Danforth Quayle has had the strength of character to call anew for the return of the family to a place of respect and highest esteem among the institutions of our society;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the 20th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America commends Vice-President J. Danforth Quayle for his support of morality and traditional Christian values upon which the United States of America was founded and to which it must return if it is to continue as a great nation.

20-29 Personal Resolution #3

A constitutional inquiry from TE Howard Griffith was received and referred to the Committee on Constitutional Business (see text and action 20-62, p. 127).

20-30 Personal Resolution #4

The following personal resolution of RE Jack Brown was received and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures (see text and action 20-51, recommendation #25, p. 120).

20-31 Personal Resolution #5

TE John Peoples submitted the following personal resolution which was received and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures (see text and action 20-51, recommendation #26, p. 121).

20-32 Committee of Commissioners on Mission to North America

Chairman William Joseph returned to continue the Committee's report. Recommendations **A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, B6, C5, and C8** were acted upon at this time. Text of the report is given at 20-23, p. 69).

20-33 Recess

The Assembly recessed at 5:35 p.m. with prayer led by RE John Taylor, remembering particularly Denise Huber and her family.

MINUTES--WEDNESDAY MORNING

June 17, 1992

Fourth Session

20-34 Assembly Reconvened

The Assembly reconvened for business at 8:00 a.m. Wednesday with the singing of "*O, Breath of Life, Come Sweeping through Us*" and prayer led by TE Hudson Armerding.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

20-35 Minutes of Previous Sessions

On motion the Assembly received the minutes of Monday's and Tuesday's sessions and agreed to submit any corrections to the recording clerks.

20-36 Committee of Commissioners on Christian Education

TE Bill Hawk, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's report (continued from 20-27, p. 80).

I. Business Referred to the Committee:

- A. Minutes of CE&P June 17, 1991, September 25-27, 1991, February 20-21, 1992, and June 15, 1992.
- B. Report and Recommendations of the permanent committee for CE&P
- C. Audit report of CE&P for 18 month period ending December 31, 1991.

II. Statement of Major Issues Discussed

- A. Present Status of Messenger and its funding
- B. Format of budget presentation - concern for a separate proposed and growth column in the 1994 budget (e.g. MNA).
- C. All minutes referred to the committee were reviewed except for the minutes of June 15, 1992 which were received as information to see that exceptions to previous minutes were being addressed.
- D. Recommendations of the permanent committee on CE&P.

III. Recommendations:

1. That the 20th General Assembly express gratitude to the Women in the Church for their generous support of the 1991 Love Gift designated to IAR (over \$94,000 was contributed). *Adopted*
2. That the 20th General Assembly approve the 1993 WIC Love Gift designation for Investor's Fund. *Adopted*
3. That the 20th General Assembly encourage local churches to participate in the 1992 WIC Love Gift, designated to CE&P and its WIC ministry. (The video presentation is also part of the WIC's curriculum for local churches regarding WIC ministries.) *Adopted*
4. That the 20th General Assembly docket, at the end of this report, a time of prayer for the 1992 WIC Conference and the 3200 plus women who will participate. *Adopted*
5. That the 20th General Assembly join with the CE&P Committee in encouraging the use of either the *Catechism For Young Children* developed by GCP and authored by Paul Settle and G. I. Williamson or the original version, and that churches be encouraged to send the names of children reciting the catechism to CE&P and the PCA *Messenger* for recognition. *Adopted*
6. That the 20th General Assembly go on record as expressing its appreciation to the Great Commission Publications' staff and board for their diligence in publishing biblical and reformed Sunday school and VBS curriculum and that those churches not presently using the curriculum be encouraged to evaluate it for use. *Adopted*

JOURNAL

7. That the 1993 budget be adopted as presented by the Administrative Committee. *Adopted*
8. That Dr. Charles Dunahoo be reelected as CE&P coordinator for 1992-1993 and that thanks be given for his 15 years of faithful service to the whole church through CE&P. *Adopted*
9. That the CE&P minutes of June 17, 1991, September 25-27, 1991 and February 20-21, 1992 be approved with the following exceptions:

June 17, 1991

- Vice-chairman and Secretary were not elected at this meeting. (RAO 4-16).
- Minutes do not indicate that a CE&P member was designated at this meeting to the Administrative Committee. (RAO 5-1).
- Minutes were not signed by the Secretary. (RAO 13-13-g).

September 25-27 1991

- Date for the meeting does not appear in the text of the minutes. (RAO 13-13-c-3)
- No clerk pro-tem is listed. (RAO 13-13-c-4)
- RE Rodney Andrews not listed as alternate. (RAO 13-13-c-6)
- Item #13-The nature of the relationship with "Reach-out Ministries" should be stated together with the confessional/doctrinal stance of an organization with whom a relationship is formed. It was noted that according to the minutes of June 17, 1991. Item #2, "further information" would be forthcoming, but does not appear.

February 20-21, 1992

- Item #5-response to General Assembly action inadequate. For example, the phrase "selected titles" does not reflect a "developed curriculum".
- Item #18 - Recommendations for nominations to permanent committees should not come from permanent committees. (BCO 14-1-11)
- Item # 23 - Recommendation approved by CE&P was not made subsequently to the General Assembly.
- Item #28 - The minutes fail to record that CE&P has performed its annual; evaluation of its coordinator according to the directives of the 14th General Assembly.

10. That the 20th General Assembly assist CE&P in encouraging and recommending the stewardship program and materials developed and coordinated by CE&P in order to promote the one work of the church concept, (*Book of Church Order* 14:1-13). *Adopted*
11. That the CE&P office be authorized to coordinate and develop a data bank for staff level PCA youth workers. *Adopted*
12. That the audit report for the 18 month period ending December 31, 1991 be received. *Adopted*
13. That responses of the CE&P to the exceptions taken to its 1990-1991 minutes (with the exception of those concerning the meeting of 6/8/90) be found adequate. *Adopted*
14. That the report as a whole be adopted. *Adopted*

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Ascension
Calvary
Central Georgia
Covenant
Eastern Carolina
Evangel
Grace
Great Lakes
Gulf Coast
James River
Louisiana
Mississippi Valley
Missouri
New River
North Texas
Northeast
Northern California
Pacific Northwest
Palmetto
Philadelphia
Potomac
South Texas
Southeast Alabama
Southwest
Southwest Florida
Susquehanna Valley
Warrior
Western Carolina
Westminster

Commissioners

TE Gary G. Baker
RE Mack Carlton
RE Douglas Pohl
TE Ford S. Williams, Jr.
RE John Z. Leigh
RE Thomas W. Harris, Jr.
TE Lee Bloodworth
RE Howard C. Lane
RE Kirby Reichmann
TE Kerry W. "Pete" Hurst
RE Hewitt Carter
RE Gabe Green
TE Howard Eyrich
TE Rodney King
TE Bob Palmer
TE T. David Gordon
TE Bill Hawk
TE Robert Cassis
RE Johnny Moore
RE John P. Clark, Jr.
RE Richard R. Larson
TE Ronald C. Rowe
RE Jack Noble
TE Gerrit De Young
TE Randall R. Greenwald
TE Tom Myers
TE Eddie Spencer
TE Phil Evaul
TE David Longacre

20-37 Committee of Commissioners on Mission to the World

TE Ronald Steele, chairman, led in prayer and began the Committee's report. The chairman yielded to TE Thomas Cheely, chairman of the permanent committee. He in turn introduced TE John Kyle, MTW Coordinator, who presented the program report of MTW, including testimonies from Tom Patton (Japan), Larry Ferris (France), and Bill Gleason, who spoke of the progress in his home church as missions conferences had been begun and grown.

Chairman Steele then presented the Committee of Commissioners' report.

I. Business Referred To The Committee:

1. The report of the Permanent Committee on Mission to the World to the Twentieth GA. (See Appendix J, p. 424)
2. The Mission to the World and Mission to the World/Impact budgets, as presented to the Administrative Committee of the General Assembly

JOURNAL

3. The Report of Independent Auditors on the Financial Statements of the Committee on Mission to the World of the Presbyterian Church in America for the eighteen months ending December 31, 1991.
4. The Minutes of the Permanent Committee Meetings, October 10-11, 1991 and February 13-14, 1992 and May 7-8, 1992 and May 22, 1992.

II. Statement of Major Issues Discussed:

1. Discussion was held pro and con on the "Team Concept" as outlined by Vision 2000 at the 18th General Assembly.
2. Discussion was held pro and con on the practice of hiring and paying national evangelists and pastors.

III. Recommendations:

1. That the minutes of the meeting of October 10-11, 1991 be approved with notations. *Adopted*
2. That the minutes of the meeting of February 13-14, 1992 be approved with notations. *Adopted*
3. (Withdrawn)
4. That the General Assembly express its gratitude to God for the missionaries and candidates of MTW and that we continue to ask Him to supply their physical, spiritual and emotional needs. *Adopted*
5. That the General Assembly express its appreciation to the members, churches and presbyteries of the PCA for their faithful prayers and financial support for the work and ministry of MTW. *Adopted*
6. The Committee on MTW has reviewed the progress toward the MTW annual and long-range goals, the performance of the coordinator and his staff. With thanksgiving to God, Committee on Mission to the World recommends that the General Assembly express its gratitude to teaching elder John E. Kyle for his excellent service as coordinator of Mission to the World and that he be re-elected to the office of coordinator. *Adopted*
7. That the General Assembly express its appreciation for the senior staff of MTW and the Atlanta office personnel for their dedicated service to our church and the cause of missions around the world. *Adopted*
8. That the General Assembly urge the churches to set aside a portion of their giving for the suffering peoples of the world and that, to that end, it be recommended that a special offering for world relief be taken during the Easter season of 1993. *Adopted*
9. That May 16, 1993 be set as the Day of Prayer for World Evangelization and that the General Assembly unite in prayer that God would send many more laborers to His harvest field. *Adopted*
10. That the seminaries and colleges involved in training PCA candidates for ministries and PCA churches be urged to promote the need for both teaching elders and lay people to serve on Mission to the World church-planting teams. *Adopted*
11. That the proposed budgets of MTW and MTW/Impact, as presented through the Administrative Committee, be approved. *Adopted under AC*
12. That the cooperative agreement with the Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf, Inc. be approved. *Adopted*

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

13. That the cooperative agreement with the Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. be approved. *Adopted*
14. That the cooperative agreement with the International Teams be approved. *Adopted*
15. That the General Assembly take note that the CMTW has, for reasons due to economy of time and funds, reduced the number of stated meetings held each year from three to two. *Adopted*
16. That the General Assembly take note that CMTW has increased missionary contributions to MTW administrative expense for MTW couples from \$590 to \$921 per month; MTW singles from \$400 to \$645 per month; Co-op couples from \$230 to \$365 per month; and Co-op singles from \$160 to \$249 per month. *Adopted*

The following amendment to Recommendation 16 was **defeated**. RE David Lachman requested that his vote for the amendment be recorded.

"That the 20th General Assembly instruct the MTW Committee that it is not to further burden our MTW missionaries by increasing their contributions to administrative expenses, and further instruct the Committee to seek alternative ways to either raise funds or cut costs with the goal of reducing and eliminating this burden from our missionaries."

17. That the report as a whole be adopted. *Adopted*

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Ronald E. Steel, Chairman

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Ascension
Calvary
Central Carolina
Central Florida
Central Georgia
Covenant
Grace
Great Lakes
Heartland
Heritage
Louisiana
Mississippi Valley
Northern Illinois
Pacific Northwest
Palmetto
Philadelphia
Potomac
North Texas
Southeast Alabama
Southwest Florida
Susquehanna Valley
Tennessee Valley

Commissioner

RE Robert L. Oldaker
TE Sam Joyner
RE George A. Robinson
TE Benson Cain
TE Sam S. Cappell
RE Jack L. Brown
RE J. R. Cameron
TE Dennis Slack
RE Michael A. Milton
TE Stanley D. Gale
TE Steve Wilkins
TE Jeff Elliott
RE G. Craig Burdett
RE Richard Hannula
TE Emory O. Watson
TE Stephen L. Parker
TE Ronald E. Steel
RE Michael Dillow
TE David Gilleran
RE Charles R. Dunlap
RE Herbert Marsh
TE Charles E. McGowan

JOURNAL

20-38 Prayer for 1992 Women's Conference

The moderator called on TE Ron Shaw to lead the Assembly in prayer as had been voted in the Committee of Commissioners on Christian Education report, Recommendation 4.

20-39 Committee of Commissioners on Covenant College

RE Len Mollenkof, chairman, led in prayer and began presentation of the Committee's report. He yielded to RE Frank Brock, President of the College, who addressed the Assembly briefly. The chairman then presented the recommendations, which were acted upon as follows:

I. Business Referred To The Committee:

- A. Review of the minutes of the Board of Trustees of October 17-18, 1991, and March 19-20, 1992.
- B. Recommendations of the Board of Trustees.

II. Three recommendations were referred to the Committee by the Board of Trustees of Covenant College

1. That the General Assembly approve the 1992-1993 operating budget. *Adopted*
2. That the General Assembly approve October 18 as Covenant College Sunday and encourage churches to observe the day and where possible allow students on fall break an opportunity to speak on behalf of the college. The Committee of Commissioners urges the General Assembly and its agencies to utilize the facilities of Covenant College, whenever appropriate, for meetings so that pastors and lay leaders might be exposed to the College of the Presbyterian Church in America. *Adopted*
3. That the General Assembly urge every church to participate in financial support of the college at the level of the PCA ASKINGS. The Committee of Commissioners laments and decries the lack of support from the Congregations of the PCA. Last year approximately 40% of our congregations met the ASKINGS of the 19th General Assembly. We ask each commissioner to vote to approve Covenant College's budget only if they fully intend to do all that is possible to ensure that their congregations strive mightily to meet this commitment. *Adopted*
4. That the report as a whole be adopted. *Adopted*

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Central Florida
Central Georgia
Covenant
Evangel
Grace
Gulf Coast
Heritage
Mid-America

Commissioners

TE Michael Beates
TE J. Archie Moore, Jr.
RE Doug Wheeler
TE William Cooper, Jr.
RE Charles Probst
TE William Tyson
TE Jonathan Seda
RE Fred Muse

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mississippi Valley	TE James Barnes
New River	RE Douglas Hart
North Texas	RE Jim Chenowith
Philadelphia	RE Frank Richards
Potomac	TE John Stringer
South Coast	TE Larry Conard
Southeast Alabama	TE Aaron Fleming
Southwest Florida	RE William Eken
Susquehanna Valley	RE Len Mollenkof, Chairman
Tennessee Valley	TE Richard Jennings
Warrior	RE Billy Jollit
Western Carolina	RE Michael Everhart, Secretary
Westminster	RE Roger Schultz

20-40 Assembly Theological Examining Committee

During the report on Covenant College, TE Laird Harris presented a report for the Committee that it had examined and approved Robert Harbert, Covenant College's Vice-President for Business Affairs. This report was adopted as a whole.

20-41 Committee of Commissioners on Ridge Haven

RE Joe Reynolds, chairman, led in prayer and began presentation of the Committee's report. Recommendations were acted upon as follows:

I. Business Referred to the Committee

- A. 1993 Budget
- B. Audit Report for period July 1, 1990 through December 31, 1991.
- C. Review Minutes of Board of Directors of Ridge Haven for 7/18/91; 10/24/91; 11/7/91; 12/3/91; 1/16/92; 4/23/92.

II. Statement of Major Issues Discussed

- A. Financial needs to approach the General Assembly ASKINGS.

III. Recommendations

- A. That the General Assembly express its appreciation to the Board of Directors of Ridge Haven and the staff for the hard work on behalf of Ridge Haven and the PCA. *Adopted*
- B. That the General Assembly be encouraged to pray that God raise up the right man to fill the duties of Administrator of Ridge Haven. *Adopted*
- C. That the audit covering July 1, 1990 to December 1991 by Kevitt & Lee be approved. *Adopted*
- D. That the 1993 Budget be adopted as presented by the Administrative Committee. *Adopted*
- E. That the President of the Board of Directors of Ridge Haven be given 5 minutes on the floor of General Assembly to speak to the financial needs of Ridge Haven. *Adopted under AC*

JOURNAL

- F. That churches be encouraged to meet or exceed General Assembly ASKINGS for Ridge Haven regardless of their geographical location and churches be encouraged to use Ridge Haven facilities and programs as much as possible. *Adopted*
- G. That the Minutes of the Board of Directors of Ridge Haven listed above be approved with the following exceptions: *Adopted*
1. 7/18/91 #17 - Executive Session - no notation recorded as to what occurred.
 2. 7/18/91 #13 - No notation of action taken by Finance and Administrative Subcommittee as stated in the subcommittee report.
 3. 10/24/91 #7 - No copy of report from Jim Poteet attached as indicated.
 4. 12/3/91 Purpose of called meeting not stated. (13-13.d.2)
 5. 12/3/91 Name of person closing in prayer not mentioned. (13-13.d.1)
 6. 12/3/91 November 3, 1991 statement of call #3 given - Items 1-3 (12/3/91) inconsistent with stated purpose.
 7. 1/16/92 Kind of meeting not stated.
 8. 4/23/92 Kind of meeting not stated.
 9. 4/23/92 TE Paul Settle not listed as present (13-13.c.6)

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ RE Joe Reynolds, Chairman
/s/ TE Mike Smith, Secretary

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Calvary
Central Carolina
Central Florida
Covenant
Eastern Carolina
Evangel
Grace
Great Lakes
Mississippi Valley
New River
North Georgia
North Texas
Potomac
Southwest Florida
Susquehanna Valley
Tennessee Valley
Westminster

Commissioner

TE Rick Lindsay
RE Robert E. White
TE Thomas T. Ellis
RE Bill Tanner
TE James T. O'Brien
TE Craig L. Boden
RE Randy Martin
TE Michael E. VanArsdale
TE Alton M. Phillips
RE Donald Wahlman
RE Ross L. Jerguson
RE Robert W. Mighell
TE David Coffin
RE David Crabtree
RE Willard H. Lutz
TE Mike Smith, Secretary
RE Joe Reynolds, Chairman

Lindsey Tippens, President of the Board of Directors, spoke for five minutes, and the report as a whole was then adopted.

20-42 Committee of Commissioners on Covenant Theological Seminary

TE Steven Meyerhoff, chairman, led in prayer and began presentation of the Committee's report. He yielded to TE Paul Kooistra, President of the Seminary, who

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

addressed the Assembly. Chairman Meyerhoff then presented the Committee's recommendations, which were acted upon as follows:

I. Business Referred To The Committee

- A. Minutes of the Covenant Theological Seminary Board of Trustees stated meetings of May 17-18, 1991 and May 15-16, 1992. Executive Committee meeting minutes of December 6, 1991 and April 2, 1992
- B. The audit of Covenant Theological Seminary financial reports of June 30, 1991 by Coopers and Lybrand.

II. Statement Of Major Issues Discussed

Matters concerning the challenges of enrollment growth, financial needs and spiritual life of the Seminary.

III. Recommendations

- A. To approve the Minutes of the full Board and Executive Committee meetings of the Trustees with exceptions and notations noted for May 17-18, 1991; September 27-28, 1991; December 6, 1991; April 2, 1992 and May 15-16, 1992. *Adopted*
- B. To approve the report of Covenant Theological Seminary to the 20th General Assembly of the PCA. *Adopted*
- C. To approve the audit by Coopers and Lybrand for June 30, 1991. *Adopted*
- D. To commend the Board of Trustees and administration for their work in the expansion of the Seminary programs and encourage the congregations of the PCA to participate in the support of the school in prayer and financially at the level of ASKINGS. *Adopted*
- E. That the report be approved as a whole. *Adopted*

Respectfully submitted,
/s/TE D. Steven Meyerhoff, Chairman
/s/RE John J. Marshall, Secretary

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Calvary
Central Carolina
Central Georgia

Evangel

Grace
Gulf Coast
Heritage
Illiana
North Texas
Northern Illinois
Pacific Northwest
Potomac
Southeast Alabama

Commissioners

RE Frank Limerick
TE J. Gilbert Moore
RE John J. Marshall,
Secretary
RE Bruce Bailey
TE J. Thomas Shields
RE John Woodward
RE Wilhelmus Schaffers
TE Bob Ellis
TE Ron Dunton
TE Ed Gray
TE Kevin Skogen
RE William Ingram
RE Charles McAllister

JOURNAL

Southern Florida
Southwest
Southwest Florida
Western Carolina
Westminster

RE Edwin Walker
TE Rick Smith
TE George Cracker
TE Bill Laxton
TE D. Steven Meyerhoff,
Chairman

20-43 Worship

The Assembly moved to the order of the day for worship under the direction of Missouri Presbytery.

*THE CALL TO WORSHIP TE Scott Churnock, Pastor
Hazelwood Reformed Presbyterian Church, Hazelwood, MO

SONG OF FAITH

Scott Smith

PRAYER FOR ILLUMINATION

RE John Prentiss

Kirk of the Hills Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, MO

SCRIPTURE

Isaiah 53

TE Jon Atkins, Assistant Pastor

Kirk of the Hills Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, MO

SERMON

"The Wounded Healer"

TE George Robertson, Senior Pastor

The Covenant Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, MO

*HYMN 621

"Sometimes a Light Surprises"

TE Donald MacNair, Churches Vitalized, St. Louis, MO

*BENEDICTION

TE Rodney Stortz, Senior Pastor

Twin Oaks Presbyterian Church, St. Louis, MO

*Congregation will please stand.

20-44 Recess

Following worship the Assembly recessed for lunch at 12:00 p.m.

MINUTES--WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

June 17, 1992

Fifth Session

20-45 Assembly Reconvened

The Assembly reconvened at 1:35 p.m. Wednesday afternoon with the singing of "O, the Deep, Deep Love of Jesus" and prayer led by TE William Jones.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

20-46 Constitutional Inquiry

TE Morton Smith presented a constitutional inquiry which was received and referred to the Committee on Constitutional Business (see text and action at 20-67, item 1, p. 137).

20-47 Committee of Commissioners on Insurance, Annuities, and Relief

TE Bruce Howes, chairman, led in prayer and began the Committee's report. He yielded to RE James Hughes, Director for Insurance, Annuities, and Relief, who introduced TE James Shipley, chairman of the Board of Trustees. Ralph Paden spoke briefly concerning health insurance, Denny Carew concerning annuities, and David Jussely concerning Ministerial Relief efforts.

Chairman Howes then presented the Committee's report and recommendations as follows:

I. Business Referred to the Committee:

1. The minutes of the Board of Trustees of Insurance, Annuities & Relief of June 17, 1991; September 13, 1991; November 1, 1991; March 6-7, 1991, and June 15, 1992.
2. The audit report dated December 31, 1991, by Arthur Andersen & Company.
3. Various legal opinions touching the work of IAR.
4. Overtures #27 and #36.
5. Report of the Trustees of IAR. (See Appendix G, p. 371)
6. Legal opinion dated 4-1-92 concerning housing allowance for retired ministers.
7. Disability and life insurance claims experience.
8. Income and administrative costs of relief program.
9. Recent staff reductions of IAR and other cost cutting measures.

II. Statement of Major Issues Discussed:

1. All of the above business.
2. Health care issues and costs related to the health care plan.
3. Rate of return and expense ratios of the retirement plans.
4. Issues relating to the relationship of the Investor's Fund and IAR.

III. Recommendations:

1. That the Minutes of June 17, 1991; September 13, 1991; November 1, 1991; March 6-7, 1992 and June 15, 1992 be approved with several notations but no exceptions. *Adopted*
2. That the audit report dated December 31, 1991, by Arthur Andersen & Company be received. *Adopted*
3. That the General Assembly approve the use of Arthur Andersen & Company to conduct the 1992 audit. *Adopted*
4. That the 1993 budget be received with the understanding that this budget is a spending plan and that adjustments will be made during the year, if necessary, by the Trustees. *Adopted under AC*
5. That the General Assembly approve the addition of Section 8 entitled "Conflict or Duality of Interest" to Article II of the Trustees' Bylaws (see Attachment 1, Appendix G, p. 377) and the accompanying Certificate and

JOURNAL

Disclosure Statement (see Attachment 2, Appendix G, p. 378).

Adopted

6. That the General Assembly urge its member churches to receive an annual offering or budget regular benevolent giving to support relief activities through the Ministerial Relief Fund. *Adopted*
7. That the General Assembly answer Overture #27 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 27 From the Central Georgia Presbytery
"Make PCA Health Plan Mandatory"

Whereas, the cost of health care in the United States has increased from \$75 billion in 1970 to \$800 billion in 1991; and

Whereas, the crisis in health care seems certain to intensify in the years ahead; and

Whereas, the purpose of insurance is the pooling of risks; and

Whereas, the larger the risk pool the less the risk for any one individual; and

Whereas, the size of the PCA health insurance pool has decreased from over 2,200 participant units in 1989 to slightly over 1,200 in early 1992; and

Whereas, there is a possibility that the plan may not survive over time if more younger and healthier participants find coverage elsewhere; and

Whereas, there are a number of uninsurable ministers, lay employees and their dependents in the PCA health plan; and

Whereas, the church cannot afford to allow these brothers and sisters to be left without health insurance coverage; and

Whereas, the mobility of PCA ministers may be severely restricted in the future as those with pre-existing medical conditions may find it cost prohibitive to change insurers; and

Whereas, we are a connectional church and our connectionalism is best demonstrated in our care for one another; and

Whereas, more and more professional groups are requiring mandatory participation in their health plans; and

Whereas, fewer and fewer insurance companies are willing to quote on groups without mandatory coverage.

Therefore, Be it Resolved that, with the compassion of Christ, the Central Georgia Presbytery overtures the 20th General Assembly to make participation in the PCA Health Plan mandatory and to be included in the call and benefits package for all PCA pastors, local lay church workers, and employees of PCA committees and agencies (except foreign missionaries) beginning January 1, 1993.

Adopted at the Stated Meeting of Central Georgia Presbytery on April 14, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Donald D. Comer
Stated Clerk

8. That the General Assembly answer Overture #36 in the negative. *Adopted*
Reasons:
 1. It contains intemperate and accusatory language.
 2. The Central Carolina Presbytery had been asked by the IAR Director at their July 1991 meeting to bring questions and concerns to the Board in the future before overturing the General Assembly.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

3. The spirit of Matthew 18 was not followed.

OVERTURE 36 From Central Carolina Presbytery

"Require IAR to Produce Legal Opinions and GA to Appoint Interim Board"

Whereas, the IAR has failed to provide timely, adequate, and complete disclosure of information regarding the investment programs they administer, namely the Money Purchase Pension Plan (MPP) or [401(a)] and the Tax Sheltered Annuity Plan (TSA) or [403(b)] and,

Whereas, there has not been a free flow of information regarding their management of such funds, and the changing and erratic pattern of how these funds are managed, and the said distribution to investors of their funds, and

Whereas, the IAR has stated on several occasions that the MPP can not, by law, be rolled over or distributed to the individual investor for investment in another plan, and

Whereas, the IAR has stated that it will not allow the TSA or the MPP monies to be rolled over or distributed to another plan at this time, and

Whereas, the IAR has sought the welfare of the IAR over the welfare of the investors through inflated administrative fees, and extremely meager returns over several years, and

Whereas, the IAR has dealt with these investment matters, and last year with the health insurance matters in a manner which appears arrogant, officious, and disdainful both on the individual and the court level.

Therefore, Be it Resolved that the 20th GA/PCA require that the IAR produce the legal opinion that states that the MPP can not be transferred or rolled over.

Be it Further Resolved that the 20th GA/PCA require that the IAR produce a legal opinion that investment in the PCA Investor's Fund is not legal from the funds held in stewardship by the IAR.

Be it Further Resolved that the 20th GA/PCA require that these opinions be produced at, on, or before the 20th GA/PCA meeting in June, 1992.

Be it Further Resolved that the 20th GA/PCA suspend the Board of Trustees of the IAR and elect or appoint an interim Board until these and other related matters regarding the investment practices, costs, management of funds, communications with investors, distributions, and all related legal matters, etc. be resolved by the interim Board and report back next GA.

Adopted at the 49th Stated Meeting of Central Carolina Presbytery on April 26, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ S. Scott Willet
Stated Clerk

9. That the moderator of the General Assembly appoint an ad-hoc committee of 3 to 5 qualified people to study the issues raised in Overtures #27 and #36 and report to the 21st General Assembly with appropriate recommendations. The expenses of the committee (up to \$5,000) will be funded by IAR from its 1992 and 1993 approved budgets ("Meetings" line item). *Adopted*
10. That the General Assembly instruct the AC to study the appropriateness of any committee or agency, or employees thereof, being involved with outside commercial interests promoting or soliciting funds for benefit plans for PCA

JOURNAL

ministers and lay workers in competition with the denominationally authorized plans. *Adopted*

11. That the General Assembly approve the report as a whole. *Adopted*

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Calvary
Central Carolina
Central Florida
Central Georgia
Evangel
Grace
Great Lakes
Gulf Coast
Heritage
James River
Louisiana
Missouri
New Jersey
New River
North Georgia
North Texas
Northeast
N. Illinois
Philadelphia
Potomac
SE Alabama
Southern Florida

SW Florida
Tennessee Valley
Western Carolina

Commissioner

Reuben Wallace
Mike Dixon
James Walkup
John Kinser
Phillip Reddick
Chester Deas
Mark Dalbey
Robert Herrmann
Bruce Howes, Chairman
Cary Shelton
Paul Lipe
Roger Hunt
Stephen Clark
Harry Reustle
Earl Witmer
William Farrell
Michael Ernst
Norman White
John P. Clark
Stephen Dawson
L. Milton Cutchen
Ronald Siegenthaler,
Secretary
Henry Darden
J. Arch Warren
Elliott Baron

STATED CLERK'S NOTE: The orders of the day were called, so item 10 was acted on at 20-50, reported here for convenience.

20-48 Procedural Motion

On motion the Assembly voted to refer to the Committee on Constitutional Business for its examination all items in the report of the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures that deal with changes in the *BCO*.

20-49 Nominating Committee

TE Neil Gilmour, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's report (Appendix L, p. 469). The results of the election were as follows:

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Class of 1996

TE William S. Henderson, Northeast RE Wm (Bingy) Moore IV, Potomac
TE Robert S. Hornick, Gulf Coast

Alternates

TE Richard C. Trucks, Evangel RE William Joseph, Jr., SE Alabama

COMMITTEE FOR CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND PUBLICATIONS

Class of 1996

TE Arthur Ames, Rky Mountain RE Marvin Padget, TN Valley
TE James R. McKee, Potomac RE Nelson Perret, Louisiana

Class of 1993

TE P. Legree Finch, S. Texas RE John Van Voorhis, Calvary

Alternates

TE L. Byron Snapp, Westminster RE George Harris, Philadelphia

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA

Class of 1996

TE James C. Bland, S. Texas RE James Hanemaayer, Pacific
TE Andrew Silman, Louisiana RE John Jardine, Heritage

Alternates

TE Philip Douglass, Missouri RE Tim Gleeson, E. Canada

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO THE WORLD

Class of 1996

TE Dominic Aquila, S. Florida RE Charles W. Burns, Heritage
TE John W. P. Oliver, C. Georgia RE Don W. Cole, N. Texas

Alternates

TE R. Lynn Downing, S. Florida RE John B. Noble, SE Alabama

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT COLLEGE

Class of 1996

TE Lane G. Adams, Potomac RE Kenneth E. Avis, Covenant
TE Dan Kim, N. Georgia RE Joel Belz, W. Carolina
RE David Edling, South Coast
RE G. Richard Hostetter, TN Valley
RE James Roberts, SW Florida

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Class of 1996

TE Stephen Bostrom, E. Carolina RE Rudolph Schmidt, TN Valley
TE Charles Green, C. Florida RE Sam Bartholomew, W. Carolina
TE Stephen Smallman, Potomac RE Lanny Moore, SW Florida

JOURNAL

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE
INSURANCE, ANNUITY, AND RELIEF FUNDS**

Class of 1996

TE Bruce B. Howes, Heritage
RE Ralph S. Paden, TN Valley
RE J. Allen Wright, No. Georgia

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE INVESTOR'S
FUND FOR BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Class of 1996

RE Henry Darden, SW Florida
RE Mark Thompson, Louisiana

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA FOUNDATION**

Class of 1996

RE Wallace M. Campbell, Northeast
RE Harry S. Morris, Louisiana

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF RIDGE HAVEN

Class of 1997

TE Malcolm M. Griffith, Calvary
TE S. Rhett Sanders, W. Carolina

ASSEMBLY THEOLOGICAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Class of 1995

TE R. Laird Harris, Heritage RE Roger D. Schultz, Westminster

Alternates

TE Wayne Herring, Covenant RE David Miner, New Jersey

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS

Class of 1996

TE Ron Steel, Potomac RE S. A. Miller, Westminster

Alternates

TE Bryan Chapell, Illiana RE Samuel J. Duncan, Grace

COMMITTEE ON INTERCHURCH RELATIONS

Class of 1995

TE Tim Fortner, Covenant RE Wilson Barbee, C. Carolina

Alternates

TE K. Eric Perrin, Palmetto RE David Wyatt, So. Florida

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION

Class of 1996

TE David W. Hall, TN Valley
TE John Montgomery, So. FLorida
TE L. Roy Taylor, Grace

RE John Barnes, Calvary
RE Eugene Friedline, James River
RE Ed Robeson, W. Carolina

20-50 Committee of Commissioners on Insurance, Annuities, and Relief

TE Bruce Howes continued the Committee's report (see text at 20-47, p. 92). The amendment to Recommendation 10 was defeated, and the recommendation was then **Adopted**. The report as whole was adopted.

20-51 Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures

TE Scott Reiber, chairman, led in prayer and presented the report. Moderator Benton announced that the Constitutional Business Committee had found that Overtures 7, 15, 23, and 34 were unconstitutional and that he therefore ruled Recommendations 5, 9, 13, and 21 would not be before the Assembly for action. It was further on motion decided that the portions of the report titled "Rationale" be retitled "Committee's Rationale". Committee recommendations were acted upon as follows:

1. That General Assembly answer Overture #1 **in the negative**. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 1 From Presbytery of Southern Florida
"Amend BCO 20-1 To Clarify Calls"

Whereas, BCO 20-1 indicates that Presbytery must approve the call of a Pastor, and

Whereas, the BCO is silent concerning amending the call resulting in very much confusion for Church Sessions and Presbyteries,

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that BCO 20-1 be amended by adding a third paragraph to read as follows:

"After the call and its terms have been approved by Presbytery, any amendment to the terms of the call do not have to be reported to or approved by the Presbytery."

Adopted at the Stated Meeting of the Presbytery of Southern Florida, on April 16, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Daniel J. Domain

Stated Clerk

[Received too late for the 19th GA.]

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. Undermines the principle of presbyterial oversight of teaching elders, congregations and their pastoral relations.
- B. Approval of Overture #1 would seriously jeopardize the integrity of the teaching elder's call by allowing for the possibility of reducing those terms to such an extent that, under extenuating circumstances resulting from animosities which might arise between the congregation and the minister, he would or could be forced to seek a call elsewhere. In addition, since BCO does not now require that amendments to terms of calls be approved by

JOURNAL

Presbytery, the proposed amendment in Overture # 1 is essentially redundant. On the other hand, such an amendment would give explicit grounds for congregations and Sessions to reduce the terms of calls at will.

2. That General Assembly answer Overture #3 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 3 From Missouri Presbytery
"Have the Committee of Commissioners Serve a 2-Year Term"

Whereas, the founding fathers of the Presbyterian Church in America saw the wisdom of creating Committees of Commissioners to oversee the work of the Permanent Committees, and

Whereas, this task has become more necessary and time consuming as we have grown larger, and

Whereas, the Nominating Committee operates very well on a 2-year term in Classes,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the General Assembly take the necessary steps to place all the Committees of Commissioners on a 2-year term in Classes.

Adopted for the Session of the New Port Presbyterian Church by Missouri Presbytery and sent without comment on the 17th day of April 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Albert F. Moginot, Jr.
Stated Clerk

[Received too late for the 19th GA.]

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. The structure of two-year classes without election of half classes every year is unacceptable. Having the entire class re-elected every two years does not help in balancing "new blood" with experience on a continuing basis.
- B. Many ruling elders and TEs are unable to attend the GA every year and would not be able to serve 2 year terms.
3. That General Assembly answer Overture #5 in the affirmative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 5 From Potomac Presbytery (420 yes, 270 no)
"Amend BCO 15-4 to Limit Membership on SJC"

Whereas, the James River Presbytery has adopted the following resolution:

The James River Presbytery meeting on April 13, 1991 does respectfully overture the 19th General Assembly to amend the *Book of Church Order* 15-4 by adding at the end of the paragraph the following:

No person may serve concurrently on the General Assembly's Standing Judicial Commission and any of the General Assembly's permanent committees.

This provision to take effect immediately.

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Potomac Presbytery meeting on May 14, 1991 concurs with the judgment of the James River Presbytery, and thus joins in respectfully overturing the 19th General Assembly to amend the *Book of Church Order* 15-4 as stated above.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Adopted at the Sixth Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery, on May 14, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Richard R. Larson
Stated Clerk

[Received too late for the 19th GA.]

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. The proposed amendment does not stop any committee or other group from using the gifts, talents and experience of non-members;
- B. It protects the church from those ills that plague all groups with power concentrated in too few hands; and
- C. It eliminates any real or apparent conflicts of interest.

Minority Report on Overture 5

Defeated

Overture 5 should be answered in the negative. There is no conflict of interest between serving on a Standing Commission and a Permanent Committee as their functions are separate and distinct. This Overture would prevent valued and experienced Elders from serving in these two separate and distinct position. Continuity of service and experience is especially needed on the SJC.

/s/ RE Sam Duncan

/s/ TE Henry Bishop

4. That General Assembly answer Overture #6 in the affirmative.

Adopted

OVERTURE 6 From Covenant Presbytery

"Amend *BCO* 14-1 by Inserting RAO 13-1"

Whereas, the PCA has always desired for the Committees of Commissioners to provide a grassroots check and balance for General Assembly's permanent committees;

Whereas, the ability of the Committees of Commissioners to be an effective check and balance will be lessened if their role is changed from evaluation and recommendation to advice;

Whereas, the ability of the Committees of Commissioners to be an effective check and balance will be lessened if business no longer comes to the floor of the General Assembly through the Committee of Commissioners but through the permanent committees and agencies;

Whereas, the PCA must not so centralize power in the permanent committees in the name of practical efficiency as to tempt the permanent committees with elitism and hegemony;

Whereas, the PCA has historically agreed with the Thornwellian position that the work of the church is to be done by the church through committees under the direct oversight of the church and not through semi-autonomous boards;

Therefore Be It Resolved that Covenant Presbytery overture the Nineteenth General Assembly to begin the process of amending the *Book of Church Order* by adding the following paragraph:

14-1.15. All business shall ordinarily come to the floor of the Assembly for final action through Committees of Commissioners, except reports of the Standing Judicial Commission, the Committee on Constitutional Business, the

JOURNAL

Committee on Review of Presbytery Records, the Nominating Committee and Ad Interim Committees, which shall come directly to the Assembly.

Adopted by Covenant Presbytery at its March 5, 1991 Stated Meeting.

Attested by: /s/ Jim Hayes
Stated Clerk

[Received too late for the 19th GA.]

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. In order to insure proper "checks and balances" in the Presbyterian process, it is essential for the Committee of Commissioners to continue to have the authority to properly evaluate the work of the permanent committees.
 - B. This position of historical Presbyterianism is less likely to be changed if it is set in the *BCO* rather than the *RAO*.
 - C. This Overture will also serve to protect the permanent committees from the charges of elitism and hegemony by maintaining an umbrella of authority through the Committee of Commissioners.
5. That General Assembly answer Overture #7 in the negative.

Declared Unconstitutional

OVERTURE 7 From Northeast Presbytery

"Amend *BCO* 43-2 and 43-3"

Whereas, the *Book of Church Order* does not require the courts to approve their minutes at the conclusion of a given meeting; and

Whereas, the approved minutes of such meetings are the only official record of what acts or decisions were made by the court; and

Whereas, a complaint may only be made against an act or decision of the court; and

Whereas, the current form of the *Book of Church Order* requires a complaint to be made within thirty days of "the meeting of the court", without regard for whether minutes of said meeting exist or have been approved;

Whereas, the current form of the *Book of Church Order* therefore permits a circumstance whereby an individual may be required to complain an act or decision of the court before there is any approved record of such act or decision, and

Whereas, such a circumstance is necessarily, though unintentionally, frustrating to potential complainants under such circumstances;

Therefore the Northeast Presbytery overtures the 20th General Assembly

1. to amend *BCO* 43-2 by inserting "approval of the minutes of the"; so that the second sentence in its entirety would read: "Written notice of complaint, with supporting reasons, shall be filed with the clerk of the court within thirty (30) days following the approval of the minutes of the meeting of the court."
2. to amend *BCO* 43-3 by inserting "approval of the minutes of the"; so that the second sentence in this entirety would read: "Written notice of complaint, together with supporting reasons, shall be filed with both the clerk of the lower court and the clerk of the higher court within thirty (30) days following the approval of the minutes of the meeting of the lower court."

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

At its September 13-14, 1991 Stated Meeting the Northeast Presbytery adopted the above overture to the 20th General Assembly. The substance of the overture is to clarify the statute of limitations for complaints in BCO 43-2,3.

Attested by: /s/ Philip J. Adams
Stated Clerk

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

A "record" is not necessary to prosecute a complaint. Accordingly, the approval of the minutes reflecting the offending action is not required to file a complaint. Connecting the thirty (30) day period to the approval of minutes would create undue uncertainty as to when a complaint may be filed.

6. That General Assembly answer Overture #8 as amended in the affirmative.

Adopted

OVERTURE 8 From Central Georgia Presbytery "Study Committee to Encourage Psalm Singing"

Whereas, metrical Psalm singing has been a vital part of the Reformed tradition from the earliest years of the Reformation, and

Whereas, Psalm singing prevailed in the Presbyterian Churches for over 300 years, but has been nearly supplanted by hymn singing in the last 100 years, and,

Whereas, Psalm singing played a crucial role in the development of the distinctive piety of the Reformed tradition, and

Whereas, Psalm singing will richly enhance the spirituality of contemporary Presbyterianism,

Now Therefore be it resolved, that the 20th General Assembly hereby appoints a sub-committee of the Christian Education and Publications Committee to formulate practical ways in which Psalm singing can be encouraged in the congregations of the Presbyterian Church in America and other Reformed churches and to make report regarding this at next General Assembly; that this sub-committee have a budget of \$3,000, to be raised through donations; and that we recommend this Sub-Committee on Psalm singing include the following:

TE Terry Johnson, Central Georgia (Convener)
RE J. R. "Sonny" Peaster, Mississippi Valley
TE Richard Bacon, North Texas
TE Wallace "Bill" Marshall, Eastern Carolina
RE J. Ligon Duncan, Jr., Calvary
RE George Caler, Ascension
TE J. Ligon Duncan, III, Mississippi Valley
TE Larry Roff, Ascension
TE Anthony Dallison, Central Florida
TE J. Cameron Fraser, Pacific Northwest
TE Joseph Pipa, South Coast

JOURNAL

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. The Presbyterian Church in America is confessionally and constitutionally committed to singing Psalms in public worship: "singing of psalms with grace in the heart . . . [is a part] of the ordinary religious worship of God" (*WCF* 21-5); "It is recommended that Psalms be sung . . ." (*BCO* 51-3); "the singing of psalms . . . by the congregation should be encouraged" (*BCO* 51-5).
- B. Previous General Assemblies have also encouraged Psalm singing: "That the General Assembly encourage the use in the churches of . . . *The Book of Psalms for Singing* (Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America) and *Bible Songs* (Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church) . . ." (*M3GA*, p. 89); "Whereas, an interdenominational committee is planning to hold the 1990 Psalmody Conference . . . ; and Whereas psalm singing is a significant part of our Presbyterian heritage, and is prescribed by our Constitution (*WCF* 21-5; *BCO* 51-5); Now Therefore be it resolved that the 17th General Assembly commends this conference to the Presbyterian Church in America: (*M17GA*, pp. 179-80.)

7. That General Assembly answer Overture #11 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 11 From Western Carolina Presbytery

"Amend *BCO* 13-1 and 14-2 to Permit All Ruling Elders to Serve at Presbytery and General Assembly"

The Presbytery of Western Carolina on November 9, 1991, approved the following overture and presents it to the General Assembly.

Whereas, the Bible places no priority on participation in the courts of the church of those we call "teaching elders," and

Whereas, the Presbyterian Church in America suffers because of the limited participation of those we call "ruling elders," and

Whereas, the Presbyterian Church in America wants to encourage the participation by ruling elders in the work of the church in every way possible,

Therefore we overture the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America to amend its *Book of Church Order*, to wit:

Chapter 13, Paragraph 1: "The Presbytery consists of all the Teaching Elders and churches within its bounds that have been accepted by the Presbytery. When the Presbytery meets as a court it shall comprise all Teaching Elders and" All Ruling Elders in good standing with their congregations.

Chapter 14, Paragraph 2. "The General Assembly, which is a permanent court, shall meet at least annually upon its own adjournment, and shall consist of all Teaching Elders in good standing with their Presbyteries," And all Ruling Elders in good standing with their congregations.

Attested by: /s/ Bill Laxton
Stated Clerk

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. This Overture removes the control of the lower court from determining who should represent them at the higher courts. The Overture would allow any ordained ruling elder in good standing to participate in the higher courts regardless of whether or not they had ever been a member of the lower court. (e.g. A ruling elder may have been ordained in another church.)
- B. This Overture does not address the reasons why ruling elders are under represented at the higher courts but presents a quick fix.
- C. This Overture would make it possible for large churches with rotating sessions and plenty of money to be over represented in the higher courts.
- D. This Overture is unnecessary because sessions already have the liberty of sending any ruling elder in their congregations whether or not they are presently serving on the session.

8. That General Assembly answer Overture #14 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVATURE 14 From Potomac Presbytery
"Amend SJC Manual 7.3 (c)"

Whereas, the Standing Judicial Commission of the General Assembly is governed by the General Assembly, in accordance with the *Book of Church Order*, as applied through the provisions of *Manual of Standing Judicial Commission*; and

Whereas, 7, "Judicial Panels" of that *Manual* reads as follows:

7.3 When a Judicial Panel is appointed, one member thereof shall be designated as "Convener." The Convener may make initial contact with the parties:

- (a) to obtain information for the initial meetings of the Panel,
- (b) to answer initial questions by the parties,
- (c) to encourage the parties to seek a reconciliation and an agreed determination of the case which, unless the parties withdraw the case, shall only become the determination of the case with the consent of the Panel, and
- (d) to answer questions of the parties concerning the preparation and submission of written briefs.

and

Whereas, 7.3 (c) allows a member of the court, the "Convener", before the case is heard by the court, "to encourage the parties to seek a reconciliation and an agreed determination of the case...." which determination may in fact become the ruling of the court; and

Whereas, the work of the Standing Judicial Commission is, and ought to be, to provide an equitable forum which will provide righteous judgment for the settling of disputes among brothers, and

Whereas, the procedures of our *Rules of Discipline* are established to further that end, when the case in question has developed beyond the personal and private exhortations required by our Lord as prerequisites to "taking it to the church" (Matt. 18); and

Whereas, these *Rules* are designed to provide formal protections of the rights and responsibilities of all parties, as well as maintain fairness and impartiality on the

JOURNAL

part of the court, through a measure of distance from the parties to the case therein established; and

Whereas, the rule of the *Manual*, 7.3 (c), transforms the court, through its Convener, it becoming an interested party rather than an impartial forum, thus setting aside the formalities and protections of our *Rules of Discipline* in order to settle the matter; and

Whereas, though "settling the matter" is a laudable goal, it remains the duty of the court, upon the failure of its preliminary "reconciliation" work, to hear and judge the case; and

Whereas, the possibility that prejudice should arise against the party refusing this "reconciliation" approaches a moral certainty, thus spoiling the beauty of impartiality and equity that should be an essential foundation of all our judicial proceedings; and

Whereas, this is especially critical in our system of church courts, which, lacking an enforcement arm, exercises authority purely moral and spiritual; and

Whereas, the moral authority of the court is essentially tied to its fairness, and the *perception* of its fairness, toward the parties and before the church; and

Whereas, the rule of the *Manual*, 7.3 (c) is very likely to occasion the diminishment of this fairness, or at least the perception thereof; and

Whereas, the rule of the *Manual*, 7.3 (c) is in conflict with, or occasions a potential conflict with, various provisions of our *Rules of Discipline*, e.g.,

BCO 32-17, "Pending the trial of a case, any member of the court who shall express his opinion of its merits to either party...shall be thereby disqualified from taking part in the subsequent proceedings." Surely the work of reaching an "agreed determination" as permitted in 7.3 (c) makes it highly probable that such an expression on the part of the Convener of the panel to the parties in question will take place, even if inadvertently so;

BCO 32-18, "When a case is removed by appeal or complaint, the lower court shall transmit "the Record" thus prepared to the higher court...Nothing which is not contained in this "Record" shall be taken into consideration by the higher court." Surely it is highly probable that the matters brought up in private by the parties with the Convener, pursuant to the "agreed determination" as permitted in 7.3 (c), will go beyond the Record of the case. Further, such matters are likely to play a role in the Convener's judgment if these pre-trial negotiations fail. See also *BCO* 42-5.

BCO 42-4, "No attempt should be made to circularize the courts to which appeal is being made by either party before the case is heard." Surely such discussions as permitted in 7.3 (c) must qualify as attempts to "circularize" the court by a party to the case (cf. *Black's Law Dictionary* art. "Circulated."). See also *BCO* 43-2; and

Whereas, there are ample provisions in the *Rules of Discipline* to ward off "bad" cases (e.g. *BCO* 31-8 and 42-12, where the litigious are warned and *BCO* 31-9, where voluntary prosecutors are warned about discipline for slander should probable cause of the charge not be shown);

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Therefore, Potomac Presbytery overtures the 20th General Assembly to amend (or direct the Standing Judicial Commission to amend) *Manual of Standing Judicial Commission* by striking 7.3 (c) and re-lettering 7.3 (d) appropriately. The Presbytery urges the Assembly to speedily repair this defect in the *Manual*, however well intentioned was its purpose in the conception of its framers, and thus protect and preserve the integrity of our courts.

Adopted at the February Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery, February 8, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Richard R. Larson,
Stated Clerk

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. The spirit of reconciliation should not be removed from any stage of the judicial process.
- B. Encouraging parties to reconcile is not circularization or "earwiggling".
- C. Circularization or earwiggling is initiated by a party, not the court.
- D. Therefore, the court's encouraging reconciliation is not in violation of *BCO* 42-4.

NOTE: A substitute motion to answer Overture #14 in the affirmative lost: 206 yes, 226 no.

9. That General Assembly answer Overture #15 in the negative.

Declared Unconstitutional

OVERTURE 15 From Presbytery of Southern Florida

"Amend *BCO* 32-2 and 32-3 to Clarify"

Whereas, there has been confusion about the proper order in which to proceed to present charges and conduct a trial; and

Whereas, the statements in *BCO* 32-2 and 32-3 appear ambiguous;

Therefore Be it Resolved, that the Presbytery of Southern Florida does respectfully overture the Twentieth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America to initiate the following changes in the *Book of Church Order*:

1. Amend *BCO* 32-2 by adding a second and third paragraph to read as follows:
Any charge laid before a Session or Presbytery shall be reduced to writing with specifications and names of witnesses known to support the charge.

It is appropriate that with each citation the moderator or clerk call the attention of the parties to the Rules of Discipline (*BCO* 27 through 46) and assist the parties to obtain access to them.

2. Amend *BCO* 32-3 by replacing the present first and second paragraphs with two new paragraphs to read as follows:

When a charge is laid before a Session or Presbytery, it shall be adjudicated in the following manner: At the first meeting (a) the Session or Presbytery shall determine if the charge has been filed in a timely manner and with appropriate language; (b) shall appoint a

JOURNAL

prosecutor; (c) shall order an indictment drawn and a copy served on the accused; and (d) shall cite the accused to appear before the court on a specific date to hear and receive the indictment.

At the second meeting of the court, which shall not be sooner than ten days after said citation, the court: (a) shall read the charges and specifications to the accused, if present, and he shall be called upon to enter a plea; (b) shall inform the accused of his rights and shall state the process that will be followed in the case; and (c) shall cite all parties and witnesses to appear for the trial on a date mutually agreed upon by the parties.

Adopted at the Stated Meeting of Presbytery held on January 21, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Daniel J. Domin
Stated Clerk

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

The Committee concurs with CCB in finding the Overture not to be in order in that, by making citation of all parties and witnesses depend on mutual agreement between the parties, it allows the possibility of indefinite delay of the process by the accused, thereby enabling him to subvert the entire process of discipline envisioned by the *BCO*. In addition, it would be noted that the proposed amendment uses language more ambiguous than that which it replaces: "timely", "appropriate language", "enter a plea", and "rights".

10. That General Assembly answer Overture #16 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 16 From Presbytery of New River
"Amend *BCO* 43-3 To Clarify it, if Current Amendment is Adopted"

Whereas, the intent of *BCO* 43-2 is that the complaint be resolved at or before the next stated meeting after being received by the court; and

Whereas, some courts have interpreted the word "consider" to mean less than to deliberate upon and then sustain or deny the complaint; and

Whereas, the presbyteries (by way of Item 5 of the *BCO* amendments sent to them by the 19th General Assembly) are in the process of voting on removing the words "or fails to act on" from *BCO* 43-3 and add in the sentence, "If the court fails to consider the complaint by or at its next stated meeting, the complainant may make complaint to the next higher court."

Therefore Be It Resolved that if *BCO* 43-3 is amended as stated above, then the General Assembly begin the process of amending *BCO* 43-3 by changing "consider" to read "act upon".

Adopted at the Fall Meeting of New River Presbytery on November 9, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Virgil B. Roberts
Stated Clerk

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

Regardless of the language, the process of complaint is still the constitutional method of relief. [BCO 43-3].

11. That General Assembly answer Overture #21 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 21 From Grace Presbytery
"Instruct AC to Appoint Committee to Revise RAO"

Whereas, the current "Rules of Assembly Operations" (RAO) is not the product of careful revision of the whole but rather the product of "piecemeal" amendments over the course of two decades; and

Whereas, some provisions in the current RAO are at best ambiguous which ambiguity has led to a variety of interpretations in recent years; for example: Article XVIII is ruled to mean one thing by one Assembly and the exact opposite by another; and

Whereas, some provisions in the current RAO appear to be contradictory; for example: Article XII New Business appears to circumvent the prescriptions of Article X Communications, and

Whereas, there is evidence of internal inconsistencies in the current RAO; for example: a job description for the chief administrative officer (Stated Clerk) for the Administrative Committee is listed but a job description for the chief administrative officer (Coordinator) of the other Permanent Committees is lacking, and

Whereas, there is evidence in the current RAO of provisions which appear to contravene the polity of the PCA set forth in the *Book of Church Order*; for example: the *BCO* speaks of the work of the church being carried out by equally essential committees and speaks of Permanent Committees, RAO IV, V, and VI appear to drive a wedge between the parity of these Permanent Committees by dividing them along the lines of service and program. Further, the current RAO provides purpose statements for three of the Permanent Committees but appears to lack such a purpose statement for the fourth. Finally, the membership of the Administrative Committee is found in the current RAO rather than in the *BCO* where the others are found, and

Whereas, there have been attempts in recent years by a Permanent Committee to recommend revisions to the RAO without the authorization of a General Assembly or a request by the lower courts,

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Presbytery of Grace respectfully overtures the Twentieth General Assembly to direct the Administrative Committee to appoint a subcommittee in accordance with RAO 4-10 to revise the current RAO following these guiding principles:

1. The subcommittee shall be composed of five (5) members, of which only two (2) shall be current members of the Administrative Committee. Further, no one who has been a member of the Administrative Committee during the years 1990 or 1991 shall be asked to serve on this subcommittee.
2. The subcommittee shall review any and all proposed changes to the RAO from individuals and lower courts which are submitted in a timely fashion.
3. The Revised RAO shall be ready by the subcommittee, the Administrative Committee, and the Committee of Commissioners on AC to be presented to

JOURNAL

the Twenty-first General Assembly as the first order of Business (A Special Order) on the second full day of the Twenty-first General Assembly.

4. The Revised RAO shall conform to the principles of polity set forth in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America.
5. The provisions of the Revised RAO will govern the annual and/or any called meeting of the General Assembly and only incidentally govern the day-to-day ministries, activities, programs etc. conducted by the Presbyterian Church in America, her courts, and her committees.
6. The Revised RAO will exhibit a spirit of neutrality in its provisions to insure that all parties have equal access to maintain the status quo or initiate changes within the denomination.
7. The Revised RAO will exhibit an internal integrity in its provision to insure that contradiction and ambiguities are avoided.

Adopted at the 72nd Stated Meeting of Grace Presbytery on the 14th of January 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Eugene C. Case
Stated Clerk

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. Difficulty of doing this in a timely manner.
- B. Cost of doing this project.

12. That General Assembly answer Overture #22 as amended **in the negative**.

Adopted

OVERTURE 22 From Western Carolina Presbytery "Objection to Using Cult Facilities"

Whereas, the Lord Jesus Christ called the Presbyterian Church in America into existence twenty years ago as a Bible believing-Bible preaching denomination, and **Whereas**, the Presbyterian Church in America has enjoyed phenomenal growth because of our adherence to the Word of God and by His grace, and

Whereas, the Word of God in Deuteronomy 23:9 and many other places in Scripture instructs us "to flee from every form of evil" or "keep yourself from every evil thing.", and

Whereas, the church of Latter Day Saints (Mormons) are an evil which permeates the world only to deny the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and

Whereas, the Presbyterian Church in America has taken a stand in prior General Assemblies, recognizing the intent of cults such as the Mormons to destroy the Word and work of Christ,

Whereas, the Marriott organization is owned (whether in part or the whole) by the Mormon church and whose CEO is, along with other upper echelon management, members and supporters of the LDS church.

Therefore, we, Western Carolina Presbytery, overture the 20th General Assembly to once again instruct all PCA agencies not knowingly to contract with or use the facilities of any cult for meetings, conferences or luncheons, specifically, that any Marriott facility not be used for any event involving the PCA or any of its agencies.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

From the Session and the WIC of Andrews Presbyterian Church. It was approved by Western Carolina Presbytery on March 21, 1992.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ William P. Laxton, Stated Clerk

NOTE: TE Mike Chastain and TE Chris Tindall requested their negative votes be recorded.

13. That General Assembly answer Overture #23 in the affirmative with the amendment "If that court, in its final decision, does not approve the candidate for ordination (or installation) it shall record in its minutes the grounds for this action"

Declared Unconstitutional

OVERTURE 23 From New River Presbytery

"Amend BCO 16-3 to Require Grounds for Not Approving Ordination Exam"

Whereas, it is the responsibility of every court to vote on the approval of any candidate appearing before it for ordination (BCO 16-3), and

Whereas, the BCO defines the area in which candidate is to be examined (BCO 21-4, 24-1), and

Whereas, the courts are limited in their areas of examination to those areas specified by the Constitution, and

Whereas, it is only right and just, if any candidate be denied, the minutes reflect the grounds on which that man is denied,

Therefore, we the New River Presbytery, hereby overture the General Assembly to amend BCO 16-3 by the addition of the following sentence at the end of the current paragraph: "If the court does not approve the candidate for ordination (or installation), it shall record in its minutes the grounds for this action."

Adopted at the Winter Meeting of New River Presbytery on March 14, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Virgil B. Roberts
Stated Clerk

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. It is only right that a candidate know the reason that a court has failed to approve him.
- B. If a candidate wishes to appeal a decision to a higher court that he has explicit grounds on which to appeal.
- C. It is only right for a court to give an account for the reason of its actions.
- D. It could often prove helpful to other courts to have access to such information in future dealings with the candidate.
- E. (Grounds for the amendment) This will allow a court to deal pastorally and discreetly with a candidate prior to its final decision in the case.
- F. Contrary to the CCB and the Minority Report this matter does belong in BCO 16 which deals with the doctrine of vocation which insists on "the concurring judgment of a lawful court of the church." The amendment deals explicitly with this judgment of a court of the church.

JOURNAL

Minority Report:

We the undersigned urge the 20th General Assembly to answer Overture # 23 in the negative for the following reasons:

- A. The Committee on Constitutional Business has ruled the Overture "not in order" for several reasons, one of which is that this language does not belong in *BCO* Chapter 16.
- B. While we agree with the spirit of the Overture to let candidates know exactly why their exams were not sustained, it is not always possible or practical for courts to do this. (For example members of a court may vote not to sustain an exam with many different reasons.) This proposed *BCO* change would then bind the courts to then agree upon the reasons for their vote.

/s/ John Waddill

/s/ Edwin D. Johnston, Jr.

/s/ Samuel T. Duncan

/s/ Jeffrey D. Brotherton

/s/ Skip Gillikin

/s/ Henry J. Bishop

14. That General Assembly answer Overtures #25 & #38 in the affirmative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 25 From Pacific Presbytery
"Evangelism of Jewish People"

Whereas, Messiah Jesus commanded that "repentance and forgiveness of sins be preached in His name to all nations beginning at Jerusalem (Luke 24:47); and
Whereas, there has been an organized effort on the part of some who claim to profess the name of Christ to deny that Jewish people need to come to Him to be saved; and

Whereas, these people have spread a false hope and security that Jewish people can inherit eternal life apart from the faith in God's New Covenant promises foretold by the Jewish prophets (Jeremiah 31:31, Isaiah 53);

Therefore, Be it Resolved the 20th General Assembly of the PCA re-affirms that:
we are "not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God for the salvation of everyone who believes: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile" (Romans 1:16); and

Re-affirms that anyone and everyone - Jewish or Gentile - who fails to receive Jesus, Messiah of Israel, as Savior and Lord, as taught in the New Covenant, will perish eternally; for Peter, appointed as Apostle to the Jewish people (Galatians 2:7), pleaded with the men of Israel, "save yourselves from this corrupt generation" (Acts 2:1-41); and

Re-commits itself to prayer for all peoples - Jewish & Gentile, to turn to the God of Israel and His Holy Messiah Jesus in faith, as the *Westminster Larger Catechism* states, we are to pray that "the gospel [be] propagated throughout the world, the Jews called, the fullness of the Gentiles brought in" (*Westminster Larger Catechism* answer to Question 191); and

Re-commits itself to the preaching of the gospel of Christ to all peoples - Jewish & Gentile, and condemns as the worst form of anti-semitism withholding the gospel from the Jewish people; and

Condemns as erroneous the false teaching held by some that salvation for Jews today is possible apart from the gospel of Christ due to the Abrahamic Covenant, for this heresy necessarily involves denying the completed atonement for sin accomplished through our Messiah (Hebrews 9:15).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

We therefore re-affirm, in accord with the scriptures and the *Westminster Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*, that it is our duty, as Messiah's people, to take the gospel to all the peoples of the earth, including the Jewish people. We call the Jewish people, through whom Jesus came, to join us in faith in their own Messiah, obedience to their own King, Jesus the "King of the Universe", and in proclamation of His gospel to all peoples, for that same Jesus will one day return to judge the world (Acts 1:11).

Adopted at the January 25, 1992 stated meeting of Pacific Presbytery.

Attested by: /s/ Donald W. Treick
Stated Clerk

OVERTURE 38 From Philadelphia Presbytery

"Regarding Evangelism of Jewish People"

(same as Overture 25)

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. All men, Jews and gentiles alike, are equally lost in sin and saved only by God's grace, through faith in Jesus Christ.
- B. The Great Commission commands us to "go ye therefore and disciple all nations" and, as the apostle Paul reminds us, "to the Jew first, and then to the Gentile."

Minority Report: (NOTE: Not presented as a substitute.)

While the minority (dissenting voters) do not disagree with the substantive elements delineated, it is nevertheless our opinion that:

- A. Overtures #25 & #38 are unnecessary because of the PCA's commitment to the Great Commission to disciple all nations, including the Jews;
- B. To focus specifically on the evangelization of Jewish people, as stated in these overtures, implies possible willful negligence and guilt on the part of the PCA;
- C. If there are those in the PCA who are known to be guilty of the implications of these overtures, then such person(s) should be made subject to proper discipline with regard to heresy;
- D. We have firm confidence in the PCA's evangelization of the Jewish people, along with all other peoples of all nations.

/s/ Carl Russell
/s/ Jerry Crick

15. That General Assembly answer Overture #28 in the negative.

Adopted

OVERTURE 28 From Central Georgia Presbytery

"Study Clergy Burnout, Stress, etc. in PCA"

Whereas, research indicates that incidences of burnout, depression, vocational change, marital dissatisfaction and divorce have been increasing within clergy families and, in particular, within clergy families in the Presbyterian Church in America,

Therefore Be it Resolved, that the Twentieth General Assembly (Roanoke) direct the Administrative Committee of the Presbyterian Church in America to investigate:

1. The extent of these problem areas within clergy families in the Presbyterian Church in America;

JOURNAL

2. The factors that lead to these debilitating areas in the Presbyterian Church in America;
3. And the factors which would improve the quality of life of clergy families; And report back to the Twenty-first General Assembly with recommendations as to:
 1. The necessary steps for the diagnosis and treatment of pastoral role strain and disability;
 2. The necessary steps toward prevention of future disabling situations in the denomination, and
 3. The necessary steps toward role rehabilitation of clergy families making a transition into a new vocational career.

Adopted at the Stated Meeting of Central Georgia Presbytery on April 4, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Donald D. Comer
Stated Clerk

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. The Overture appears to depend on a denial of the sufficiency of God's Word and a naive optimism about psychology.
 - B. The Overture implies that there is some special temptation which falls upon teaching elders which is clearly contrary to Scripture (I Cor. 10:13)
16. That General Assembly answer Overture #29 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 29 From Evangel Presbytery
"Restatement of BCO 38-2."

Whereas, the *Book of Church Order* is silent concerning the process by which a minister who has been divested without censure at his own request (in accordance with BCO 38-2), may seek reinstatement,

Whereas, the *Book of Church Order* does make provision for reinstatement of a minister who has been deposed (see BCO 37-4) without having to go through the candidacy and licensure process all over again.

Whereas, the 1989 General Assembly cited Evangel Presbytery's policy of dealing with reinstatement of ministers who have been divested without censure as a substantive BCO error.

Therefore, Be it Resolved that the 20th General Assembly amend the *Book of Church Order* as follows:

Add a second paragraph to *Book of Church Order* 38-2 so that it reads as follows:

"If a minister who has been divested without censure approaches the Presbytery which divested him (or another Presbytery with the consent of the original Presbytery) requesting that his ordination be reinstated, the Presbytery shall proceed carefully. The Presbytery shall examine him diligently with respect to his revitalized sense of call by God to the Gospel ministry and in the areas delineated by BCO 13-6. If, after careful examination, the Presbytery is convinced that the man's call is valid, the Presbytery may choose one of two alternatives to pursue reinstatement:

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- (1) The Presbytery may treat him as a man without call and without credentials and require him to follow the normal process leading to ordination which includes candidacy, licensure, internship, examination, etc. (*BCO* chapters 18 through 21).
- (2) The Presbytery may follow a reinstatement service and receive him as a member of the Presbytery. The service is as follows:

The moderator shall announce to him in the following form:

Whereas, you, _____ formerly a Teaching Elder of this Presbytery have been divested without censure, but have now expressed evidence of a revitalized call which has satisfied the church, in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by His authority, we, the Presbytery of _____ do declare you restored to your ordination and to the exercise of all the functions of your office, whenever you may be orderly called thereto."

NOTE: Carried over from the 19th GA, formerly Overture 1 (*M19GA*, p. 156)

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. The committee believes that ordination to the office of Teaching Elder is not to be lightly applied, nor laid aside at pleasure, nor can anyone be degraded but after regular action by presbytery. (Titus 1:7, *BCO* 24-6)
 - B. The committee further observes that a Teaching Elder may only be properly divested from his office by presenting adequate evidence to presbytery of his inability to serve the church as a result of lack of suitable gifts, or his not being called by God, and presbytery concurring after duly considering all factors surrounding the case. (*BCO* 38-2 & 3)
 - C. The committee finally believes that divestiture, being an official judgment by the Church that an individual is not called of God or is lacking sufficient gifts to serve the Church, ought to be restored only with great caution and only after thorough testing of the individual's call, gifts, ability and doctrine as outlined in *BCO*_16, 18, & 19.
17. That General Assembly answer Overture #30 in the affirmative. A substitute motion passed (330 yes; 258 no) to answer the overture **in the negative**.

Adopted

OVERTURE 30 From New River Presbytery

"Amend *BCO* 15-4 to permit General Assembly to Adjudicate."

Whereas, the power to receive and issue all appeals, references, and complaints belongs to the General Assembly (*BCO* 14-16); and

Whereas, the actions taken in judicial decisions are to be the actions of the General Assembly (*BCO* 14-7); and

Whereas, it is better that each court discharge the duty assigned it under the law of the Church (*BCO* 41-5); and

Whereas, the Eighteenth General Assembly determined that *BCO* 15 requires that judicial cases first be tried by the Permanent Judicial Commission and that the Assembly cannot hear a case first itself, nor erect a special commission, under any circumstances; and

JOURNAL

Whereas, it is improper irrevocably to commit the duties or powers of a court to any other body;

Therefore be it resolved that the Twentieth General Assembly vote to amend *BCO* 15-4 by the insertion of the word "ordinarily" following the second "shall" in the first sentence.

NOTE: Carried over from the 19th GA, formerly Overture 5 (*M19GA*, p. 161)

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. Refer to the arguments laid out by New River Presbytery. This does affirm that the General Assembly represents the church, and is a court by definition. General Assembly should not be denied its right to hear a case when it deems the situation to be out of the ordinary.
- B. There are no biblical reasons why the General Assembly as a court of the Church of Jesus Christ charged by Christ to function as a court of appeal should be kept from adjudicating cases which it deems to properly be before it. Acts 15 demonstrates how matters arising from Antioch were dealt with by the apostles and elders assembled in Jerusalem. Thus the jurisdiction of the Assembly to receive and act upon such matters is irrevocable and should not be denied.

NOTE: TE Michael Chastain requested his affirmative vote be recorded.

18. That General Assembly answer Overture #31 in the affirmative. A substitute motion passed to answer the overture **in the negative**. *Adopted*

OVERTURE 31 From Westminster Presbytery

"Amend *BCO* Preface II, to avoid Pluralistic Interpretation."

Whereas God has placed enmity between His seed and the seed of the serpent (Gen. 3:15) and

Whereas no one can come to the Father except through Jesus, thus there is only one true religion, and

Whereas Christians regularly and rightly appeal to God's Word for instruction in the midst of major political issues of today such as abortion, homosexuality, and pornography and,

Whereas state and church must remain separate but the state and a moral basis for law can never be separate, and

Whereas the current reading of the Preface of the *BCO* II (1) seems to support pluralism by equating all religious constitutions,

Therefore be it resolved that the 20th General Assembly vote to amend the Preface of the *Book of Church Order* II (1). Change the last sentence to read:

"We believe the Bible, God's infallible word, provide proper commands for conduct of society even in civil affairs. However, we deny that the constitution of a particular Christian Church should be supported by the civil power, further than may be necessary for protection and security equal and common to all others."

NOTE: Carried over from the 19th GA, formerly Overture 10 (*M19GA*, p. 164)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

For the reasons stated in the Overture. [cf. *WCF* ch. XXIII]

19. That General Assembly answer Overture #32 in the affirmative. *Adopted*

OVERTURE 32 From Ascension Presbytery

"Amend *BCO* 34-1 so Neighboring Presbytery May Adjudicate Case."

Whereas, our present form of church government permits *de novo* trials (i.e., trials as a court of original jurisdiction) by the judicial commission of General Assembly from which there is no appeal (*BCO* 15-1); and

Whereas, such a situation insinuates either that:

- 1) Our judicial commissions are infallible or,
- 2) That the rights of the accused are of secondary importance to the need for expediency in dealing with an overloaded court docket, both of which are fallacious; and

Whereas, *BCO* 34-1 clearly states that "process against a minister shall be entered before the Presbytery of which he is a member; and

Whereas, presbyteries should not be permitted to abdicate their judicial responsibilities. *BCO* 31-2 states, "It is the duty of all Church Sessions and Presbyteries to exercise care over those subject to their authority", (see also *BCO* 11-4). If presbyteries are to learn, and grow and be effective, they must be willing to address cases at their own level. If our Church is to function properly all our courts must function fully at their own levels; and

Whereas, our General Assembly Judicial Commission is intended to be a court of review and appeal and not a court of default (see *BCO* 14-6. 40-5);

Therefore, be it resolved that the 20th General Assembly vote to amend *BCO* 34-1 to read "Process against a minister shall be entered before the presbytery of which he is a member. However, if the presbytery refuses to act in doctrinal cases or cases of public scandal the General Assembly, through its Standing Judicial Commission, at the request of two other presbyteries, shall assign the case to a neighboring presbytery for adjudication. In no instance shall such cases be tried *de novo* by a judicial commission of General Assembly."

NOTE: Carried over from the 19th GA, formerly Overture 12 (*M19GA*, p. 165)

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. This keeps the process of adjudication intact--first presbytery then the General Assembly's Judicial Commission.
 - B. It safeguards the General Assembly's Standing Judicial Commission from having more of a caseload than is necessary.
 - C. These cases should be handled at the presbytery level before coming to the General Assembly.
20. That General Assembly answer Overture #33 in the affirmative. *Adopted*

OVERTURE 33 From New River Presbytery

"Amend 24-5 to Permit Session to Ordain Elders and Deacons."

JOURNAL

Whereas, "Elders being of one class of office, ruling elders possess the same authority and eligibility to office in the courts of the church as teaching elders" *BCO* 8-9; and

Whereas, "To the office of deacon, which is spiritual in nature, shall be chosen men of spiritual character, honest repute, exemplary lives, brotherly spirit, warm sympathies, and sound judgment." *BCO* 9-3; and

Whereas, it may be desirable in some instances to have greater participation of ruling elders in the ordination and installation of ruling elders and deacons; and

Whereas, there are many capable, knowledgeable, and articulate persons on the Sessions of local churches;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Nineteenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America initiate the following changes in the *Book of Church Order*:

1. Amend the first sentence in the third paragraph of *BCO* 24-5 by deleting the words "the minister shall proceed to set apart the candidate, with prayer" and inserting the words "the candidate shall then be set apart, with prayer by the minister or any other Session member"; so that it reads as follows: "The members of the church having answered this question in the affirmative, by holding up their right hands, the candidate shall then be set apart, with prayer by the minister or any other Session member and the laying on of hands of the Session, to the office of ruling elder (or deacon)",
2. Amend the last paragraph sentence by deleting the words "he" and inserting in its place the words "the minister or any other member of the Session; the paragraph sentence shall then read "after which the minister or any other member of the Session shall give to the ruling elder (or deacon) and to the church an exhortation suited to the occasion."

NOTE: Carried over from the 19th GA, formerly Overture 22 (*M19GA*, p. 167)

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. We note that *BCO* 24-5 requires that a minister be present to preside over, give prayer, and provide an exhortation during the installation of ruling elders and deacons. Regrettably, *BCO* 24-5 as written does not permit members of the session to lead prayers for or give exhortations to newly ordained and installed officers.
- B. We believe that participation by the Session is appropriate and should be expressly allowed on these grounds:
 - (1). The Session has shepherded and examined the candidates, and may be better suited to give an appropriate exhortation--especially in cases where the presiding minister is less familiar with the candidates for office than the session. This circumstance arises when a church is without a teaching elder, or when the Teaching Elder is new to a church.
 - (2). A minister may also wish to delegate part of the prayer or exhortation as a matter of courtesy.
 - (3). The reasons given in the "whereas" part of the overture.
- C. The Committee of Commissioners notes that a minister of the gospel must preside over installation not primarily as matter of conformity to *BCO* 24-5, but as a matter of conformity to biblical example (e.g. Paul and

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Barnabas appointing elders -- Acts 14:23, Paul's instruction to Titus -- Titus 1:5). Prayer and exhortation are appropriate roles for the ruling elder, but the teaching elder must preside.

21. That General Assembly answer Overture #34 in the negative.

Declared Unconstitutional

OVERTURE 34 From New River Presbytery

"Amend BCO 15-4 So as to limit membership on SJC."

Whereas, all men, even Christian men, are weak and sinful creatures; and,
Whereas, the light of nature and observation of history makes it clear that it is unwise for too few men to hold too much authority; and,
Whereas, as Presbyterians we believe in parity of all elders in the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in America; and
Whereas, Providence has indicated the value of the separation of the powers of government in these United States;
Therefore be it resolved, that the 19th General Assembly vote to amend the *Book of Church Order* 14-1 (12) so that it read as follows:

Persons who have served for a full term, or for at least two years of a partial term on one of the Assembly's permanent committees or agencies or a standing commission shall not be eligible for re-election to an Assembly committee or standing commission until one year has elapsed. (Exceptions may be permitted in agency Bylaws approved by the Assembly.)

And also amend RAO 4-6 as follows: "No individual shall serve on more than one Assembly committee, standing commission, or agency at one time. . . ."

NOTE: Carried over from the 19th GA, formerly Overture 27 (*M19GA*, p. 168)

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

While the committee was sympathetic to the substance of the Overture, we voted to respond negatively because:

- A. We believed that the intent of the original New River Presbytery Overture was satisfied by the Bills and Overtures Committee action on Overture # 5.
- B. We concurred with the Committee on Constitutional Business opinion that Overture # 34 is procedurally out of order, since such modifications should properly originate from a lower court, rather than from a General Assembly Committee.

22. That General Assembly refer Overture #35 to the Committee on Constitutional Business by the adoption of the **Minority Report**.

Adopted

OVERTURE 35 From Delmarva Presbytery

"Amend BCO 37-4 to Apply to Presbyteries as Well as Sessions"

Whereas, BCO 37 is clearly intended to cover the cases of teaching elders as well as regular church members, and
Whereas, BCO 37 contains several references which are inconsistent with this intention,

JOURNAL

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the General Assembly of the PCA amend *BCO 37* in the following ways:

1. In section 37-4, add "(or presbytery)" after "the session" on line 3, line 6 and line 25.
2. In section 37-4 add "(or moderator)" after "the minister" on line 7 and line 19.

Adopted at the February 11, 1989 meeting of Delmarva Presbytery.

Attested by: /s/ Bruce B. Howes
Stated Clerk

NOTE: The above overture was submitted by Delmarva Presbytery to the 17th GA and numbered Overture 19 (*M17GA*, p. 166). It was referred to Committee on Constitutional Business "to draft amendments to *BCO 37* to clarify jurisdiction in the process of restoring an excommunicated and deposed teaching elder.

Grounds:

The proposed amendments do not fully deal with the question of what jurisdiction does a presbytery have (over against a session's jurisdiction - see *BCO 6-2, 4; 11-4; and 12-5*) for the restoring of an excommunicated teaching elder (see *BCO 13-9; 34-4; 36-7; and 37-7*)."

Recommendation Of CCB:

CCB proposes that *BCO 37-4* be amended by adding a new second paragraph and renumbering the remaining paragraphs as follows:

"Prior to the readmittance of an excommunicated teaching elder, the session shall obtain information and advice from the court imposing such censure in order to assist the session in determining that the excommunicated person desiring to be readmitted to the communion of the church is so affected with his state as to be brought to repentance."

Minority Report:

The following minority report was received:

The committee's report, while a substantial improvement in the CCB's previous recommendations of a new *BCO 37-5* (see *M19GA*, p. 230), nevertheless falls considerably short of fulfilling the GA's instruction that it "draft amendments to *BCO 37* to clarify jurisdiction in the process of restoring an excommunicated and deposed teaching elder."

1. It implies that such jurisdiction belongs to the session, but, though it instructs the session to "obtain information and advice from the court," does not explicitly give the session, as opposed to the presbytery, power to proceed with restoration.
2. It fails to take into consideration what relationship, if any, an excommunicated teaching elder sustains to the presbytery which deposed him, and fails to take into account the implications of *BCO 34-8, 37-5 and 37-7*.

It is recommended that the matter again be referred to the CCB with instruction that it take particular care to clarify the matter of jurisdiction both in the particular place in question (*37-4*) and in respect to other relevant sections of the *BCO*.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ RE David C. Lachman

23. That General Assembly refer Overture #36 to the Committee of Commissioners on Insurance, Annuities, and Relief (see text and action, 20-47, III, 8, p. 93).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

24. That General Assembly answer Overture #37 in the negative. *Adopted*
OVERTURE 37 From Southeast Alabama Presbytery
"Have GA Meet Only Every Two Years"

Whereas, in relation to the Annual General Assembly of the PCA,

1. There is a vast jungle of paper work and untold hours devoted to printing, and whereas,
2. Our Minutes as of the 1991 Assembly reached the two-volume stage, also incurring added work, and whereas
3. There is a limit to how much purposeful business can be conducted annually, and whereas
4. The original aim of the PCA was to be less centralized and more grassroots oriented. It seems increasingly difficult to relate Assembly business to the local churches, and whereas
5. There are some Denominations whose Highest Court meets less often than once every 2 years, and whereas
6. Individual church members seem increasingly less interested in decisions of the higher Church Court, and whereas
7. Our denomination has experienced a serious shortfall in funds (especially at the Assembly level), and whereas
8. It requires an untold sum of money from local Churches, Presbyteries, and Assembly agencies to fund the annual Assembly, and finally whereas
9. That money could be better spent.

Therefore, Be it Resolved that, the General Assembly move as expeditiously as possible toward a bi-annual (once every 2 years) Assembly.

Approved by Southeast Alabama Presbytery at its Stated Meeting on April 28, 1992.

Attested by: /s/ Henry Lewis Smith
Stated Clerk

COMMITTEE'S RATIONALE:

- A. General Assembly permanent committees would be without protective oversight and court review for two years.
 - B. General Assembly already has enough work to do meeting once per year.
 - C. General Assembly already has made arrangements through 1998.
 - D. If this Overture is passed the BCO, by-laws, and RAO would have to be changed, as would terms of coordinators and committeemen.
25. That the General Assembly adopt **Personal Resolution #4 from RE Jack Brown** with amendments, as follows: *Adopted*
- Whereas**,
1. Judeo-Christian standards of morals and ethics are under vicious attack by secular interests in the media, entertainment, and sundry anti-Christian organizations;
 2. Christian (biblical) family values are under attack by the same interests outlined in 1 above;

JOURNAL

3. Efforts by Christian groups to prevent abortion throughout the U.S.A. and the world are under organized attack supported by seemingly unlimited financing and political organization;
4. Such anti-Christian activity and the results therefrom are causing the disintegration of American civilization, i.e. divorce, abortion, birth out of wedlock, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, homosexuality and fornication, political, governmental, and civil corruption at all levels, racist attitudes and activities, deficit spending both governmental and private, child abuse and devastating crime including rape, murder, rioting, looting, and pillage;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the 20th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America boldly, publicly, and unequivocally supports all Biblical values involving marriage, family values, sexual conduct and practices, social conduct and the sanctity of life both parental and post-natal.

26. That the General Assembly not adopt **Personal Resolution #5 from TE John Peoples**. A substitute motion was passed that it be answered in the affirmative as amended. *Adopted*

Whereas, we as believers are to be in the world, but not of it;

Whereas, we are to be salt and light in the world;

Whereas, we as the Lord's people are to take a stand for the truth for the glory and honor of Christ;

Whereas, the acting government of Sudan is presently treating the Christian population of that country and other non-Muslims unfairly through military action, starvation, and other forms of discrimination;

Whereas, the government of Sudan has agreed to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN-GA,217 [III] Act 18, Adopted December, 1948) allowing the freedom of religion, but is now actively working against people who are not Muslims;

Whereas, the Sudanese government has removed humanitarian aid from those who need it most in their country and have in effect signed the death warrants of those citizens;

Whereas, the current government of Sudan is acting in a way that is in direct opposition to the Word of God and to the charter of the UN;

Be it therefore resolved that the General Assembly pause to pray for our persecuted Sudanese brethren, led by TE John Peoples.

27. That the report as a whole be adopted.

Adopted

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ TE Scott Reiber, Chairman
/s/ TE Mark Rowden, Secretary

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Ascension

Calvary

Central Carolina

Commissioners

RE Jeffrey Brotherton

TE Jerry Crick

RE Bernard Lawrence

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Central Florida	TE Maurice Sikes
Central Georgia	TE Scott Reiber, Chairman
Covenant	RE Howard Davis
Eastern Carolina	TE James Routszong
Evangel	TE Carl Russell
Grace	RE Sam Duncan
Great Lakes	TE John Gillikin
Gulf Coast	TE Mark Rowden
Heartland	RE Charles Meador
James River	RE John Waddill
Louisiana	TE T. Mark Duncan
Mid-America	TE Michael OBel
Mississippi Valley	TE Michael Ahlberg
New Jersey	TE Kenneth Klett
New River	RE James Williams
North Georgia	RE Edwin Johnston, Jr.
North Texas	RE Raiford Stainback
Potomac	TE Julian Dusenberry
Southwest	RE William Montgomery
Southeast Alabama	TE Henry Bishop
Susquehanna Valley	RE Harrison Brown
Tennessee Valley	TE King A. Counts
Western Carolina	RE Jack Sullivan
Westminster	RE Neil S. Smith

STATED CLERK'S NOTE: Recommendation 4 was acted on after report from the chairman of CCB. Recommendation 18 was acted on at 20-56, and items 22, 23 and 24 were acted on at 20-58, but all are reported here for convenience.

20-52 Recess

The Assembly recessed at 5:35 p.m. with prayer led by TE Thomas Shields.

MINUTES--THURSDAY MORNING

June 18, 1992

Sixth Session

20-53 Assembly Reconvened

The Assembly reconvened for business at 8:05 a.m. Thursday with the singing of "*There Is a Fountain Filled with Blood*" and prayer led by RE Philip Fanara.

20-54 Minutes of Previous Sessions

On motion the Assembly received the minutes of Wednesday's sessions and agreed to submit any corrections to the recording clerks.

JOURNAL

20-55 Report on Christian Reformed Church Synod

Moderator Benson recognized TE Herman Keizer, fraternal delegate from the Christian Reformed Church. He reported that the CRC had voted not to ratify the changes in their Church Order which would have allowed women into all offices of the Church. The Synod encouraged the churches to use the gifts of women church members to the fullest extent possible in their local churches, including allowing women to teach, expound the Word of God, and provide pastoral care under the supervision of the elders.

20-56 Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures

Chairman Reiber continued the Committee's report (see text at 20-51, p. 98). Recommendation 18 was acted upon at this time.

20-57 Constitutional Inquiry

TE Roy Taylor presented the following constitutional inquiry which was received and referred to the Committee on Constitutional Business (see text and action at 20-67, item 2, p. 138).

20-58 Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures

Action continued on Recommendations 22, 23, 24 at this time. (See text at 20-51, p. 98). Recommendation 4 was adopted after report by TE Rod Mays, chairman of the Constitutional Business Committee, that it had concurred with the change as printed in the text.

The Assembly then paused for the prayer just ordered.

20-59 Protest

The following protest of TE Eugene Case was on motion admitted to the record.

I respectfully dissent from the action of the Assembly in adding the words "racist attitudes and activities" to Resolution #4, citing as my principal reason the fact that these terms may be defined and are being defined, especially by the media and certain parties who have a vested interest in the presence of racial discord, in ways which characterize as "racist" any expressed attitude or action which does not conform to their own opinions or programs in a wide variety of areas touching, however lightly, upon certain matters of race.

TE Anthony Dallison, TE G. Brent Bradley, RE Joe L. Reynolds and TE Frank J. Smith requested their names added to the dissent.

20-60 Committee of Commissioners on PCA Foundation

TE John Grauley, chairman, led in prayer and began presentation of the Committee's report. He yielded to RE Jack Hudson, Director of the Foundation, who addressed the Assembly. Recommendations were then acted upon as follows:

I. Business Referred to the Committee:

The convener TE John Grauley appointed RE Will Thompson as secretary pro tem. TE John Grauley then led in a devotion and began the meeting with prayer. TE John Grauley was elected as chairman and TE Lee Lovett was elected as secretary.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The report of the PCA Foundation was presented to the committee. The director, John Hudson, gave a brief overview of the purpose of the Foundation emphasizing its ministry to the local church.

There followed a discussion of the minutes of the Board meetings, the budget, the recommendations from the Foundation and the audit.

II. Recommendations:

A. That the report of the PCA Foundation be recommended to the GÁ for their approval and that the following recommendations in that report be approved.

Adopted

1. The two regular vacancies on the board be filled with godly men gifted to lead our ministry.
2. Approval of our Proposed 1993 Budget.
3. Each local church be encouraged to consider the various ways the Foundation can serve them. Seminars and literature are available to be used to better inform the people regarding more effective management of God's assets.
4. Each church be encouraged to take full advantage of the Memorial Gift Program offered by the Foundation.
5. The Amendment to the Articles of Incorporation of the Presbyterian Church in America Foundation, Inc. be approved as submitted. (See Attachment 3, Appendix M, page 497)
6. The Amended and Restated Bylaws of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc. be approved as submitted. (See Attachment 4, Appendix M, page 497)
7. The Corporate Bylaws of Presbyterian Church in America (A Corporation) be amended as per Article IX of the Articles of Incorporation of the PCA Foundation. The amendment being made to Article VI, Section 6. as follows:

The Board of Trustees of the Presbyterian Church in America Foundation, Inc. shall be comprised of four classes of three men each who may be Teaching Elders or Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in America. At least one-fourth of the Directors shall be Teaching Elders and at least one-half of the Directors shall be Ruling Elders.

B. That the minutes of August 24, 1991, be approved without exceptions. *Adopted*

C. That the minutes of February 15, 1992 be approved without exceptions. *Adopted*

D. That the audit of the PCA Foundation, dated December 31, 1991, be approved.

Adopted

E. That the PCA Foundation be instructed to provide a list of non-PCA gifts outlining those organizations purposes and goals to the committee of commissioners of the Foundation for all General Assemblies from this point on.

Adopted

F. The report of the committee be approved as a whole.

Adopted

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ TE John Grauley, Chairman
/s/ TE Lee Lovett, Secretary

JOURNAL

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Ascension
Central Carolina
Central Georgia
Evangel
Heritage
Mississippi Valley
New River
North Georgia
North Texas
Pacific NW
Potomac
SE Alabama
Southern Florida
Warrior
W. Carolina
Westminster

Commissioners

TE John Grauley
TE Alex Coblenz
RE Charles Hill
RE Don Harrison
RE Douglas Latimer
RE Will Thompson
TE Steve Leonard
TE Lee Lovett
TE Jim Pancoast
TE Bob Bruhn
RE Ira Ward
RE Armistead Harper
RE Herman Hinz
RE Wayne Fair
TE Dick Gillen
TE Byron Snapp

20-61 Committee of Commissioners on Investors' Fund

TE John Keen, chairman, led in prayer and began presentation of the Committee's report. He yielded to TE Cecil Brooks, Director for the Fund, who addressed the Assembly. Chairman Keen then presented the Committee's recommendations, which were acted upon as follows:

I. Business Referred to the Committee:

1. Review of minutes of the Investor's Fund Trustee meetings, dated June 5, 1991; July 19, 1991; August 20, 1991; September 23, 1991; December 2, 1991; January 23, 1992; March 5 and 6, 1992; May 14, 1992.
2. Review of 1993 IFBD budget.
3. Review of audit dated December 31, 1991.
4. Review of report of the permanent committee.
5. Review of the recommendations of the permanent committee.

II. Statement of Major Issues Discussed.

Teaching Elders Cecil Brooks and John Ottinger presented an overview of the work of IFBD and of the Lord's continued blessing on its growth and usefulness to the denomination. Both men were available for questions and explanations as the committee worked through the items of business before it.

III. Recommendations:

1. That the minutes of June 5, 1991; July 19, 1991; August 20, 1991; September 23, 1991; December 2, 1991; January 23, 1992; March 5 and 6, 1992; May 14, 1992 be approved without exception. *Adopted*
2. That the General Assembly express its gratitude to God for continued growth of IFBD and its ministries to churches, as well as encourage churches, presbyteries,

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

individuals and committees of the Assembly to participate in IFBD programs.

Adopted

3. That the General Assembly give thanks to the Father for the work of the staff of IFBD, TE Cecil A. Brooks, Coordinator; TE John T. Ottinger, Associate Coordinator; Shirley S. Covington, Virginia Harris and John Underwood. *Adopted*
4. That the General Assembly approve the audit of the year ending December 31, 1991. *Adopted*
5. That the General Assembly adopt the Budget for the year ending December 31, 1993. *Adopted*
6. That the 20th General Assembly appoint Jackson McDaniel, III, C.P.A., as auditor for 1992 due to his expertise in banking securities and non-profit management and cost effectiveness. *Adopted*
7. That the IFBD review the policy Guidelines as approved by the 17th General Assembly in light of the scope of it's current activities, e.g.: Building Department (previously administrated by MNA); Five Million Fund; Basic Counsulting Services; and the Development Consulting Program, and present its recommendations for changes to the 21st General Assembly. *Adopted*

Explanation:

The final recommendation is being presented in light of the new possibilities that were assigned to the IFBD by the 19th General Assembly (Administration of Building Department and the Five Million Fund) and the new opportunities for related ministry that have presented themselves to the IFBD in recent years (Consulting Services for Financial and Building Department).

8. That the report be approved as a whole.

Adopted

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ TE John K. Keen, Chairman

/s/ RE M. C. Culbertson, Secretary

Commissioners present:

Presbytery

Central Carolina

Central Georgia

Covenant

Evangel

Grace

Gulf Coast

Heritage

Louisiana

Mississippi Valley

New River

North Texas

Potomac

Commissioner

TE Robert Dyar

TE Ronald Clegg

RE Marion Johnson

TE Barny Heyward

RE Don Huyser

TE Jack Waller

TE Dal Stanton

TE John Keen, Chairman

TE Daniel Gilchrist

RE Calvin Ribbens

RE M. C. Culbertson,

Secretary

TE George Miller

JOURNAL

Susquehanna Valley
Warrior
Westminster

RE Ben Rooke
RE John Graham
RE Larry Hambrick

The Assembly was led in prayer by TE Daniel Gilchrist.

20-62 Committee on Constitutional Business

TE Rod May, chairman, reported the Committee's recommended response to **Personal Resolution #3 from TE Howard Griffith**. On motion it was received and ordered spread upon the minutes.

"May a minister from another denomination, duly licensed by a presbytery (*BCO* 19-1), serve as a stated supply (*BCO* 22-5, 22-6)? May such a minister administer the sacraments? This inquiry comes from a real situation within the James River Presbytery which needs a timely answer to this perplexed question. The advice will go to the Ministerial and Church Relations Committee and, through it, to the Presbytery."

Response:

The Committee on Constitutional Business answers Personal Resolution #3, constitutional inquiry, with the following:

- 1) Yes. A minister from another denomination recognized by presbytery as such and duly licensed by presbytery, may serve as a stated supply (*BCO* 19-1, 22-5)
- 2) No. Unless he is a minister in a church with which the PCA had fraternal relations or the presbytery has determined that his view of the sacraments are consistent with the Standards of the PCA.

20-63 Committee of Commissioners on Administration

TE William Henderson, chairman, led in prayer and began the Committee's report. He yielded to TE Paul Gilchrist, stated clerk, who reported on the work of the permanent committee. Also, RE Jerry Kornegay was introduced and reported on the progress of the PCA Historical Center. Recommendations were then acted upon as follows:

I. Business Referred To The Committee

- A. Minutes of the Board of Directors:
June 15, 1991, March 21, 1992, October 15, 1991
- B. Minutes of the Administrative Committee:
June 15, 1991, October 4-5, 1991, March 20-21, 1992,
- C. Responses to Exceptions Taken to Minutes
- D. Overtures 2, 4, and 37
- E. Communication # 2
- F. Recommendations of the Administrative Committee
- G. Personal Resolution #1

II. Statement Of Major Issues Discussed

- A. Church Administration Manual
- B. Responses to Exceptions to Minutes

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- C. Refinancing of the mortgage balance on the PCA office building
- D. The proposed legal audit
- E. Budgets of the Committees and Agencies

III. Minutes Of The Board Of Directors:

- A. Approve the minutes of June 15, 1991 *Adopted*
- B. Approve the minutes of October 5, 1991 *Adopted*
- C. Approve the minutes of March 21, 1992 *Adopted*

IV. Minutes Of The Administrative Committee:

- A. Approve the minutes of June 15, 1991 with notations *Adopted*
- B. Approve the minutes of October 4-5, 1991 with notations *Adopted*
- C. Approve the minutes of March 20-21, 1992 with notations *Adopted*

V. Responses To Exceptions To Minutes

1. The AC respectfully disagrees that the Board of Directors minutes should be excepted. The Minutes of the Board of Directors of 6/6/90 were mistaken by the Committee of Commissioners for the March 16, 1991, minutes which had not been approved. These minutes were corrected at the June 1991 meeting which met concurrently with the Committee of Commissioners on Administration and the correction was so reported to the Committee of Commissioners but was not taken into consideration. The Board recognizes it has no power to amend the Bylaws on its own authority. *Adopted*

NOTE: The original minutes of March 16, 1991, of the Board of Directors need to be corrected and the following comment added: "That the General Assembly does not endorse the phrase 'it was not taken into consideration'."

2. The AC respectfully disagrees that the minutes of 3/15-16/91 call for an exception in item BF-3/91-13. The minutes of 3/15-16/91 reporting the budget amounts are not discrepancies. The budget recommended prior to the committee meeting was in fact changed by the Administrative Committee to incorporate the increase in compensation recommended by the officers of the Committee. Hence the two different figures. This also was reported to the Committee of Commissioners, but was not taken into consideration. *Adopted*

NOTE: The General Assembly does not endorse the phrase "it was not taken into consideration."

3. The GA disapprove response #3. *Adopted*
The Administrative Committee agrees that the AC changed the date of the close of the 19th General Assembly from Friday to Thursday. Within the spirit of their assignment the AC scheduled the close on Thursday for the following reasons: (1) General Assembly has encouraged AC that the docket should be streamlined and made more efficient; (2) the experience of the last two or three years has been that the Assembly did in fact conclude its business earlier than docketed; (3) when preparing a docket the AC is under no mandate to stretch out the business just for the sake of filling time; (4) in the interest of stewardship having a shorter meeting is more economical; (5) historically, the Monday through Friday Assembly period was set to avoid having an Assembly in 2 calendar weeks.

JOURNAL

Grounds: While we appreciate the spirit and desire of the Administrative Committee to promote efficiency, the Administrative Committee has no authority to deviate from the General Assembly's directive.

4. The AC agrees with general exception 2 that we have not completed the "Church Administration Manual." As long as there was litigation against PCA, Inc., we were advised to hold off on this project. Subsequently we have been advised by legal counsel that production of such a manual is not advisable. (See Section III above.) *Adopted*
5. The AC agrees with general exception 3 that no progress report was given on the PCA Logo. The AC will seek to give a progress report to the 20th General Assembly. *Adopted*
6. The AC respectfully disagrees with the general exception 4 regarding the deficit reported in the *Handbook* and the audited statement. The report in the *Handbook* was the unaudited (and therefore not the final corrected) statement. The formal audit was received after the *Handbook* went to press, hence the audited statement is the correct figure in any case. This was reported to the Committee of Commissioners but was not taken into consideration. *Adopted*

NOTE: That the General Assembly does not endorse the phrase "But was not taken into consideration".

VI. Recommendations:

1. That the 20th General Assembly accept the invitation from Mississippi Valley Presbytery to host the 26th General Assembly in 1998 in Jackson, MS, subject to review of the facilities in Jackson for housing, etc. *Adopted*
2. That the 20th General Assembly accept the invitation from Potomac Presbytery to host the 27th General Assembly in Baltimore, MD, in 1999. *Adopted*
3. That the 20th General Assembly accept the invitation from Southwest Florida Presbytery to host the 28th General Assembly in Tampa, FL in the year 2000. *Adopted*
4. That the 20th General Assembly commend the Korean *BCO* translation team for their excellent endeavors namely: Rev. Nah, Sung Kyun, Rev. Kim, Hosea Ju, Rev. Kim, Paul Taek Yong, Dr. Dan Kim of MNA and Dr. Dwight Linton of CE&P. *Adopted*
5. That the 20th General Assembly refer all pending matters relative to the records of the Korean language presbyteries to the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records, in accordance with *MISGA*, 15-96, III, 19, p.207, namely:
 - a. Each Korean presbytery should check its current bylaws or standing rules for conformity to the *BCO*,
 - b. New English translation of each presbytery's rules be submitted to the committee on Review of Presbytery Records,
 - c. Each Korean presbytery should appoint a representative to certify the English translation of all Korean minutes submitted to the Committee on Review (or to serve on the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records to review other Korean minutes). [Note: this latter part has been recommended by the officers of the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records.] *Adopted*
6. The 19th General Assembly received the following **Personal Resolution from TE Albert Moginot, Jr.** and referred it to the Administrative Committee:

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

"Whereas the Rules of Assembly Operation (RAO) is about 25 pages long and is printed for every commissioner every year, resulting in large printing costs and a waste of paper,

Therefore be it resolved that the General Assembly print the RAO on paper that will fit into the looseleaf *BCO*, so they can be saved and used every year and updated as necessary in the same manner that the *BCO* is updated."

Response:

- (a) That the 20th General Assembly authorize the Stated Clerk to produce the Certificate of Incorporation, Bylaws and RAO to be inserted with the *BCO* rather than in the *Handbook for Commissioners*. Copies are to be made available at each General Assembly.
- (b) That the Stated Clerk be instructed not to print these documents in the *Minutes of General Assembly* since they will be updated and printed along with any amendments to the *BCO* following each General Assembly.

Adopted

7. That the 20th General Assembly respond to Overture 2 from Missouri Presbytery "Print RAO to Fit Looseleaf *BCO*" (which is the same as personal resolution from TE Albert Moginot) by reference to recommendation 6 above. *Adopted*

OVERTURE 2 From Missouri Presbytery

"Print RAO to Fit in looseleaf *BCO*"

Whereas, the Rules of Assembly Operation (RAO) is about 25 pages long and is printed for every commissioner every year, resulting in large printing costs and a waste of paper,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the General Assembly print the RAO on paper that will fit into the looseleaf *BCO*, so they can be saved and used every year, and updated as necessary in the same manner that the *BCO* is updated.

Adopted by Missouri Presbytery, at its Spring Meeting, on the 17th day of April 1991.

Attested by: /s/ Albert F. Moginot, Jr.
Stated Clerk

[Received too late for the 19th GA.]

8. That the 20th General Assembly take note that the concerns of Overture 4 from New Jersey Presbytery ["Worship Services at General Assembly"] have been reflected in this year's docket. *Adopted*
9. That the 20th General Assembly answer Overture 4 **in the negative**. *Adopted*

Grounds:

- a. It will unduly limit the time and content of the worship services at General Assembly
- b. The General Assembly, having been assured that the Administrative Committee will not, in the future, instruct a presbytery to omit the preaching of the Word in its worship service, should answer the overture in the negative.
- c. The Administrative Committee assured the 20th General Assembly that all future dockets shall include daily worship services of a minimum of 30 minutes which shall include the preaching of the Word.

JOURNAL

OVERTURE 4 From New Jersey Presbytery "Worship Services at General Assembly"

Whereas, each morning session of the General Assembly has traditionally begun with a worship service, and,

Whereas, these times of worship have been greatly edifying, and

Whereas, the Presbyteries responsible under the rotating system begun many years ago have been informed that they are limited to 15 minutes for their time of worship and that a sermon is not to be included, and,

Whereas, the Westminster Confession of Faith prescribes in 21-5 that "the sound preaching and conscionable hearing of the Word" is part "of the ordinary religious worship of God", and,

Whereas, great benefit has come from the former practice of beginning each day with worship services led in rotation by the various presbyteries with the inclusion of a sermon by a preacher of their choosing, and,

Whereas, the Assembly has not asked that these worship services with sermons be omitted, and,

Whereas, these times of presbytery-led worship with their sermons are too valuable to be omitted, even for the sake of time or of more flamboyant evening services with "name" speakers, and,

Whereas, the Presbytery of New Jersey by the adoption of this resolution directs its Stated Clerk to notify other presbyteries slated to lead morning worship or prayer times of intent to ask that sermons be included in these services,

Therefore, The Presbytery of New Jersey respectfully overtures the Nineteenth General Assembly:

1. to docket 30-45 minutes for worship services including sermons to begin each morning session of the Nineteenth General Assembly, and,
2. to amend RAO 9-3 by inserting after "Worship Services", the words, "including a sermon shall begin each morning session of the Assembly and other worship services" so that the first sentence shall read, "Worship services including a sermon shall begin each morning session of the Assembly and other worship services shall be included as approved by the Assembly."

Adopted by the Presbytery of New Jersey on May 21, 1991.

Attested by: /s/ James A. Smith
Stated Clerk

[Received too late for the 19th GA.]

10. The 19th General Assembly received the following **Personal Resolution from TE Timothy Diehl** and referred it to the Administrative Committee: *Adopted*

"Request clarification for future General Assemblies: (1) a statement as to whether the worship and/or inspirational evening services are a part of the Assembly, and (2) if it is determined that they are a part of the Assembly, that no committee meetings be scheduled/held during the service(s) and that the Administrative Committee report back to the 20th General Assembly."

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Response:

- (a) The docket of the 20th General Assembly has been structured so that the stated worship services during the docketed time of the Assembly are part of the Assembly and committee meetings should not be scheduled for those times. The evening inspirational meetings and other seminars are not considered part of the Assembly docket.
 - (b) The Administrative Committee recommends that this procedure be adopted for future General Assemblies.
11. That the 20th General Assembly respond respectfully to Communication 2 from Westminster Theological Seminary **in the negative.** *Adopted*

Grounds:

There are already several members of the PCA on the Westminster Seminary Board and Faculty and do not see the necessity of adding a non-voting observer.

COMMUNICATION 2 From Westminster Theological Seminary "Appoint Observer to Westminster Theological Seminary Board"

August 2, 1991

The Presbyterian Church in America
Dr. Paul R. Gilchrist, Stated Clerk
1852 Century Place, Suite 190
Atlanta, GA 30345

Dear Dr. Gilchrist:

The Board of Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, at its meeting on May 30, 1991, voted to invite your denomination and each member church of the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council to send an observer to our meetings. Westminster Seminary is an independent institution yet it serves primarily the NAPARC churches. We desire a continued and increased relationship with these churches and see this action as a helpful step in that direction.

The resolution adopted by the Board invites "each participating NAPARC denomination to appoint a formal observer to the two stated meetings of the Board, spring and fall, with the following understandings:

- A. The denomination will fund the observer's travel and lodging expenses
- B. The observer will be granted limited privileges of the floor
- C. The observer would not be permitted to be present at executive sessions
- D. The observer would not have a vote, nor would he be considered a Board Member
- E. The observer would be required to make a formal report to the church he represents in the manner the church desires
- F. The observer would be a teaching or ruling elder."

The next meeting of the Board is December 3-4, 1991. Ordinarily, however, the fall meeting is held on the third Tuesday in November. The spring meeting is held on the Tuesday preceding commencement. In 1992 commencement will take place on May 27th, and therefore the Board will meet on May 26th.

JOURNAL

We hope that you will send an observer to these or future meetings. If you have any questions you may write to me or to the new President of the Seminary, Dr. Samuel T. Logan, Jr.

Cordially,
/s/ George R. Cottenden
Secretary, Board of Trustees

12. That the Administrative Committee be temporarily released from its responsibility of producing a church Administration Manual and that the Administrative Committee make a report on this subject to the 21st General Assembly after receiving results of the legal audit. *Adopted*
13. That the 20th General Assembly express its heartfelt appreciation for the Administrative Committee staff in Atlanta and St. Louis (PCA Historical Center), and that Dr. Paul R. Gilchrist be commended for his good work as Stated Clerk and be elected for another year of service. *Adopted*
14. That the General Assembly approve Robins, Eskew and Farmer, PC as auditors for the Administrative Committee, Christian Education & Publications, and Mission to North America for the calendar year ending December 31, 1992. *Adopted*
15. Approve the Administrative Committee budget for \$994,076, and ASKINGS budget of \$853,626, and approve the PCA Office Building budget for \$620,650. *Adopted*
16. Approve the Covenant College budget for \$9,429,267 and the ASKINGS budget of \$1,309,740. It was noted that the President's salary and benefits exceed the recommended cap for CEO salaries. *Adopted*
17. Approve the Covenant Seminary budget for \$3,298,440 and the ASKINGS budget of \$1,526,740. *Adopted*
18. Approve the PCA Insurance, Annuities & Relief budget for \$751,740. *Adopted*
19. Approve the Investors' Fund for Building and Development budget for \$324,293. *Adopted*

Comment:

The Director's salary and benefits for 1992 and 1993 are provided for a planned position not presently occupied. (TE Cecil Brooks of MNA now provides this leadership). The 1991 budget "actual" reflects the salary and benefits of the Assistant Director.

20. Approve the Mission to North America budget for \$3,458,000 and ASKINGS budget of \$3,111,740. *Adopted*

Comment:

The "Operational Support" increase in the 1993 budget vs. 1992 is \$142,500, a 39.6% increase with no accompanying explanation.

21. Approve the Mission to the World budget for \$16,302,290 and ASKINGS budget of \$15,696,740. *Adopted*

Comments:

- a. The Revised 1992 budget has no Administrative Committee approval.
- b. The Committee of Commissioners sees no need for a separate MTW//IMPACT budget.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The following motion from the floor was *Adopted* at this point:

"In the 1994 MTW Budget to be brought to 21st General Assembly that a new expense category, "Administration", be added, including supporting sub-categories such as but not limited to:

coordinator's salary and benefits; senior staff salaries and benefits; committee meetings; computer services; conferences and meetings; G.A. expense; professional services; occupancy costs (rent, utilities, etc.); telephone; office expense; personnel development; communications; promotions; staff travel; other expenses;

and that MTW report to the 21st General Assembly detailed, actual expenditures which make up the \$2,498,000, or 15%, budgeted for 1993."

22. Approve the MTW/IMPACT budget for \$2,709,390. *Adopted*

Comments:

- a. The Revised 1992 budget has no Administrative Committee approval.
b. The Committee of Commissioners sees no need for a separate MTW/IMPACT budget.

23. Approve the Ridge Haven budget for \$567,315 and ASKINGS budget of \$509,815. *Adopted*

Comments:

- a. Askings are increased by \$112,000 (28.1%) with no accompanying explanation.
b. Revenue from facilities provides only 10.2% of the operating expenses.

24. Approve the PCA Foundation budget for \$400,740. *Adopted*
Comment: The Committee of Commissioners questions whether the finances of the contributing committees and agencies will permit a 45% increase in the committees and agencies support over the actual 1991 amount.

25. Vacated by the Administrative Committee.

26. Approve the Christian Education & Publication budget for \$2,013,097 operating expenditures and ASKINGS of \$1,220,217. But the line item of income entitled "Messenger Support/Subsidy" of \$100,000 (see budget, Attachment 3, Appendix C, pg. 323) is specifically disapproved. The Net Surplus (deficit) for 1993 of \$135,000 is reduced to \$35,000. The budget thus changed becomes the Administrative Committee recommended budget for CE&P in accordance with RAO 4-11. *Adopted*

27. That the 20th General Assembly discontinue policy of 1982, 1988 and 1989 where General Assembly authorized funding of the *Messenger* by undesignated funds, namely: *Adopted*

1982,p. 117,10-90,III,16: *That the General Assembly instruct the PCA Business Administrator to pay for the total printing and postal cost of the Messenger out of the total of undesignated funds given to the General Assembly each month prior to percentage distribution of those funds to the Permanent Committees....*

1988, p. 122, 16-33,III,15: *That whereas, the PCA Messenger is seeking to serve the entire church as a vital part of the PCA's programs; and...*

Therefore, CE&P requests that the General Assembly continue to allow the use of the undesignated funds to assist with the printing and postage of the PCA Messenger, to be reviewed at the 1989 Assembly.

JOURNAL

Therefore, CE&P requests that the General Assembly continue to allow the use of the undesignated funds to assist with the printing and postage of the PCA Messenger, to be reviewed at the 1989 Assembly.

1989, p. 81, 17-47, III, 8: *That the General Assembly continue to allow the use of undesignated funds to help with the cost of publishing the PCA Messenger and that local churches be encouraged by the Assembly, through the Stated Clerk, to participate in the every-family plan subscription.*

28. That the 20th General Assembly require each committee or agency budget to be in the same format as its operating financial statements. *Adopted*
29. That the 20th General Assembly relieve the AC of its responsibility to develop a PCA logo. *Adopted*

Grounds:

- a. An ad interim committee would be too costly and would take a committee slot that could be better used for another purpose.
- b. The Administrative Committee does not think that they can adequately fulfill the mandate to develop a logo.
30. That the 20th General Assembly require all committees and agencies to participate in the Legal Audit Questionnaire. *Adopted*
31. That the 20th General Assembly direct the completion of a Representative Legal Audit Analysis for the PCA, the cost not to exceed \$17,398, which is to be divided equally among the ten committees and agencies. Further, if adopted, that the budgets for committees and agencies be adjusted accordingly. *Adopted*
32. That the 20th General Assembly direct the completion of an on-site representative field legal audit contingent on obtaining designated funding through PCA Foundation or otherwise. The cost is approximately \$10,000. *Adopted*
33. That the 20th General Assembly approve the auditing firm of Ernst & Young to audit Mission to the World and MTW//IMPACT's books of account for the year 1992. *Adopted*
34. That the 20th GA adopt **Personal Resolution #1 from TE William Henderson.**

Adopted

Whereas the budgets of some of the PCA committees and agencies contain explanatory notes, while others do not; and

Whereas some committees and agencies justify the increases in their budgets while others do not; and

Whereas proposed increases and planned expenditures of the budgets do not appear to be realistic for some committees and agencies; and

Whereas assumptions used for the escalation of salaries, benefits, and other expenses vary by committee and agency; and

Whereas the AC has had difficulty exercising its responsibilities delineated in RAO 4-11 due to lack of uniformity and commonality in budgeting procedures for the committees and agencies;

Therefore be it resolved, that the 20th General Assembly direct the AC to recommend budgeting standards for the preparation and evaluation of all committee and agency budgets, and that such recommendations be reported to the 21st General Assembly; and

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Be it further resolved, that the proposed budgeting standards include at least these minimum provisions:

- a) reasonable grounds for increases in the ASKINGS from one year to the next;
 - b) that adequate correlation must exist between the proposed ASKINGS and the ASKINGS received in the last fiscal year; and
 - c) documentation that substantiates the funding included in the proposed budget for any new ministry or activity."
35. That the two Ad-Interim Committees be approved, namely: (1) On Communications (continued under CE&P, see 20-26, p. 80), and (2) On Policy Questions of IAR (see Report of IAR, 20-47, III, 9, p. 94).
36. That the report as a whole be approved. *Adopted*

Commissioners Present:

Presbytery

Ascension
Calvary
Central Carolina
Covenant
Evangel
Grace
Heartland
James River
Louisiana
Mississippi Valley
Missouri
North Georgia
North Texas
Northeast

Northern Illinois
Potomac
Southeast Alabama
Southern Florida
Susquehanna Valley
Tennessee Valley
Warrior
Westminster

Members

TE Robert C. Peterson
RE Wilbur D. Livingston
TE S. Scott Willet
TE William Rose
RE Tom Leopard, Secretary
TE Norman A. Bagby, Jr.
TE David L. Burke
TE Howard Griffith
RE Dale Peacock
RE James Elkin
TE S. Michael Preg, Jr.
TE John Batusic
TE David A. Sherwood
TE William S. Henderson,
Chairman
TE Bruce W. Dunn
RE Phil Fanara, Jr.
RE W. Jack Williamson
RE Blair R. LittleJohn
TE John MacRae
RE Terry L. Futrell
TE William L. Gleason
TE Ben Konopa

20-64 Worship

The Assembly moved to the order of the day for worship under the direction of Mid-America Presbytery.

Organ Prelude: *"When Morning Gilds The Skies"*
Choral Introit: *"O Daughter, Hear and Heed"*
Covenant Singers

Innes & Fasig
Psalm 45

JOURNAL

Call to Worship: TE Mike Obel
Prayer of Adoration, Confession and Invocation:
TE Craig Weaver
Hymn: *"In Sweet Communion, Lord With Thee"* No. 657
Scripture: Song of Solomon 2:8-13
RE O'Dell
Sermon: *"The Call of the Beloved"*
TE John Owen Butler
Prayer of Application: RE Fred Muse
Hymn: *"Come Away to the Skies"* No. 723
RE Lyle Fogel
Benediction: TE Mike Obel
Organ Postlude: *"March in D Major"* *Guilmant*

20-65 Recess

Following worship the Assembly recessed for lunch at 12:15 p.m.

MINUTES--THURSDAY AFTERNOON

June 18, 1992

Seventh Session

20-66 Assembly Reconvened

The Assembly reconvened at 1:30 p.m. Wednesday afternoon with the singing of *"Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty"* and prayer led by TE Mac Gray.

20-67 Committee on Constitutional Business

TE Rod Mays, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's report. These items were on motion received and ordered spread upon the minutes:

1. Response Of The Committee On Constitutional Business To The Constitutional Inquiry From Dr. Morton H. Smith:

"Whereas (WCF 31-3) reads:

"All synods or councils, since the apostles times, whether general or particular, may err; and many have erred. Therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith, or practice; but to be used as a help in both.", which means that all church members should be guided by the latest action of an Assembly on a subject.

Since the report of the SJC comes to the floor of the General Assembly without any provision for questions or discussions, which means that only a small group of the Assembly has any input into the report, does the SJC have authority to propose a decision to the Assembly which contradicts the action of a previous General Assembly? If so, should this not be open to debate by the Assembly?"

Response:

1. Yes, the Standing Judicial Commission (SJC) does have authority in the adjudication of a case to propose a decision which is different or contradicts an action of a previous Assembly.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

"All synods or councils, since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err; and many have erred. Therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith, or practice; but to be used as a help in both."
(WCF 31-3)

2. No, the decision of the Standing Judicial Commission is not debatable. However, the General Assembly may refer, (a debatable motion), any strictly constitutional issue(s) to a study committee. (BCO 15-15)

2. Response To Constitutional Inquiry By TE Roy Taylor:

"What is the force of an action of a court which is contrary to the constitution of the church? Specifically, may a court take exception contrary to BCO 40-3 to a lower courts' actions while the matter is under judicial process of complaint or appeal? If so, what is the force of such unconstitutional decisions? If not, is the exception taken through review and control null and void?"

Response: The committee on constitutional business provides the following advice on the inquiry:

No. Proceedings in judicial cases shall not be dealt with under review and control when notice of appeal has been given to the lower court. (BCO 40-3) An exception pertaining to a lower courts' actions is not to be "dealt with" until the judicial process is complete. The language of the BCO does not prohibit Review and Control from noting what it believes to be an exception, but no action can be taken by the higher court until final judgement has been rendered in the judicial case.

The effect of an alleged unconstitutional action by a court shall be suspended when an appeal is entered (BCO 42-6) and may be suspended by action of the court when a complaint is entered (BCO 43-4).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rod Mays, Chairman

/s/ Granville Dutton, Acting Scty.

20-68 Constitutional Inquiry

TE Grover Dunn presented a constitutional inquiry which was received and referred to the Committee on Constitutional Business (see text and action 20-75, p. 267).

20-69 Standing Judicial Commission

TE Robert Ferguson, chairman, led in prayer in beginning his report. He reported that the stated clerk has verified that the Commission's report had been sent out the required thirty days prior to the beginning of the Assembly. Further, he reported that a separate packet had been sent to all clerks of sessions not sending commissioners to the 20th General Assembly. He also explained the procedure mandated by the Assembly for presentation of this report. The report is as follows:

**STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION REPORT
TO THE 20TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA**

I. INTRODUCTION

Your Standing Judicial Commission held two meetings of the full Commission: one "face to face" meeting on March 6-7, 1992 [which was attended by twenty three (23) members] and one telephone meeting on April 22, 1992 [in which sixteen (16) members participated].

II. JUDICIAL CASES

1. Case 91-1 Sandra Lovelace vs. Northeast Presbytery
2. Case 91-2 Bruce Nicholey *et. al.* vs. Southwest Presbytery
3. Case 91-3 Daniel R. Morse vs. Covenant Presbytery
4. Case 91-4 Robert D. Hopper vs. James River Presbytery
5. Case 91-5 Herman Gunter, III, *et. al.* vs. Central Florida Presbytery
6. Case 91-6 Sandra Lovelace vs. Northeast Presbytery (Second Case)
7. Case 91-7 W. Austin Kenly vs. Potomac Presbytery
8. Case 92-1 Frank J. Smith vs. Northeast Presbytery
9. Case 92-2 Virgil Roberts vs. New River Presbytery
10. Case 92-3 Richard E. Olson *et. al.* vs. Heritage Presbytery
11. Case 92-4 William A. Conrad, *et al.* vs. Central Carolina Presbytery

In accordance with the operation manual, with the exception of Cases 92-3 and 92-4, each of the above cases was first submitted to a Judicial Panel for hearing and recommended judgment. It was then submitted to each member of the Standing Judicial Commission along with the recommended judgment and decision of the Judicial Panel. The judgment of the Judicial Panel was approved by vote of the full Commission in every case by an almost unanimous vote (see individual cases). Once a judgment of the Judicial Panel is confirmed by a vote of the full Commission, such a judgment cannot be altered without a rehearing of the case by the full Commission (Manual 12.6).

Case 91-5 Herman Gunter, III., and Donald Monroe vs. Central Florida Presbytery was argued before the full Commission. No oral argument before the full Commission was granted in any other case. Request for hearing before the full commission was requested by a party in Case 91- 4; but the request failed to receive the required votes of at least four (4) Commission members and was thus denied.

Under the operation Manual, the reasoning and opinion of a decision may be revised at the full Commission meetings with minor language revisions. However, more substantive revision of a decision may only be made by a 2/3 vote of those members present and voting, or with the concurrence of a majority of the Judicial Panel. The reasoning and opinion sections of each decision were reviewed by the full Commission.

As was our experience last year, we saw again this year the Spirit of God working during our full Commission meetings. While a wide diversity of opinions was expressed and discussions were open and full, we always came to conclusions which met the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

approval of almost every member. It was a real blessing to see brothers work in the unity of the Spirit.

As of April 22, 1992 the following is the status of the only cases pending before the Standing Judicial Commission:

1. Case 91-6 Sandra Lovelace vs. Northeast Presbytery (Second Case)
2. Case 92-1 Frank J. Smith vs. Northeast Presbytery

Status:

As these two cases were similar to each other and from the same Presbytery one Judicial Panel was appointed late in 1991. The Panel has been assembling the record of the cases and seeking to clarify issues. The Panel is expected to hear the cases before the 20th General Assembly but the Panel's decisions and judgments are not expected to be finalized in time for consideration by the 20th General Assembly.

3. Case 92-2 Virgil Roberts vs. New River Presbytery

Status:

A Judicial Panel was appointed and is expected to hear this case before the 20th General Assembly. However, the Panel's decision and judgment is not expected to be finalized in time for consideration by the 20th General Assembly.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

We, therefore, make the following recommendations regarding these judicial cases:

1. **That the findings in the case of Sandra Lovelace vs. Northeast Presbytery (SJC Docket 91-1) be confirmed.** *Adopted*

**SANDRA LOVELACE
VS.
NORTHEAST PRESBYTERY**

JUDICIAL CASE 91-1

I. A. Statement of the Facts

Relevant facts in the above complaint are as follows:

1. That on October 11, 1990, Sandra Lovelace in a letter to Dr. Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Church in America, offered a complaint against an alleged action of the Northeast Presbytery at its stated meeting of May 11-12, 1990.
2. That on January 23, 1991, Sandra Lovelace in a letter to Dr. Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Church in America, offered a complaint against an alleged action of the Northeast Presbytery at its stated meeting of January 11-12, 1991.

JOURNAL

II. A Statement of the Issues

1. Does the letter of October 11, 1990 from Sandra Lovelace to Dr. Paul Gilchrist constitute a complaint that is administratively and judicially in order?
2. Does the letter of January 23, 1991 from Sandra Lovelace to Dr. Paul Gilchrist constitute a complaint that is administratively and judicially in order?

III. Disposition of the Case

1. The letter of October 11, 1990 from Sandra Lovelace to Dr. Paul Gilchrist does not constitute a complaint that is administratively and judicially in order.
2. The letter of January 23, 1991 from Sandra Lovelace to Dr. Paul Gilchrist does not constitute a complaint that is administratively and judicially in order.

IV. Reasoning

1. The letter of October 11, 1990 was judged to be administratively and judicially out of order because it did not meet the requirements set down in the *Book of Church Order* for a complaint. *BCO* 43-2 requires that a "complaint shall first be made to the court whose act or decision is alleged to be in error." The letter of October 11, 1990 makes reference to "Complaints [that] were filed on June 2 and 9, 1990" that the presbytery failed to act upon. The two letters that were sent to Northeast Presbytery dated June 2 and 9, 1990 were not complaints but simply letters. The letter of June 2 simply asks a series of questions concerning an oral report to the May 11-12, 1990, meeting of Northeast Presbytery. The letter of June 9 is in reference to the same report and Mrs. Lovelace in the letter says that she wants to "communicate a concern" and does not say that she desired to file a complaint. The contents of the oral report, about which the letter is concerned, did not become part of the records of presbytery.
2. The letter dated January 23, 1991 was judged to be administratively and judicially out of order because it did not meet the requirements set down in the *Book of Church Order* for a complaint. *BCO* 43-3 requires that "[w]ritten notice of complaint, together with supporting reasons, shall be filed with both the clerk of the lower court and the clerk of the higher court within thirty (30) days following the meeting of the lower court." Complainant's letter of January 23, 1991, contains no supporting reasons for the complaint. At the January 11-12, 1991, meeting of the Northeast Presbytery, the presbytery acted upon complainant's complaint, set forth in her letter of October 13, 1990, to the stated clerk of the presbytery, although the presbytery was not required to do so by *BCO* 43-1. The presbytery ruled not to sustain any of the four specifications of error. In her letter of January 23, 1991, the complainant offered no supporting reasons to show how presbytery allegedly erred in not sustaining her specifications of error. Secondly, the specifications of error listed in complainant's complaint of October 13, 1990, do not constitute as "act or decision" of Northeast Presbytery and, therefore, are not complainable actions.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

We the undersigned, LeRoy H. Ferguson, III, Harrison Brown and John W. Lane, the Judicial Panel duly appointed to hear the above captioned case, hereby submit our unanimous decision thereon.

/s/ LeRoy H. Ferguson, III	11/1/91
/s/ Harrison Brown	11/7/91
/s/ John W. Lane	11/5/91

V. Voting on Proposed Disposition:

APPROVED by SJC: 20-0

2. That the judgment in the case of Bruce Nickoley and David Stephens vs. Southwest Presbytery (SJC Docket 91-2) be approved. *Adopted*

**BRUCE NICKOLEY AND DAVID STEPHENS
VS
SOUTHWEST PRESBYTERY
JUDICIAL CASE NO. 91-2**

I. A. Statement of the Facts

The Complainants in this Case are complaining against the action taken by the Southwest Presbytery at its January 31, 1991 and February 1, 1991 meeting which adopted a report of a Presbytery Commission concerning Covenant Presbyterian Church of Wheat Ridge, CO.

The Presbytery had appointed this Commission at its September 26 and 27, 1990 meeting with the following powers (R.C.p.24):

"MSC with the concurrence of the Judicial Business Committee that a Commission be appointed to adjudicate the charges against RE Rob Farrington and RE Gary Flye of Covenant PC-Wheatridge (sp). (The J.B.C. concurred. The word "adjudicate" was intended to mean that commission was to investigate the charges and proceed with trial if they determined the charges had substance.)"

"MSC that the Commission have the power to dissolve the Pastoral relationship beteen Covenant PC, Wheatridge (sp) and TE Mike Pollock, which would include the authority to call a congregational meeting to reconsider the action of the previous congregational meeting to dissolve the Pastoral relationship."

"MSC that Presbytery suspend the jurisdiction of the Session of Covenant PC, Wheatridge (Sp), until the two above matters be settled and that the Commission assume oversight of the congregation."

JOURNAL

Previous to this meeting of Presbytery, the Congregation of Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge met on September 8, 1990. The Congregation voted to:

"ask Presbytery to dissolve the relationship between Pastor Mike Pollock and this congregation with Pastor's salary and benefits being paid until the end of 1990 or until he secures other employment, which ever occurs first." (R.C. p. 80)

After this congregational meeting, the minister of Covenant PC, TE Mike Pollock, and a member of the congregation, Mr David Stephens, presented written charges against two of the three ruling elders of Covenant PC; RE Rob Farrington (R.C.p.32) and RE Gary Flye (R.C. p. 78). Both sets of charges were dated September 18, 1991 and both sets of charges were identical; that each ruling elder had violated his ordination vows (*BCO* 24-5, #4, 5 & 6) and thereby violated the ninth commandment. The Complainants argued that this constituted a dereliction of duty to strive for the peace, unity and purity of the church, and that this constituted a failure to be in subjection to the brethren. The charges were not addressed to the Presbytery but were presented to the Presbytery after the Congregational meeting.

In addition to presenting these charges, TE Mike Pollock and Mr David Stephens, by letter dated September 20, 1991 (R.C. p. 4) personally requested the Southwest Presbytery to "assume original jurisdiction in all matters pertaining to judicial process against Ruling Elders Rob Farrington and Gary Flye." They asserted that their request was made pursuant to the provisions of *BCO* 31.1.

At no time did the congregation nor the Session of Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO., ask for, nor give its consent for, the Southwest Presbytery to assume original jurisdiction in the case of the charges against its two ruling elders. At no time did the congregation nor the Session request the Southwest Presbytery to act as a "Session pro tem" for Covenant Church.

At the end of the September 1990 meeting of Southwest Presbytery, the Commission appointed at that Presbytery meeting convened to elect officers and to appoint TE Bruce Nickoley as prosecutor of the charges against the two ruling elders.

The Commission met again on October 3, 1990 and began acting as the "Session pro tem" of Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO. While the Commission had appointed a Prosecutor, it did not begin formal prosecution, rather it began, as is required by the *BCO*, to investigate the charges against the two ruling elders. It also sought to carry out those aspects of its mandate which related to seeking reconciliation between all the parties.

Between September and October 1990 the Commission met a number of times and its minutes record that it was not until October 22 (R.C. p. 40) that it focused direct attention on the formal charges against the ruling elders. While the Commission seems to have accepted the charges at their face value, the Commission set up a series of meetings with the express purposes of seeking reconciliation without judicial process.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

During this period of investigation, the two elders of Covenant Church, Wheat Ridge, CO sought and obtained advice from the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly concerning the question of whether or not a Presbytery had a right under the *BCO* to "assume original jurisdiction" over a local Session and Church. The Stated Clerk, by letter addressed to RE Rob Farrington and dated October 26, 1991 (R.C. 46 ff), quoted from the statement of issues prepared by the Judicial Panel of the Standing Judicial Commission in Case 90-4 (C. E. Chappell vs. East Carolina Presbytery). He then summarized the reasoning and opinion of the Panel in Judicial Case 90-4. Copies of this letter were sent by the Stated Clerk to the Presbytery's Commission.

Upon receipt of the details of the Judicial Panel decision in the Chappell Case, the elders of Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO., advised the Presbytery Commission and the Presbytery that they were re-asserting their right to retain original jurisdiction in all matters concerning the running of their Church.

The Presbytery's Commission met on October 20, 22, 26 and 29, 1991 and reviewed its actions in the light of the responses of the parties and in the light of the advice they had received following the Chappell Case.

The commission already had heard the arguments of the two original Complainants in this case. They had argued before the Presbytery Commission, as the Complainants did before this Panel, that a set of documents prepared by RE Farrington and RE Flye on or about September 11, 1990 contained substantial false accusations, as well as what they believed were lies, about TE Pollock. These documents had been prepared at the request of the Officers and Churches Committee of the Southwest Presbytery and outlined what the ruling elders understood to be the difficult situation at Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO. The Complainants also contended that these documents contained sufficient data in themselves to warrant a finding of "a strong presumption of guilt" and thus the judicial hearing of the charges.

The Commission, when they became aware of the Chappell Case began reviewing their actions and authority. The Commission formally noted that great caution needed to be exercised in these proceedings and in relation to the charges against the two ruling elders. Their concern for caution was expressed not only because they had yet to determine whether there was a "strong presumption of guilt" but also because they seemed as yet to be uncertain about the requirements for sustaining the particular charges which had been made and about the nature of their jurisdiction in this matter (R.C. pp. 40 - 45).

In part, their uncertainty arose, according to their records, because the charges against the two ruling elders had been prepared by TE Pollock and Mr Stephens before the September 1990 Congregation meeting but had not been lodged until after the Complainants had seen the outcome of the September 1990 Congregational vote, a vote which decided to request the Presbytery to dissolve the pastoral relationship between TE Pollock and the Covenant PC (R.C. p. 44).

After considering the Chappell Case the Presbytery Commission recommended to the January 31 and February 1, 1991 of the Southwest Presbytery:

JOURNAL

- a. that the Presbytery "no longer assumes oversight of the congregation",
- b. that the Presbytery acknowledge "it acted in an unconstitutional manner by suspending the jurisdiction of the Session",
- c. that the Commission withdraw the charges against the two ruling elders,
- d. that the Presbytery, in accordance with the expressed wishes of the Congregation, dissolve the pastoral relationship between TE Mike Pollock and Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO.

The Complainants at the January 31 and February 1, 1991 Presbytery meeting were TE Mike Pollock (the minister at Covenant PC), TE Bruce Nickoley (the minister who had previously been appointed by the Presbytery Commission to be the Prosecutor of the charges against the two ruling elders), and Mr David Stephens (R.C. pp. 60-61). Shortly after first lodging their complaint with the Presbytery, TE Mike Pollock transferred his ministerial credentials to another denomination. Thus the Complainants before the SJC come from TE Bruce Nickoley and Mr David Stephens.

The Complainants complained about the following matters:

1. dismissing the charges against Ruling Elders Farrington and Flye,
2. dissolving the pastoral relationship between TE Pollock and Covenant PC, and
3. rescinding the action of Presbytery to suspend the Session at Covenant.

II. A Statement of the Issues

1. Did the Southwest Presbytery correctly determine that it does not have constitutional authority and power to suspend, either temporarily or permanently, the Session of Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO., without the consent of the congregation and without due process?
2. Did the Southwest Presbytery correctly determine that it did not have constitutional authority and power to constitute itself, or appoint a Commission, to act as a "Session pro tem" for the Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO.?
3. Did the Southwest Presbytery correctly withdraw the charges it was considering against RE Rob Farrington and RE Gary Flye?
4. Did the Southwest Presbytery correctly dissolve the pastoral relationship between TE Mike Pollock and Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO.?

III. Judgment of the Case

After consideration of the Complaint, it is the judgement of the Standing Judicial Commission that the Complaint should not be sustained and that the decisions of the Southwest Presbytery should be affirmed as follows:

1. The *Book of Church Order* of the Presbyterian Church in America does not give a Presbytery constitutional authority and power to suspend, either temporarily or permanently, the Session of a local church without the consent of the congregation and without due process. Thus the Southwest Presbytery correctly determined, as it had not received formal and official consent from the congregation of the Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO., that the Presbytery

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- did not have constitutional authority or power to suspend the Session of Covenant PC.
2. Because the Presbytery does not have the constitutional authority or power to replace, suspend or act as a "Session pro tem" for a Session of a church without the prior formal consent of the congregation of that Church, the Southwest Presbytery correctly determined that it did not have constitutional authority and power to constitute itself, or its Commission, to act at any time as a "Session pro tem" for the Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO.
 3. *BCO* 31-1 places original jurisdiction over the charges made against ruling elders Farrington and Flye with the Session of Covenant PC. The Southwest Presbytery had no constitutional authority to assume original jurisdiction over charges which must be brought before that Session. Thus the Southwest Presbytery correctly withdrew from any consideration of the charges against RE Rob Farrington and RE Gary Flye. Jurisdiction over these charges first rests with the Session of Covenant PC. It is only after that Session has in some way considered or has in some way failed to consider the charges that complaints or appeals may be brought to the Presbytery under the *BCO* (e.g. under *BCO* 33-1).
 4. As TE Mike Pollock no longer is a minister in the Presbyterian Church of America the question of reversing the action of the Presbytery in approving the dissolution of the pastoral relationship is moot. This was agreed by the parties to this case. However, it may be noted that the Southwest Presbytery acted correctly to dissolve the pastoral relationship between TE Mike Pollock and Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO. The Presbytery received from the congregation of Covenant PC a request that the Presbytery dissolve the pastoral relationship between it and TE Pollock and once they, in accordance with the *BCO*, had exercised their discretion to determine that such a request came out of a valid congregational vote, they indeed acted correctly to dissolve that relationship.

IV. Reasoning and Opinion

In relation to the first three issues in this case, the Standing Judicial Commission sees the principles set out by the Commission in Case 90-4 (C. E. Chappell vs. East Carolina Presbytery) as being at the heart of this case.

First, in relation to a Presbytery having constitutional authority and power to suspend, either temporarily or permanently, the Session of a church, the SJC affirmed in the Chappell Case what it saw as a long standing principle of Presbyterian polity, a principle which it saw as affirmed by the *BCO* when read in the light of the Preface to the *BCO*, that our polity and *BCO* does "not give a presbytery the authority and power to suspend members of a Session without the consent of the congregation and without due process", where due process is appropriate. (*M19GA*, Exhibit B, IV, 2; page 492).

In the Chappell Case a Commission of the East Carolina Presbytery suspended the Session of the Fuller Memorial Presbyterian Church in Durham, NC. In that case the Commission found this action to be unconstitutional.

JOURNAL

The principle applied in the Chappell Case applies in this case. The Southwest Presbytery correctly determined, as it had not received formal and official consent from the congregation of the Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO., that the Presbytery did not have constitutional authority or power to suspend the Session of Covenant PC.

Secondly, in relation to the constitutional authority and power of a Presbytery to constitute itself, or appoint a Commission, to act as a "Session pro tem" for a local church, the Commission affirmed in the Chappell Case that there is "no provision for a 'Session pro tem' in the BCO of the Presbyterian Church in America (BCO 11-4) or for officers to be placed in authority over a congregation without its consent" (M19GA, Exhibit B, IV, 4; page 492).

In the Chappell Case the Presbytery had purposed to act for the local Church as a "Session pro tem" and the Commission found this action to be unconstitutional.

Because the Presbytery does not have the constitutional authority or power to replace, suspend or act as a "Session pro tem" for a Session of a church without the prior formal consent of the congregation of that Church, the Southwest Presbytery correctly determined that it did not have constitutional authority and power to constitute itself, or its Commission, to act as a "Session pro tem" for the Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO.

Thirdly, in relation to the question of whether the Southwest Presbytery correctly withdrew the charges it was considering against RE Rob Farrington and RE Gary Flye, the Commission must first decide what is the effect of actions and decisions taken by a resbytery or taken by its Commission when purporting to act as a "Session pro tem" for a local Church without constitutional authority.

In the Chappell Case the Commission decided that officers whose resignations had been accepted by the alleged "Session pro tem" had not been validly accepted and were thus still elders of the church in full standing (M19GA, Exhibit B, IV, 4; page 492). Thus it is not possible for the Southwest Presbytery or for its Commission to validly act for the Session of Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO in any matter which constitutionally remains a part of that Session's jurisdiction.

Thus, the Southwest Presbytery at no time properly acted as the Session of Covenant PC.

As BCO 31-1 places original jurisdiction over the charges made against ruling elders Farrington and Flye with the Session of Covenant PC., the Southwest Presbytery, at no time, had constitutional authority to assume original jurisdiction over charges which must be brought before that Session. Thus the charges were at no time validly before the Presbytery or its Commission, and thus the Southwest Presbytery correctly withdrew from any consideration of the charges against RE Rob Farrington and RE Gary Flye.

Jurisdiction over charges made against all members, other than Teaching Elders, first rests with the Session of the Church of which they are members. It is only after

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

that Session has in some way wrongly considered or has in some way failed to consider the charges that complaints or appeals may be brought to the Presbytery under the *BCO* (e.g. under *BCO* 33-1).

Presbyteries should exercise great care before attempting in anyway to exercise the jurisdiction of a Session. It is not possible for that which is done without constitutional authority to be valid. Actions and decisions taken by a Presbytery, or by one of its Commissions, when purporting to act as "Session pro tem" without Constitutional authority are of no effect. Presbyteries which purport to act as a "Session pro tem" do so at the risk of being liable financially and otherwise for actions taken on their behalf without Constitutional authority.

Fourthly, in relation to the question of whether the Southwest Presbytery correctly dissolve the pastoral relationship between TE Mike Pollock and Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO., the Commission noted that all the parties involved agreed that as TE Mike Pollock no longer is a minister in the Presbyterian Church of America the question of reversing the action of the Presbytery in approving the dissolution of the pastoral relationship is moot.

However, despite the fact that the pastor did not request that the pastoral relation be dissolved, it may be noted that the Southwest Presbytery acted correctly to dissolve the pastoral relationship between TE Mike Pollock and Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO. The Presbytery received from the congregation of the Covenant PC a request that the Presbytery dissolve the pastoral relationship between it and TE Pollock and once they, in accordance with the *BCO*, had exercised their discretion to determine that such a request came out of a valid congregational vote, they indeed acted correctly to dissolve that relationship.

While a previous Judicial Case (Cooke Lewis *et. al.* vs Grace Presbytery, *M9GA* (1981) 9-76, p. 150) may be read as indicating that a Presbytery has a wide discretionary power under *BCO* 23-1, the discretion given to a Presbytery under *BCO* 23-1 does not give a Presbytery power to prevent the implementation of a valid decision of a congregation.

This case was heard by the Commission at Village Seven Presbyterian Church in Colorado Springs on May 30, 1991 a little over two month after the case was lodged with the SJC. We wish to thank the Pastor and Staff of the Village Seven Presbyterian Church and the parties to this case for their co-operation in facilitating this case being heard in a timely manner.

We also commend the Southwest Presbytery for the long hours and sincere effort they made in seeking to find a way to bring all the parties to a reconciled position. In addition we commend the Southwest Presbytery for their acting quickly to bring their actions into conformity with the polity of the Presbyterian Church in America.

We pray that the parties will work together to rebuild relationships within the Southwest Presbytery and within Covenant PC, Wheat Ridge, CO.

JOURNAL

We, the undersigned, William N. Brown, II, Robert M. Ferguson, and John E. Spencer, the Judicial Panel duly appointed to hear the above captioned case, hereby submit our unanimous decision thereon.

Heard May 30, 1991 and signed this 13th day of June, 1991.

/s/ William N. Brown, II,
/s/ Robert M. Ferguson, and
/s/ John E. Spencer

V. Voting on Proposed Disposition:
APPROVED by SJC: 23-0, 1 disqualified.

COMPLAINANT'S BRIEF

JUDICIAL CASE 91-2

Judicial Panel
Dr. Robert M Ferguson, Chairman
Churches Vitalized West
716 Douglas Street
Bakersfield, CA 93308

May 19, 1991

Brothers:

We request that the complaint of Bruce D. Nickoley, T.E. and David R. Stephens against the Presbytery of the Southwest, dated February 27, 1991, be found in order and upheld for the following reasons:

Regarding the dismissal of charges against Ruling Elders Rob Farrington and Gary Flye:

- A. Process not in accordance with *BCO* 31-2, 32-3 (see paragraph 1 of complaint dated February 27, 1991).
- B. Of greater importance, process stopped by the commission upon irrelevant grounds (re: Judicial Case 91-2, p. 51, #2, paragraphs a., b., c., and d.).
 1. Malicious intent irrelevant to the charges.
 2. Written documents represent proof of the sins of slander and gossip - intent irrelevant.
 3. Said Judicial Case, p. 75, is libelous regardless of manner of origination and regardless of public/private distinction made as the document was presented to a committee of Presbytery.
 4. Evidence of the charges is based primarily on written documents (refer to personal confession, p. 35 and chronology, pp. 66 - 77 of Judicial Case 91-2), rather than upon personal conversations.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ David R. Stephens for
Bruce D. Nickoley
David R. Stephens

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

JUDICIAL CASE 91-2

Judicial Panel
Dr. Robert M. Ferguson, Chairman
Churches Vitalized West
716 Douglas Street
Bakersfield, CA 93308

May 14, 1991

NOTE: The Addendum referred to herein is the document entitled, "JUDICIAL CASE 91-2, COMPLAINT, BRUCE NICKOLEY, et. al. vs. SOUTHWEST PRESBYTERY, STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION, FEBRUARY, 1991," and is a part of this Brief. This document is already in the hands of the Judicial Panel of the General Assembly Standing Judicial Commission.

BROTHERS:

The Presbytery of the Southwest requests that the COMPLAINT AGAINST THE ACTION OF PRESBYTERY, dated February 27, 1991, and brought by Bruce D. Nickoley, TE, and Mr. David Stephens, be found judicially NOT IN ORDER for the following reasons:

I. REGARDING THE COMPLAINTS THEMSELVES

A. RE: Dismissing the charges against Ruling Elders Rob Farrington and Gary Flye.

This complaint, brought by ex-PCA Pastor TE Michael Pollock at the February 1, 1991 meeting of the Presbytery, was referred to the Presbytery Judicial Committee, TE Richard Fite, Chairman. The Presbytery upheld the Committee's motion to deny.

1. TE Nickoley and Mr. Stephens complain that "charges were instituted after instituting process, appointing a prosecutor, serving the indictments and setting the trial date" and that this is a "violation of the order outlined in BCO 31-2 and 32-3."

This is not a violation of the order outlined in BCO 31-2 & 32- 3. In re: BCO 31-2, the Commission which had been hastily appointed in the last 30 minutes of a two day meeting of Presbytery had in its hands only the charges which had been presented by TE Michael Pollock and Mr. David Stephens. It is likewise true that a trial date was set to inform both parties of the necessity of preparing and answering charges if it came to that point.

It is not true that "the commission reversed itself and decided to conduct an initial investigation a full four weeks after the indictments were issued." As a matter of fact, the Commission had decided from the beginning to proceed with trying to effect a dialogue and reconciliation between the parties while investigating if the charges indeed had sufficient weight of evidence to bring to final trial.

In re: the charges that "Pressure was exerted on all parties concerned from members of presbytery and General Assembly to not proceed to trial," we, as members of the Presbytery of the Southwest, do not succumb to pressure, either pro or con to the situation at hand, to make decisions of such import as to affect the destiny of either one of our Pastors or a Church of our denomination based on opinions of those who are not most intimately familiar with all sides of the matter. We do, however, reserve the right to obtain the counsel of mature brothers in any matter to enable the best decisions, as did those bringing charges.

As to BCO 32-3, the Commission believed it to be appropriate to establish a trial date even while working toward a dialogue and reconciliation between parties. Having been appointed during the last minutes of the Presbytery meeting, we felt it necessary to do those things necessary to begin to "adjudicate the charges" against the two Ruling Elders.

JOURNAL

2. TE Nickoley and Mr. Stephens complain that the "primary case document was ruled inadmissible, though it met all the rules of evidence according to BCO 35: 3".

The document" referred to is an eleven page "Chronology" (see addendum, pp. 67-77) which was given in confidence (Addendum, p. 66) to the Chairman of the Presbytery Officers and Churches (O & C) Committee by the Two Ruling Elders to document what they saw as the cause of the problems at the Wheatridge Church. Further the document had been requested by the Chairman (not originally offered by the two Ruling Elders) to expedite the work of the O & C Committee to "avoid generalities and to deal in specifics" according to the O & C Committee Chairman, TE Arthur Ames.

Further, the Commission and the Presbytery do not agree with the Complainants that this "Chronology" is "corroborative evidence "under BCO 35-3.

3. TE Nickoley and Mr. Stephens complain that "While the Commission publicly and unanimously concluded that there was not a strong presumption of guilt, privately some of the commission members acknowledged their belief to the contrary."

While it is acknowledged that there was/is sin manifested somewhere, else there would not have been division in the Church, there is no private or corporate belief that there was a strong presumption of guilt of the Elders toward the end of the adjudication process.

This complaint is based on hearsay and misunderstanding from private conversations on the part of TE Nickoley and should be ruled inadmissible.

4. TE Nickoley and Mr. Stephens complain that "Failure to properly adjudicate these charges has resulted in an improper dissolution of the pastoral relationship in that it was not brought about in Christian love and good order on the part of the parties concerned." BCO 23-1."

It is pure assumption and opinion on the part of TE Nickoley and Mr. Stephens that the Commission and Presbytery have failed to adjudicate properly the charges. The Commission diligently listened to and studiously considered all the evidence, from both sides, that was placed before it. They, on the other hand, heard and considered only their own.

B. Re: Dissolving the pastoral relationship between TE Pollock and Covenant.

This complaint, brought by ex-PCA Pastor TE Michael Pollock at the February 1, 1991 meeting of the Presbytery, was referred to the Presbytery Judicial Committee, TE Richard Fite Chairman. The Presbytery upheld the Committee's motion to deny.

TE Nickoley and Mr. Stephens complain that "Failure to properly adjudicate these charges has resulted in an improper dissolution of the pastoral relationship in that it was not brought about in Christian love and good order on the part of the parties concerned (BCO 23-1)."

The dissolution of the pastoral relationship had nothing to do with the adjudication of the charges. It is true that the dissolution did not take place until after adjudication, but that was to allow TE Pollock to be properly supported until the case had been settled and a proper severance could be negotiated. It was, in fact, unanimously held that his ministry at Covenant was finished due to the congregational vote to dismiss.

There was nothing judicially improper in the called congregational meeting of September 8, 1990 which was moderated by TE Richard Fite and overseen by a subcommittee of the O & C Committee, and in which the Congregation voted 27 to 17 to request Presbytery to sustain the dissolution of the pastoral relationship. In an earlier vote, the motion to retain TE Pollock as pastor failed in a 23 to 23 tie. The Commission simply acted in compliance with the request of the Wheatridge Church after the charges against the Ruling Elders had been adjudicated.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Complainants further alleged in their charges against the Ruling Elders that they had allowed discriminatory and disparaging comments to be made about TE Pollock during the Congregational meeting where the vote to dissolve was taken, whereas it was the Presbytery O & C Subcommittee that allowed the rather open, free discussion from both sides so that the situation which brought about the request to dissolve the pastoral relationship could be known. This 'open discussion' was in accordance with the terms of the call of the meeting. There were charges and countercharges from both sides of the controversy such that, in the opinion of the subcommittee, no one could point to anyone else and charge them with any wrong doing that had not been done by all -- if it indeed could be classed as wrong-doing.

C. Re: Rescinding the action of Presbytery to suspend the Session of Covenant.

This complaint, brought by ex-PCA Pastor TE Michael Pollock at the February 1, 1991 meeting of the Presbytery, was referred to the Presbytery Judicial Committee, TE Richard Fite Chairman. The Presbytery upheld the Committee's motion to deny.

TE Nickoley and Mr. Stephens complain that "The Commission acted unconstitutionally in reversing an action of Presbytery by reinstating the Session at Covenant," and that this action was also done unilaterally by the Committee Chairman based on counsel given to him by the Stated Clerk of PCA."

The Commission did not act unconstitutionally in reversing an action of Presbytery in that it did not reverse the decision at all. RE's Rob Farrington and Gary Flye called the Chairman of the Commission, TE Gerald Partain, on October 21, 1990, to report that they had been in contact with Dr. Paul Gilchrist. Their report was that they had been told that Presbytery had no right to suspend the Session - not even with charges pending. They then informed the Chairman of their intent to resume oversight of the Covenant Presbyterian Church and to be responsible for pulpit fill.

The Chairman's response was that he could neither confirm nor deny the rightness of their action. He also told RE's Farrington & Flye that he could "not hold a gun to your head to keep you from resuming Session oversight," but that he would likewise contact Dr. Gilchrist to affirm this. Following a telephone conversation with Dr. Gilchrist and receipt of a letter from him (Addendum, pp. 46-49), the Chairman reported and the Commission moved as follows:

"That the Commission, by way of the Chairman, inform the Elders of Covenant Presbyterian Church of Wheatridge that the Commission no longer assumes oversight of the congregation; and that the Chairman inform Presbytery that it acted in an unconstitutional manner by suspending the jurisdiction of the Session w/o this being formally requested by the members of the congregation."(Addendum, pp. 42, 44 & 54)

Presbytery ratified this action at the Feb. 1, 1991 meeting.

It was not an unconstitutional action, but rather one that saved the Presbytery from further judicial embarrassment, and it certainly was not a unilateral action by the Chairman.

II. REGARDING THE AMENDS SOUGHT

The Presbytery Judicial Commission submits that the amends sought should either be denied or are not possible due to the following:

A. Regarding reinstatement of the charges against Ruling Elders Farrington and Flye based on Chronology Paper (See Addendum, pp. 66-74).

This matter has been answered in I. A. 1-4, above. The Presbytery ratified the decision of Commission. When a complaint was brought to the floor of Presbytery by TE Pollock, it was diligently considered by the Presbytery Standing Judicial Committee and was denied in every point. This too, was upheld by the Presbytery.

JOURNAL

B. Regarding reinstatement of Teaching Elder Pollock as pastor of the Covenant Presbyterian Church.

This is not even remotely possible due to the following facts:

1. TE Pollock is not a member of the Presbytery of the Southwest nor even of the PCA. At the Presbytery meeting in Las Cruces, a communication was received from the Presbytery of the Dakotas of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC) that TE Pollock had been received by them and that they awaited his release from the PCA for him to be received officially. He was released by unanimous vote. We were informed that he has been assigned to an OPC mission work in Denver where some of his former Covenant flock attend, including Mr. David Stephens, Complainant in this action. The Presbytery therefore questions Mr. Stephens' present "good standing" in the Covenant Church which he has not attended since November, 1990.
2. TE Pollock has consistently disregarded every bit of counsel given by his brothers at both the Presbytery and General Assembly levels and it is highly unlikely that the Presbytery would receive him back because of his unsubmitive attitude and the fact that he sought affiliation with another denomination instead of working to heal his differences with his brothers in the Presbytery and the PCA as he was encouraged by all to do.
3. The Covenant Presbyterian Church has voted to dissolve the pastoral relationship with TE Pollock (their right!), and it is even more unlikely that they would reverse that decision and recall him. Further, they have called, and Presbytery has approved a new Interim and soon to be Ordained, Intern James Talarico.

C. Regarding formal reproof of the unconstitutional actions of the Judicial Commission of the Presbytery of the Southwest.

This has been dealt with in 1. C. above. This Commission was formally dissolved on February 1, 1991, having concluded its work. The Presbytery cannot reprove a commission which does not exist and would, in fact, have to reprove itself since it ratified the action making it a Presbytery action, not a Commission action.

III. REGARDING THE CASE AS A WHOLE.

In the opinion of the Presbytery, TE Nickoley should be reprovved for bringing this frivolous and time-consuming action to the General Assembly.

The Presbytery appreciates the fact that the rights of all ought to be upheld and that TE Nickoley was/is a close personal friend of TE Pollock (so were/are many of the others of us), and that he seeks to right some real or perceived wrongs against his friend.

Therefore, the Presbytery prays that the Judicial Panel will recommend to the Standing Judicial Commission that the Complaint be denied and that the amends sought be obviated.

We further pray that Christ be exalted in all of this, His people edified and His Kingdom advanced, and that this will be the end of a long, distressing episode for all of us.

Respectfully submitted, for the Presbytery of the Southwest,
/s/ Gerald K. Partain
TE Gerald K. Partain, Respondent
Foreagate Presbyterian Church
3945 Topsail Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80918

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

3. That the judgment in the case of Daniel R. Morse vs. Covenant Presbytery (SJC Docket 91-3) be approved. *Adopted*

**TE DANIEL R. MORSE
VS
COVENANT PRESBYTERY**

JUDICIAL CASE 91-3

I. **A Statement of the Facts**

The Record of this Case consists of 526 pages. From this Record, we consider the following to be the pertinent facts relating to this Reference, to-wit:

1. On March 6, 1990 Covenant Presbytery denied a motion to institute process against Rev. Daniel R. Morse and Curtis I. Crenshaw.
2. On March 6, 1990 a protest was filed by three Ruling Elder Commissioners to the action of Covenant Presbytery in failing to institute process against Rev. Daniel R. Morse and Rev. Curtis I. Crenshaw.
3. On March 8, 1990 a similar protest was filed by Ruling Elder Howard I. Davis, Jr., a Commissioner to said Presbytery meeting, against the action of Covenant Presbytery in not instituting process against Rev. Daniel R. Morse and Rev. Curtis I. Crenshaw.
4. On March 19, 1990 a similar protest was filed by Teaching Elder Carl Brannon to the action of Covenant Presbytery in not instituting process against Daniel R. Morse and Curtis I. Crenshaw.
5. At its Stated Meeting on May 22, 1990, Covenant Presbytery voted to receive and record the above protests.
6. On June 18, 1990 Grace Presbyterian Church filed a complaint against Covenant Presbytery for receiving the protests on May 22, 1990.
7. At its Stated Meeting on October 2, 1990, the Moderator of Covenant Presbytery ruled the complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church out-of-order under *BCO* Section 45-5, which action of the moderator was challenged; and the ruling of the Moderator was sustained by vote of Covenant Presbytery.
8. On October 15, 1990 a complaint was filed by Grace Presbyterian Church against Covenant Presbytery complaining against the action of the moderator, sustained by the presbytery, in ruling that the Grace Presbyterian Church Complaint of June 18, 1990 was out-of-order.
9. On January 9, 1991 Grace Presbyterian Church filed a request that Covenant Presbytery institute process against Teaching Elder Carl D. Brannon, Jr. and Ruling Elder Howard O. Davis, Jr.
10. On January 9, 1991 Grace Presbyterian Church filed a request with Covenant Presbytery to institute process against the Administrative Committee of Covenant Presbytery.
11. On February 24, 1991 Rev. Daniel R. Morse tendered his resignation from Covenant Presbytery and the Presbyterian Church in America.
12. On February 24, 1991 Grace Presbyterian Church filed its complaint against Covenant Presbytery for Presbytery's refusal at its October 2, 1990 Stated Meeting to hear the complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church, dated June 18, 1990.

JOURNAL

13. On February 26, 1991 Curtis I. Crenshaw tendered his resignation from Covenant Presbytery and the Presbyterian Church in America.
14. On March 5, 1991 Covenant Presbytery adopted the recommendations of a Quasi Committee of the Whole as follows:
 - (a) It found no basis for the charges by Grace Presbyterian Church against the four Ruling Elders who protested.
 - (b) It found Teaching Elder Brannon without error in the charges filed by Grace Presbyterian Church.
 - (c) It sustained the Moderator in ruling the complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church against the receiving of the protests as being "out-of-order" and thus denying the October 15, 1990 complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church.
 - (d) It referred to the Standing Judicial Commission for both "advice and all matters up to this point and for full disposition of all matters" relating to Rev. Daniel R. Morse, Rev. Curtis I. Crenshaw and Grace Presbyterian Church.
15. At its Stated Meeting on March 5, 1991, Presbytery of Covenant adopted the following:
 - (a) That the Clerk informed Rev. Morse and Rev. Crenshaw that in spite of their resignations they remain as members of Covenant Presbytery.
 - (b) That the Clerk require Rev. Morse and Rev. Crenshaw to express their intentions as to their future service.
 - (c) That the Ministers Committee be instructed to instruct the Session of Grace Presbyterian Church to notify Covenant Presbytery of the intentions of Grace Presbyterian Church as to its affiliation with the Presbyterian Church of America.
16. On March 5, 1991 at its Stated Meeting, Covenant Presbytery denied the complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church, dated February 14, 1991, as being "out-of-order" due to failing to file the same within the time limit required by the Book of Church Order.
17. On May 28, 1991, Covenant Presbytery received a request from the Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church requesting letters for Rev. Daniel R. Morse and Rev. Curtis I. Crenshaw stating that these two ministers had joined that denomination.

II. Related Facts Subsequent to Filing The Record of The Case

Rev. Daniel R. Morse and Rev. Curtis I. Crenshaw publicly stated that they are no longer members of Presbyterian Church in America but have joined the Reformed Episcopal Church. A Ministerial Biographical Data Form was submitted to Rev. Daniel R. Morse for his completion; but he returned it to the Office of the Stated Clerk of the PCA on September 26, 1991 with the following notation:

"I am no longer in the PCA. Please remove my name from your files."

Grace Presbyterian Church has notified, in writing, Rev. James Hayes, Stated Clerk of Covenant Presbytery, that Grace Presbyterian Church has withdrawn from Covenant Presbytery and the Presbyterian Church in America.

The Review of Presbytery Records Committee of the 19th General Assembly (1991) noted the following exception to the minutes of Covenant Presbytery (*GA Minutes* page 179):

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

BCO 43-1-p. 92 Presbytery improperly ruled the complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church out of order. Rationale: The complaint was against the action of Presbytery in receiving a protest rather than the protest itself. It is proper to register a complaint against an action of presbytery. The phrase "Here the matter shall end. . ." (*BCO* 45-4) cited by presbytery in support of its action refers to the subject matter of a protest and not the act of receiving the protest.

III. A Statement of the Issues

1. What is the proper action for a Presbytery to take when a Teaching Elder resigns from the Presbyterian Church in America without a request to transfer his letter to another body or to divest him of his office under *BCO* Section 38-2, and when the Teaching Elder subsequently renounces the communion of the Presbyterian Church in America by joining some other evangelical church?
2. Is a particular church required to notify its Presbytery in order to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church in America?
3. Is receiving protest under Book of Church Order Chapter 45 such an act or decision by the Court against which a complaint may be made?

IV. Jurisdiction

Chapter 41 of the *Book of Church Order* deals with "References". Section 41-3 is as follows:

In making a reference the lower court may ask for advice only, or for final disposition of the matter referred; and in particular it may refer a judicial case with request for its trial and decision by the higher court. (Emphasis added)

Book of Church Order Section 15-4 provides that all judicial cases shall be committed to the Standing Judicial Commission. The Rules of Assembly Operation 7-2 provide that the Committee on Constitutional Business shall "receive from the Stated Clerk all non-judicial references submitted by presbyteries. . ." In keeping with these provisions, the Standing Judicial Commission has stated in its Manual Section 9.1 that:

The only reference which the Commission may entertain is the reference of "a judicial case with a request for its trial and decision by the higher court" (*BCO* 41-3).

We also conclude that under our rules a judicial reference should be heard by the Standing Judicial Commission and non-judicial references are to be referred to the Committee on Constitutional Business for its consideration.

In this case, it appears that issues 1 and 2, above, basically are non-judicial in their nature and that issue 3, above, is clearly judicial in its nature. But because all these 3 issues arise out of the same facts and circumstances, it is difficult to separate them into distinctive categories. We conclude that this reference from Covenant Presbytery is such a mixture that it is properly before us. Further, we note that under *BCO* § 41-3 Covenant Presbytery has requested that we make a "final disposition" of all these issues.

JOURNAL

We call attention to *BCO* § 41-5 which provides:

Although references are sometimes proper, in general it is better that every court should discharge the duty assigned it under the law of the church. A higher court is not required to accede to the request of the lower, but it should ordinarily give advice when so requested.

We realize that Covenant Presbytery has taken a great deal of its time in seeking to resolve these issues; and we have concluded that it would be wise and helpful to Covenant Presbytery for us to accede to its request and to make "final disposition" of all these issues.

V. Disposition of Issues 1 and 2

1. As to the position of Rev. Daniel R. Morse and Rev. Curtis I. Crenshaw, we note that there is no provision in the *Book of Church Order* for a Teaching Elder to resign. *BCO* Section 38-2 contains a provision under which a presbytery may concur with a Teaching Elder and divest him of his office without censure. Of course, presbytery can transfer a Teaching Elder upon his request; but there is no provision for just receiving a resignation as these two Teaching Elders submitted. In view of facts stated above, we conclude that Rev. Daniel R. Morse and Rev. Curtis I. Crenshaw have "renounced the communion of this church by joining some other evangelical church" (*BCO* 38-3). We instruct Dr. Paul Gilchrist as Stated Clerk to notify Covenant Presbytery that *BCO* § 38-3 is applicable to these 2 Teaching Elders, that Covenant Presbytery should comply therewith by recording the irregularity and erasing their names from its rolls.

As to the request from the Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church, we instruct Dr. Paul Gilchrist as Stated Clerk to reply by a courteous letter noting that these 2 Teaching Elders were in good standing and that no charges were pending against either of them at the time their names were erased from the rolls of Covenant Presbytery in accordance with the Presbyterian Church In America Book of Church Order.

2. As to the position of Grace Presbyterian Church, we find no provision in the Book of Church Order requiring a particular church to notify its Presbytery as a requirement to its withdrawing from the Presbyterian Church in America. The *Book of Church Order* Section 25-11 provides a method by which a particular church may sever its association with the Presbyterian Church in America. All that is required under this *BCO* Section is for a particular church to vote in a duly called congregational meeting to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church in America. Rev. James Hayes, the Stated Clerk of Covenant Presbytery, has informed the Standing Judicial Commission that he has received a letter from Grace Presbyterian Church stating that, in a duly called congregational meeting, the church has voted to withdraw from the Presbyterian Church in America. It would be proper and in order for a local church to so notify its presbytery when it has with-drawn from the denomination; but it is not mandatory. Covenant Presbytery now should erase the name of Grace Presbyterian Church from its roll of the churches.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

VI. Judgment as to Issue 3

The complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church filed on June 18, 1990 against Covenant Presbytery for receiving the protests at its May 22, 1990 Stated Meeting; and the complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church filed on October 15th, 1990 against Covenant Presbytery complaining of the ruling of the moderator, sustained by the presbytery, that Grace Presbyterian Church's complaint of June 18, 1990 was "out-of-order"; and the complaint of Grace Presbyterian Church filed on February 24, 1991 against Covenant Presbytery complaining of the refusal of the presbytery at its October 2, 1990 meeting to hear Grace's complaint of June 18, 1990; all have been abandoned by the Complainant.

VII. Reasoning and Opinion

In a telephone discussion with Rev. James Hayes, Stated Clerk of Covenant Presbytery and Carl Chaplain, appointed to represent the Presbytery, they confirmed that they had no desire to appear and argue the case or take any testimony in regard thereto. They were willing to submit the Reference on the Record of the Case, without further testimony or argument. In a telephone conversation with Rev. Daniel R. Morse, the Moderator of the Session of Grace Presbyterian Church, he stated that since they had left the Presbyterian Church in America that they no longer had any desire to pursue the complaints. He was informed that amounted to Grace Presbyterian Church abandoning the complaint. He agreed. We are thereof of the opinion that the complainants have abandoned the complaint and that the complaints are moot.

We further are of the opinion that the recording of a protest by a court is an administrative act directed under *Book of Church Order* Section 45-5; and that such is not an act or decision of the court against which a complaint may be made for *Book of Church Order* Section 45-5 specifically states that "here the matter shall end". It is a general and universal rule of statutory construction that when there is a "general" provision in one part of the document and a "special" provision in another part of the document, that seem to be contradictory, the "special" provision is considered as an exception to the "general" rule.

Book of Church Order Chapter 43-1 defines a complaint as follows:

A complaint is a written representation made against some act or decision of Court of the Church . . .

This is a "general" definition of a complaint. The complainants in the instant case argue that the action of Covenant Presbytery in receiving and recording the protests was such an action that a complaint may be filed against it. We differ with the complainants. Chapter 45 of the *Book of Church Order* gives to individual members of a court who are in the minority three methods of registering their disapproval of an action taken by a court. One of these methods is by filing a "dissent" which is just a method of expressing a different opinion from that of the majority.

Another method is a "protest" which is a more solemn and formal declaration by members of the minority.

JOURNAL

The third method is for members of a court who did not have the right to vote on an appeal or complaint to file an "objection", which is a method like a "dissent" expressing a different opinion from the decision of the court.

Book of Church Order Chapter 45 provides that if any of these methods are used and be couched in temperate language, and be respectful to the court, it shall be recorded. It further provides that if the court desires to file an answer to the same that it may be done. But then *Book of Church Order* 45-5 provides that "here the matter shall end. . ."

It is obvious that this is a "specific" provision for concluding anyone of these three methods for disagreeing with a majority decision in a court. It is the court itself which determines whether or not, in its discretion, the dissent, protest or objection "be couched in temperate language and be respectful to the court". This concluding language comes immediately after that language; and it clearly means that once a decision is made to receive the dissent, protest or objection by the court that "here the matter shall end". Otherwise, we would be dealing ad-infinitum with those who do not agree with a majority decision in a court.

It could be argued that the complaint should be allowed on the basis that someone thinks the document is not couched in temperate language and is not respectful to the court, and that in so ruling the court has taken an action from which a complaint may be allowed. But here we have a "specific" exception to the "general" rule of *Book of Church Order* 43-1. In the wisdom of the drafters of our *Book of Church Order*, they decided that with these mild forms of differences of opinion that the minority should be given a right to record their dissent, protest or objection; but that "here the matter shall end".

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ David W. Hall
/s/ John E. Spencer
/s/ W. Jack Williamson

VIII. Voting on Proposed Disposition:

APPROVED by SJC:

23-0

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

4. That the judgment in the case of Robert D. Hopper vs. James River Presbytery (SJC Docket 91-4) be approved. *Adopted*

ROBERT D. HOPPER
VS.
JAMES RIVER PRESBYTERY

JUDICIAL CASE NO. 91-4

PROPOSED DECISION OF THE JUDICIAL PANEL

I. A Statement of the Facts

TE Robert Hopper, pastor of Grace Covenant Church in Williamsburg, Virginia, came to the Ministerial and Church Relations Committee (MCR) of the James River Presbytery (JRP) in late 1989 to discuss what he considered to be a change in his view regarding the work of the Holy Spirit in this age. In summary, he stated that he affirmed that the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, including the gift of tongues and prophecy, may be present in the church in any age as they are given in special times and circumstances according to the sovereign purposes of God. He further stated that he believed that the office of apostle was closed, and that nothing further could be added to the canon of Scripture, that the exercise of spiritual gifts must be carefully guarded by the rules set forth in Scripture regarding their use.

MCR met on several occasions with Mr. Hopper, and on January 12, 1990, recommended to JRP that

"though Bob Hopper's views on the ministry of the Holy Spirit have changed since the assumption of his ordination vows, and while individual members of the committee do not agree with these views, it is the committee's judgment that they do not violate the fundamentals of the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Standards." (Record, 83).

This recommendation of MCR was considered by JRP at the January 13, 1990, stated meeting of Presbytery. After discussion, JRP referred the matter back to MCR, who then met on two occasions with the Session of Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church. At the April 7, 1990, meeting of JRP, Presbytery received a statement from three of the four ruling elders from Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church, expressing their strong disagreement with their pastor, Teaching Elder Robert Hopper, on the issues stated. After a further report from MCR, JRP passed the following motion:

"That the Presbytery commend TE Hopper and the Grace Covenant Session for their godly conduct in this problem, and encourage TE Hopper to continue to study the Bible on these subjects in conjunction with the Ministerial and Church Relation Sub-Committee, and that he report to Presbytery within one year as to whether his views as expressed in 'A Paper on the Holy Spirit' and their summation as found in the Twelve Points of this committee report have been modified; and further, for the common welfare of all its congregations, the Presbytery disallow the teaching and preaching of the views of prophecy and tongues found in the writings cited above,

JOURNAL

and that concurring with the stated views of the majority of the Session of Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church, it likewise disallow the practice of these phenomena in the public worship of Grace Covenant." (Record, 87).

The above motion was passed by a vote of 26 to 15. During the nine months following the April 7, 1990, meeting of JRP, other meetings were held at various times by MCR, the Session of Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church, Teaching Elder Hopper and members of the congregation to discuss the issues. In November, 1990, JRP hosted a debate on the gift of prophecy between Dr. Wayne Grudem and Dr. Richard Gaffin. Mr. Hopper prepared a written "Final Report" on November 21, 1990, reexpressing his views, which were substantially as set forth earlier.

At the January 12, 1991, stated meeting of JRP, a motion was passed to adopt a recommendation regarding Mr. Hopper's "Final Report" which stated, in part:

"Although Bob Hopper's views on the Holy Spirit have changed since the assumption of his ordination vows, and while individual members of the Presbytery don't agree with those views, it is the Presbytery's judgment they do not violate the fundamentals of the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Standards." (Record, 129).

JRP further, at that meeting, acknowledged that the "mind of the church" was expressed in the pastoral letter adopted by General Assembly in 1974, wherein "the General Assembly would also urge a spirit of forbearance among those holding differing views regarding the spiritual gifts as they are experienced today." (Record, 129).

Certain members of JRP filed a complaint against such action of Presbytery, which was considered at a meeting of Presbytery on April 13, 1991. After due consideration of the complaint, a motion was adopted to sustain the complaint, and the following motion was adopted:

"That the James River Presbytery reaffirm its Confessional position maintained at the April 1990 stated meeting, wherein TE Hopper was for the common welfare of the churches of Presbytery and now again shall be disallowed to teach and preach the views of prophecy and tongues found in the writings of his paper titled 'Final Report to James River Presbytery.' TE Hopper is advised to hold his views as his personal opinion, and continue studying the issue in question. He may communicate his views to members of Presbytery for their consideration, if he so desires. Furthermore, that Presbytery in view of the Complaint which has been sustained at this stated meeting, disband the five man committee appointed to the issue of TE Hopper's views on spiritual gifts and elect a four man committee to the Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church regarding this action and its implications." (Record, 138 and 139).

TE Robert Hopper and RE Robert Loker filed a complaint in presbytery against the above action of JRP which was considered by that presbytery at its meeting of July 13, 1991. Presbytery denied the complaint at that meeting (Record, 156). TE Hopper now

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

brings his complaint against James River Presbytery's April 13, 1991 action, to the Standing Judicial Commission for consideration.

II. A Statement Of The Issues

TE Hopper's complaint filed with SJC differs somewhat in form from that which he filed with JRP, but in substance the complaints are the same. His general specification of error, filed with SJC, is as follows:

The James River Presbytery has erred in forbidding one of its teaching elders from preaching and teaching his views on the ministry of the Holy Spirit (as summarized in his Twelve Points and amplified in his 'Final Report to the James River Presbytery'). (Record, 6).

The issues will be dealt with by this commission in the order in which the specifications of error were set forth in TE Hopper's complaint filed with presbytery. This complaint challenges JRP's April 13 action on five specific grounds, claiming that (1) it is contrary to the explicit teaching of the Word of God; (2) it is contrary to the mind of the church as expressed in the 1974 pastoral letter on the Holy Spirit; (3) it violates the counsel of the General Assembly regarding mutual forbearance; (4) it binds the conscience of a teaching elder in violation of Scripture and our constitution; and (5) it inconsistently maintains that a theological view can be promoted in the church to fellow presbyters, but not to church members. (Record, 149-152).

III. Judgment of the Case

It is the judgment of the court that the complaint should be denied.

IV. Reasoning

Issue 1: That the action of James River Presbytery is contrary to the explicit teaching of the Word of God. The complainant's argument is that the Word of God teaches that the extraordinary gifts, especially the gifts of prophecy and tongues, continue in the post-apostolic era to the present date. He denies that these gifts constitute new revelation from God, and affirms the closed canon of Scripture.

Although General Assembly in recent years has not, by ad hoc committee or otherwise, issued a comprehensive or formal definitive statement on the subject on the continuation of the extraordinary gifts, there have been judicial cases and other definitive actions of General Assembly which provide some guidelines for the courts of this church. The Standing Judicial Commission will not assume to itself the responsibility nor the authority to make a comprehensive doctrinal statement on this subject. However, in past judicial cases approved by General Assembly, the court of original jurisdiction has been recognized to have power to determine whether a particular teaching or preaching is heretical, erroneous, or such as disturbs the peace or purity of the church. It is clear that presbytery has power to limit teaching and preaching accordingly when it makes such a determination.

Issue 2: That the action of James River Presbytery is contrary to the mind of the church as expressed in the 1974 Pastoral Letter on the Holy Spirit. The specific action of JRP complained about here is the presbytery's forbidding the complainant to

teach and preach his view that the extraordinary gifts continue in the present age. This judicial decision will not go beyond the complaint, to determine, for example, whether all that JRP said regarding the extraordinary gifts is a proper interpretation of Scripture, the constitutional documents of the PCA, or the 1974 Pastoral Letter.

The 1974 Pastoral Letter does not address the issue of the power of a presbytery to enjoin one of its members from teaching or preaching on the subject of the extraordinary gifts. Therefore, we cannot say that JRP's action is contrary to the mind of the church as expressed in the Pastoral Letter.

Issue 3: That the action of James River Presbytery violates the counsel of the General Assembly regarding mutual forbearance. The General Assembly, in the 1974 Pastoral Letter, urged

"a spirit of forbearance among those holding differing views regarding the spiritual gifts as they are experienced today." (Record, 103).

It is the opinion of the Commission that JRP did not always represent TE Hopper's views in his terms or to his satisfaction in their briefs and at oral argument of this case on January 13, 1992. To that extent, we would urge a renewed spirit of forbearance among the brethren.

Nevertheless, the April 13, 1991 action of James River Presbytery did not violate the principle of forbearance "among those holding differing views regarding the spiritual gifts as they are experienced today." The Pastoral Letter's urgings to show forbearance cannot be read to forbid a presbytery's proper exercise of its constitutional powers to promote and safeguard the peace and purity of the congregations within its bounds. Since three of the four ruling elders of the Grace Covenant Church in Williamsburg disagreed with their pastor over his teaching of these views and have subsequently left the church, the Commission must conclude that the presbytery sought, in its action, to promote the peace and purity of that congregation.

Issue 4: That the action of James River Presbytery binds the conscience of a teaching elder in violation of Scripture and our constitution. Presbyteries have the right of original jurisdiction to decide cases of judicial process concerning teaching elders (*BCO* 34-1). Those cases may include doctrinal matters where the presbytery determines that a matter is either erroneous or injurious to the peace and purity of the church. Presbyteries have powers in controlling the credentials and preaching of teaching elders (*BCO* 13-9). In 1986, the General Assembly adopted a judgment in a judicial case which held that

"[w]hen a man is ordained with the allowance of exceptions to his full acceptance of the PCA standards, he thereby obtains (1) approval of his suitability to function within the ordained office, and (2) liberty to believe and live in some way not fully in accord with some portion of those standards. This allowance of exceptions, however, does not warrant his teaching or preaching of that matter so as to disturb the peace and purity of the church. The court of jurisdiction must determine in each situation whether such unwarranted actions have occurred." (*M14GA*, pp. 125,126.)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

And in 1990, the 18th General Assembly adopted this recommendation:

"Presbyteries do have jurisdiction over TEs and have the authority to restrict a minister from preaching views which the presbytery is convinced may be harmful to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care (*BCO* 13-9 and 34-5). If a member of a church is convinced that the presbytery under whose jurisdiction he is has erred, judicial process is provided for in *BCO* 43 (Complaints)." (*MI&GA*, p. 205.)

Presbyteries may exercise such power over the preaching and teaching of its members short of a determination that the forbidden teaching is heresy, without necessarily binding the consciences of the men under its care. JRP has not determined, in this case, that the complainant's preaching or teaching is heretical. We must defer to presbytery, therefore, as the court most able to determine what may be harmful to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care.

We do not find any evidence in this case that JRP, by limiting the preaching and teaching of the complainant in the areas here in issue, has violated Chapter XX of the Confession of Faith or the Scripture cited in the complaint. Chapter XX of the Confession of Faith states, in relevant part, that

"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in anything, contrary to his Word; or beside it, in matters of faith, or worship."

In order for this complaint to be upheld, TE Hopper would have to prove that for a presbytery to forbid a teaching elder to teach and preach the continuation of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit in the present day is explicitly contrary to the Word of God. This specification of the complaint necessarily depends, therefore, upon Issue 1 (above) being sustained. Therefore, for the reasons set forth in Issue 1, we determine that it is no violation of liberty of conscience to limit the complainant's teaching and preaching as JRP has done here.

Issue 5: That the action of James River Presbytery inconsistently maintains that a theological view can be promoted in the church to fellow presbyters, but not to church members. The JRP, in order to maintain dialogue with TE Hopper, gave him the opportunity to discuss his views with members of presbytery for the mutual edification and growth of all concerned. There was to be a mutual give and take in such discussions. TE Hopper was not inconsistently given the right to "promote" views in presbytery which he was forbidden to "promote" in his preaching and teaching at Grace Covenant Church. In a given situation, a presbytery could determine that continued dialogue on a subject among fellow presbyters would be consistent with a restriction on a pastor's teaching and preaching on that subject. Until TE Hopper could convince presbytery that his views were correct, presbytery was within its jurisdiction to forbid him to teach such views to his congregation.

Dated this 31st day of January, 1992.

/s/ Mark Belz (co-author)

/s/ John Montgomery (concur)

/s/ Michael D. Bolus, Chairman (concur)

/s/ Dewey Roberts (co-author)

/s/ John W. Lane (concur)

JOURNAL

V. Voting on Proposed Disposition:

APPROVED by SJC: 22-0, 2 disqualified

COMPLAINANT'S BRIEF

JUDICIAL CASE 91-4

I. INTRODUCTION

On Friday, December 27th, I received in the mail from Dr. Bolus a copy of "The Brief of the James River Presbytery . . ." Because of necessary preparations for the Lord's Day (December 29th), I just began to read it this morning (December 30th). Because of the ten day requirement regarding the submission of briefs, the brief that I now submit will be - pardon the pun - brief. It is my hope and prayer that if I get it in the mail tomorrow (via express delivery) that you will receive it by January 3 - ten days before our hearing in Richmond on January 13th.

I would like it noted that I requested from the Respondents (in writing) several weeks ago that they send me their brief, but that request was not honored.

This brief that I now submit is essentially a rebuttal of a number of assertions and representations made by the Respondents in their brief. Rather than critiquing them line by line, I will simply identify what I consider to be several salient items. In doing so, I intend to show that the Respondents have not fairly or accurately represented my views or the actions of Presbytery.

A. REGARDING THE DEALINGS OF JAMES RIVER PRESBYTERY

The Respondents claim (page 3, lines 1-3) that their dealings with me have been "loving and even-handed." I realize that since I have been personally involved that I may also be subjectively defensive, but I think an objective observer would conclude that the claim of the Respondents is contrary to fact. When Mr. Griffith and Mr. Wilson spearheaded an effort in January, 1991, to bring charges against me for my change of views, I don't think such an aggressive action can rightly be called "loving and even-handed." When Mr. Harrell spearheaded an investigation of our church and myself in July of 1991, without ever discussing his personal concerns with me first, this again hardly appears "loving and even-handed." Hence, I would challenge the very first assertion the Respondents make in their brief.

B. REGARDING THE EXEGETICAL CRITIQUE OF MY VIEWS

The Respondents are to be commended, at least, for their diligent and thorough attempt to refute my position Biblically. This is precisely the kind of engagement that I had hoped for and asked for in late 1989. I find it sadly ironic that it is only on the eve of a Judicial Panel trial that I finally have in hand the refutation that I had invited nearly two years ago. After reading their brief, I am happy to concede that several of their criticisms are valid. I wish they had been made when originally requested. Nevertheless, I do not believe any of their criticisms eradicate my fundamental position on spiritual gifts, which can best be summarized by point #4 of my Twelve Point Summary of views.

"I AFFIRM that the extraordinary gifts may be present in the church in any age as these are given in special times and circumstances according to the sovereign purposes of God. I DENY that the absence of these extraordinary gifts necessarily implies a withholding of God's blessing upon a particular congregation or ministry." (see Record, page 29)

C. REGARDING RESPONDENTS CLAIM THAT I CONDEMN OTHERS

As an example of an inaccurate representation of my views, I refer to the statement made at presbytery and cited again in the brief:

"were Presbytery to sustain this point of the complaint, we would not simply be allowing TE Hopper to maintain his erroneous view, we would be positively endorsing that view, and condemning as being unscriptural all who hold opposing views . . ." (Respondents' Brief, page 14, lines 18-30)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

This charge is a clear example of not fairly or accurately representing what I have repeatedly maintained, and explicitly stated in my Final Report regarding church unity (see Record, pages 7376). Again, point #12 of my Twelve Point Summary states:

"I AFFIRM that teaching regarding spiritual gifts is potentially divisive in any congregation or denomination, and, therefore, must be done with great charity, precision, and pastoral sensitivity. I also affirm that the call of the Scriptures for church unity requires that there be mutual toleration and respect among those who differ on this issue." (see Record, page 31)

D. REGARDING PREVIOUS RULINGS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

To save time and space, I would refer the reader to pages 123-125 of the Record where I interact with various decisions of the General Assembly. The Respondents fail to acknowledge the substantial differences in view between myself and men such as TE William Hyer. It is simply not fair to pursue this "guilt by association" reasoning.

E. REGARDING ERRONEOUS INFERENCES

The respondents, in their brief, have me saying something that I have never said, either verbally or in writing. They state:

"TE Hopper says that he denies that a prophet can ' . . . inerrantly predict the future . . . ', implying that he allows for fallible prophetic predictions." (Respondents' Brief, page 16, lines 16-18).

Here again is an example of an inaccurate and unfair representation of my views. At no point in time have I defined prophecy as predicting the future, either infallibly or fallibly.

E. REGARDING FAULTY ARGUMENTATION

The reader is asked to compare my argument on page 60 of the Record (point 7) and the Respondents' presentation of my argument (their Brief, page 24). In addition to the apparent incongruity, the Respondents conclude: "We note, however, that this is no more than a 'possibility,' even for Mr. Hopper; it is no proof at all." (their Brief, page 24, lines 13-14).

In the next paragraph, they offer an argument in response to my undeniable observation that the teachings of the alleged infallibly-inspired prophets described in Ephesians 2:20 are simply nowhere to be found in the New Testament. Having just stated above that a "possibility . . . is no proof at all," the Respondents state: "We might suggest the Epistle to the Hebrews as a possibility." In addition to this self-defeating argumentation, I would ask: in the history of Reformed exegetical scholarship, is there even the theory that Hebrews is authored by some unknown person called a "prophet"?

G. REGARDING CLEAR MISREPRESENTATIONS TO THE PANEL

The Respondents state: "TE Hopper seems not to have considered the teaching of the Apostle Peter about the nature of prophecy" (their Brief, page 30, lines 22-23). This, of course, is a very serious charge. No student of Scripture with any integrity should avoid a very clear teaching of Scripture that addresses precisely the issue that he is discussing. If I were on the Panel, I would give great weight to this point raised by the Respondents. They make an apparently convincing case.

The Panel should understand that my Final Report was, by design for the sake of brevity, a reduction and clarification of my views views that had been expressed in a previously written paper of some 140 pages. Mr. Griffith and Mr. Wilson, having served on the Ministerial and Church Relations Committee, had studied and discussed that original paper with me. Mr. Harrell also requested a copy of that paper and studied it on his own, in an unofficial capacity. These brothers now make the serious charge that I have ignored a very strategic teaching by Peter, and the Panel - not having access to that original paper - no doubt must concede such a charge. For the sake of the Panel, therefore, I now cite my treatment (from my original paper) of the passage that I have allegedly "not considered." I cite four common arguments used to attempt to disprove that New Testament prophecy can be non-canonical. When I consider II Peter 1:20, I cite Dr. George Knight because he is one of the most able proponents of this view. Below is the argument in its entirety. I entitle this argument, "II Peter 1:20 TEACHES THAT

JOURNAL

PROPHECY IS CANONICAL," and I begin with a lengthy quote from Dr. Knight, followed by this rebuttal.

"Is Peter offering to us a definition of all forms of prophetic utterances, as Dr. Knight claims, or is he referring to canonical prophecy in general and Old Testament prophets in particular? A simple reading of II Peter 1:20-21 in its context will answer this question.

Peter seeks to reinforce his authority as an apostle and the truth of his message to his readers.

'Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ' . . . We did not follow cleverly invented stories when we told you about the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty . . . We ourselves heard this (God's) voice that came down from heaven when we were with him on the sacred mountain.' (1:1,16,18)

Notice that Peter is taking his readers BACK in his personal history in order to assure them of the veracity of his teaching. In verse 19, he takes them back even further.

'And we have the word of the PROPHETS (emphasis mine) made more certain, and you will do well to pay attention to it, as to a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts.

Above all, you must understand that no prophecy OF SCRIPTURE (emphasis mine) came about . . . ' (1:19-20)

There can be no doubt that Peter is speaking of the Old Testament prophets in this passage.

In 2:1 (which immediately follows the statement about the prophets being 'carried along by the Holy Spirit'), Peter states:

'But there were also false prophets among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you.'

Notice the tenses. In contrast to the true Old Testament prophets, there were false prophets among the people of God. With that historical example before them, Peter warns them of the false prophets in their midst.

Notice that in verses 4-8, Peter draws further on Old Testament incidences (Noah and the flood, Sodom and Gomorrah and Lot).

Notice that in 3:1-2, it is abundantly clear that Peter is referring to Old Testament prophets.

'Dear friends, this is now my second letter to you. I have written both of them as reminders to stimulate you to wholesome thinking. I want you to recall the words spoken in the past by the holy prophets and the command given by our Lord and Savior through your apostles.'

One must ignore the entire context of II Peter 1:20-21 to deduce that Peter is giving us 'a definition which defines prophecy whether given in the Old or the New Testament periods and whether spoken or written' (Dr. Knight, page 16)

If the Book of Acts is to be brought to bear, it should be done so to show that Peter's passion is to convince his audience that the message of the gospel is a fulfillment of what the Old Testament prophets had anticipated - 'and we have the word of the prophets made more certain' (2 Pet. 2:19)

In his first public sermon, Peter refers to David as an Old Testament prophet:

'Brothers, I can tell you confidently that the patriarch David died and was buried, and his tomb is here to this day. But he was a prophet and knew that God had promised with an oath

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

that he would place one of his descendants on the throne. Seeing what was ahead, he spoke of the resurrection of Christ . . .' (2:29-31)

'Repent, then, and turn to God, so that your sins may be wiped out, that times of refreshing may come from the Lord, and that he may send Christ . . . He must remain in heaven until the times comes for God to restore everything, AS HE PROMISED LONG AGO THROUGH HIS HOLY PROPHETS' (3:19-21).

'Indeed, all the prophets from Samuel on, as many as have spoken, have foretold these days. And you are heirs of the prophets and of the covenant God made with your fathers' (3:24).

When Peter refers to the prophets as they relate to the preparation and establishment of the gospel of which he is an apostle, there can be no doubt that he is speaking of Old Testament prophets.

We conclude, therefore, that II Peter 1:20-21 does not in any way define the gift of prophecy, but does define canonical prophecy -

. . . no prophecy OF SCRIPTURE came about by the prophet's own interpretation . . .

I beg the indulgence of the Panel with this lengthy citation. It is simply contrary to fact and very unfair for the Respondents to claim: "TE Hopper seems not to have considered the teaching of the Apostle Peter about the nature of prophecy."

H. REGARDING AN ACCURATE CRITICISM

The greatest emphasis of the Respondents' brief seems to be their objection to defining prophecy as "congregational counseling." After writing my Final Report in December of 1990 and listening to the debate at both the January and April 1991 presbytery meetings, I came to realize that this is a very valid criticism.

In previous papers that I had written, I had referred to prophecy as "non-canonical revelation" - that is, revelation that is neither inerrant nor absolutely binding. Even though there are clear indications in the New Testament that 'apokalupsis' is used in a non-canonical fashion (see Eph. 1:17-18 and Phil. 3:15), I sensed that this was an insurmountable obstacle for most presbyters to cross. That is, the term "revelation," in spite of Pauline references to the contrary, will inevitably be understood to be "the very words of God."

Therefore, for purely pragmatic reasons, I had to coin some descriptive term for prophecy that would not solicit such an automatic and resistant response from my brothers. In all of my writings thus far, this has been my most serious blunder. Worse yet, I now see that this effort to do an "end run" around this obstacle lacked integrity.

Here is the great dilemma as I see it. Defining tongues and prophecy is very similiar to defining the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. That is - it is easier to say what it is not, rather than what it is.

It is much easier to say that His presence is not that of transubstantiation (the Catholic view) nor consubstantiation (the Lutheran view) or representative (the Zwinglian view) - but what do we really mean when we say that Christ is "spiritually present" in the Lord's Supper? One could argue that the term "spiritually present" is nowhere to be found in Scripture (as the Respondents argue that the term "congregational counseling" is likewise absent). Why did even Calvin state that the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is a "mystery"?

The answer lies, I believe, in the simple proposition that any time you have a combination of that which is divine and that which is human (or, in the case of the sacrament, that which is physical and that which is spiritual), there is an element of mystery. Human understanding can only approximate the Lord's design. To use an expression coined by the late Dr. Francis Schaeffer - God has given us sufficient but not exhaustive knowledge of Himself.

JOURNAL

Preaching serves as an example in this regard. The preacher is human: subject to weakness, frailty, lack of clarity even in his own understanding of Scripture, and various carnal idiosyncrasies. He can prepare and memorize a manuscript, and recite it in the pulpit on a Sunday morning. But apart from the operation of the Holy Spirit - both in terms of His work in the preacher and His work in the hearts of the listeners (speaking to them in and through the Scriptures), a sermon can be a dry and lifeless monologue - a merely human enterprise.

But when the Spirit of God is truly at work, He empowers that preacher (in himself, a sinful vessel) and penetrates those listeners - and sinners are brought to repentance and believers are truly challenged, comforted, and edified.

With respect to the gift of prophecy, there is likewise a spiritual dynamic involving the Spirit of God and a sinful, human vessel. The gift of prophecy, for reasons already indicated (Record, pages 51-67), is not to be equated with canonical revelation. It is, on the other hand, a potential vehicle whereby God can bring "strengthening, encouragement, and comfort" (I Cor. 14:3) to his church.

The Respondents object to this novel definition of prophecy as "congregational counseling." They seem intent on discrediting my views using a strategy that we might call, "guilt by disassociation." That is, since no one else in the history of the church has used the term, "congregational counseling," then surely we must conclude that TE Hopper is novel and unbiblical and unconstitutional.

The purpose of the chart on page 67 of the Record was not designed to elevate myself to the level of scholarship represented by the other men cited. Rather, it was to show that when one understands the gift of prophecy as "non-canonical" (that is, distinct from the reception of the very words of God as the apostles experienced), one is in good company. (We could also sight the view of the Christian Reformed Church as well which would even add an additional category to that chart).

In short, I think it valid to object to my novel terminology, and I would happily amend it accordingly. But I would insist that for reasons already stated in my Final Report - the Scriptures simply do not teach the classic cessationist position.

I. GUILT BY ISOLATION AND EXAGGERATION

The Respondents' strategy seems to be an isolation and exaggeration of what I have said and what I intend to do with my views. For example, they state:

"TE Hopper's views teach that congregations have 'unique needs.' The word 'unique' means 'alone in its own kind.' Something 'unique' is not only unusual, it is one of a kind. WE TAKE IT THEN (emphasis mine) that Mr. Hopper believes that a given congregation has needs that are theirs alone. Its needs are no other congregation's; other congregation's needs are not its own." (Respondents' Brief, page 39, lines 22-27)

The most accurate statement made by the respondents is the phrase, "we take it then." Indeed, they have taken what I have said erroneously, and, worse yet, have me saying what I have never said.

Ephesians 4:29 teaches that our conversation with one another in the Body of Christ is to be "only what is helpful for building others up (oikodomen) according to their needs." In I Corinthians 14:4, Paul describes those with the gift of prophecy as one who "speaks to men for their strengthening (oikodomen), encouragement (paraklesin), and comfort."

I grant the Respondents that the adjective "particular" would have been more appropriate than "unique" in describing my views, but the point is this: the Respondents have me saying much more than I have ever said in this regard, and they have failed to acknowledge what I have said. I have never said that an appropriate and timely exhortation to a congregation (whether from the pulpit or from a parishioner) means that "its needs are no other congregation's; other congregation's needs are not its needs." I reject the charge that my views elevate the gift of prophecy to the point where there are, as the Respondents claim, "Two counsels to the church, Scripture and the insight of prophets . . ." (their brief, page 41, line 26).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

I have said that anyone who thinks they may have this gift would have to be a member of that congregation, and interviewed by the session, and given liberty to exercise that gift only if the session believed that it was genuine and would edify the flock under their care. This is a far cry from the charge made by the Respondents that: "TE Hopper would modify the public worship of his congregation in light of his 'disputable' views." (Respondents' brief, page 48, lines 12-13)

In short, this is an example of the Respondents making me say more than I have ever said, and not taking into proper account what I have said.

I. CONCLUSION

The briefest way to summarize this brief is to ask the Judicial Commission Panel to make its decision on the basis of what I have said, and not on the basis of what the respondents have said that I have said. Thank you for this consideration.

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

JUDICIAL CASE 91-4

<u>Contents</u>		<u>Page</u>
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Response to Specifications of Error	11
III.	Conclusion	63
IV.	Appendices	66

I. Introduction

It should be noted at the beginning that in dealing with Teaching Elder Robert D. Hopper the James River Presbytery has been loving and even-handed. Mr. Hopper's desire for revival and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in our Presbytery is shared by the Presbytery. It is only Mr. Hopper's views of prophecy, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues which Presbytery has taken exception to and which Presbytery has disallowed him to teach.

The Complainant levels serious charges against the James River Presbytery. In response, the Presbytery maintains that it has acted in a biblically responsible manner, with pastoral concern for the members under its care and for Mr. Hopper. We make no brief for perfection. We do believe that our actions have been according to God's Word and according to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America. To the Complainant's charges, the James River Presbytery humbly responds that it has violated neither the Scriptures nor the Constitution.

In developing this brief we are expounding Presbytery's position based upon its actions (as listed below):

- 1) on 4/13/91, in sustaining the complaint of Harrell, *et. al.* (Record of the Case, pp. 140-146, hereafter Record, followed by page number),
- 2) its reaffirmation of that judgment in adopting the motion "that the James River Presbytery reaffirm its Confessional position maintained at the April 1990 Stated Meeting where TE Hopper was for the common welfare of the churches of Presbytery and now again shall be disallowed to teach and preach the views of prophecy and tongues found in the writings of his paper ... " (Record 138f.);
- 3) on 7/13/91, its denial of TE Hopper's complaint (Record 156),
- 4) the committing to record of the document "Refutation of Hopper and Loker Complaint" (Record 153-155, which is appended to this brief. See Appendix 1, "Refutation of Hopper and Loker Complaint"),
- 5) and its reaffirmation of its position in adopting the motion, "whereas Presbytery has elected a Committee to report to the Grace Covenant Church in Williamsburg respecting the actions of the April 1991 Stated Meeting of Presbytery, wherein a complaint against a previous action

JOURNAL

of Presbytery which had allowed TE Hopper to teach his views on prophecy, tongues, and interpretation of tongues was sustained, with Presbytery reaffirming its Constitutional position by disallowing the teaching of such views ... Whereas the complaint filed by TE Hopper and Ruling Elder Loker has not been sustained by Presbytery ...," (Record 156 and 157).

The conduct of the James River Presbytery's response to this Complaint has been complicated by numerous procedural problems in the hearing of the case by the Standing Judicial Commission. A Hearing was held on 18 November 1991, but had to be adjourned due to several of the requirements of the "Manual of Standing Judicial Commission" not having been met by the Commission's Panel. This brief is submitted for the Hearing scheduled for 13 January 1992.

According to the "Manual of Standing Judicial Commission", the Respondents respectfully acted in accordance with stated instructions 5.5 (a) and submitted our objections to the Record of the Case we received in the following particulars (we quote):

1. The complaint of Harrell, *et. al*, as found in the Record on page 144 has been obscured. The bottom paragraph is illegible and quite important.
2. A document referred to in the Record, page 154, under "point number 3" should be included (it is the response of the Committee on Constitutional Business to a Constitutional Inquiry posed by the Stony Point Reformed Presbyterian Church Session, about the constitutionality of a Presbytery's having forbidden a TE to teach and preach his views. This question was raised with TE Hopper and an action of the James River Presbytery specifically in view.) The Committee's answer is found in the minutes of the 18th General Assembly, page 205 (attached). (Letter of the Respondents to the Convener, 17 September 1991, page 2.)

These defects in the Record of the case were never agreed to by the Complainant, nor addressed by the Judicial Panel, despite our timely written request filed with the Panel. The Panel's conduct, we respectfully point out, is in explicit violation of "Manual of Standing Judicial Commission" 5.5 (c):

If the parties do not agree on the correction, the hearing will be postponed, and the Secretary of the Commission shall remit the record of the case to the Clerk of the lower court, together with the party's objections and suggested corrections...

The Hearing date was not postponed, nor was the record remitted to the Clerk of the lower court, despite the fact that these defects could easily have been remedied.

Further, the Respondents registered an objection to the judicial orderliness of the complaint of 22 July 1991 in the following particulars:

1. TE Hopper filed a complaint against 3 actions of the James River Presbytery taken on 13 April 1991, in five specifications of error (Record 149-152). That complaint was denied by the James River Presbytery on 13 July 1991. However, the complaint forwarded to the General Assembly dated 22 July 1991 is not the same complaint as the one which the James River Presbytery considered. Thus the complaint which you have received (22 July) has never been considered by the James River Presbytery. This is contrary to *BCO* 43-3.
2. The 22 July complaint contains specifications of error which were never considered as such by the James River Presbytery: Record 6, #6, "The Presbytery in its deliberations ..." As respondents on behalf of the James River Presbytery, it is impossible for us to defend Presbytery, when Presbytery has never heard or responded to this charge itself. Moreover, when and how did Presbytery allegedly do this? (Compare the principle of *BCO* 32-5, "... the times, places and circumstances should, if possible, be particularly stated, that the accused may have an opportunity to make his defense.")
3. Paragraph 1 of the 22 July complaint (Record 3) states that it is the Complainant's intention to complain against "the July 13 action of the James River Presbytery." This would amount to a complaint against the denial of his earlier complaint. Obviously, it is the earlier complaint, which was denied by Presbytery, which should be before the Judicial Commission. The James River Presbytery has never heard a complaint against any 13 July action.
4. We respectfully suggest that the paragraph beginning, "The most grievous dimension of this process ..." (Record 7), is not properly before the Standing Judicial Commission. Rather it

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

might come before the Committee on Constitutional Business as a non-judicial reference. We believe that this may confuse some of the issues by being introduced before the Standing Judicial Commission. (*ibid.*)

Further objections raised to the record of the Case as the result of the submission of a different complaint to the General Assembly were as follows:

1. (Record 6, "Specifications of Error: General", 1.): "The James River Presbytery has erred in forbidding one of its Teaching Elders from preaching and teaching his views on the ministry of the Holy Spirit (as summarized in his Twelve Points and amplified in his Final Report to the James River Presbytery)." NOTE THAT NO CORRESPONDING "GENERAL" SPECIFICATION OF ERROR IS FOUND IN THE COMPLAINT HEARD BY THE PRESBYTERY (RECORD 149-152).
2. (Record 6, #3): The Presbytery was never charged with the violation of BCO "Preliminary Principle 1." NOTE NOTHING CORRESPONDING IN ANY SPECIFICATION OF ERROR FOUND IN THE COMPLAINT HEARD BY THE PRESBYTERY (RECORD 149-152).
3. (Record 6, #6): The Presbytery in its deliberations, has given great weight to the fact that the majority of the Grace Covenant elders were in opposition to TE Hopper's views. We believe that the orthodoxy of a Teaching Elder ought not to be determined by what the majority of his Ruling Elders believe ..." NOTE THAT NO CORRESPONDING SPECIFICATION OF ERROR IS FOUND IN THE COMPLAINT CONSIDERED BY THE PRESBYTERY (RECORD 149-152).

Our objection to the judicial orderliness of the 22 July complaint was likewise an objection to the Record of the Case. The Judicial Panel initially, in our humble and respectful opinion, acted contrary to the instructions in the "Manual of Standing Judicial Commission", 5.5 (b), and (c) on this matter as well:

If the other party shall agree to the suggested corrections, such corrections shall be reduced to writing, stipulated to by the parties and made a part of the Record of the Case ... If the parties do not agree on the correction, the hearing will be postponed, and the secretary of the Commission shall remit the Record of the Case to the Clerk of the lower court, together with the party's objections and suggested corrections. The Clerk of the lower court shall reply promptly to these objections.

At the first attempted Hearing, the Complainant agreed not to raise these points in his oral argument. The Respondents then appealed in writing to the Panel to follow its Manual, and it stated in a letter dated 13 December 1991 that these points are no longer to be considered part of the Record.

We humbly maintain however, that because the Record has not yet been agreed to by the parties on the original matters, or sent down to the Presbytery, no date can yet have legitimately been set for a hearing. The Respondents appealed to the Panel on 18 November and again later in writing to remit the Record to the Presbytery in accordance with the rules of the Manual. But despite the fact that the Manual grants no discretion on this matter, the Panel has refused to respond to our appeals.

Additionally, we humbly point out that this Judicial Panel acted contrary to the "Manual of Standing Judicial Commission," 7.7 (a): which requires a Panel to set a time and place for a hearing of the case, "making every reasonable effort to obtain such time and place as may be agreeable to all parties." Before the first hearing, on 18 November, no attempt whatsoever was made to determine a time agreeable to the Respondents.

Further, we respectfully point out that this Judicial Panel acted contrary to "The Manual of Standing Judicial Commission," 7.7 (b), pertaining to the notification of parties. Written notification was posted on 22 October for a hearing scheduled for 18 November, giving less than the 30 day notice required. One of the Respondents received no written notification whatsoever.

Further, we feel obliged respectfully to point out that this Judicial Panel, before the 18 November scheduled hearing, did not comply with the "Manual of Standing Judicial Commission," 7.7 (c), which states the responsibility of a Panel to "notify all parties of their right to submit written briefs. . . ." No

JOURNAL

such notification was made. This panel, we respectfully point out, did not comply with the "Manual of Standing Judicial Commission," 7.7 (d), which requires a Panel to notify all parties of their right to represent themselves or be represented at the hearing in accordance with the provisions of the *Book of Church Order*. No such notification was made by this Panel.

The Respondents acknowledge that the objections raised to the Panel's not having followed the rules of the "Manual" 7.7 (a)-(d) are no longer relevant. Another Hearing date was set and proper notification was made. Further, certain objections raised to the Record were remedied. We appreciate these corrections. But these were not provided according to the provisions of the Manual, because the Record was not sent to the lower court. What is more, these corrections were made only after our third request and we were notified of them on 13 December 1991, giving us less than the required 30 days to prepare our brief.

However our objection to the Panel's non-compliance with "Manual" 5.5 (c) with respect to the matters raised on page five, above, remains.

While we respectfully maintain these objections to the procedure, we acknowledge that we are men under authority, and therefore proceed to respond.

II. Response to Specifications of Error ["Specific" (Record 6)]

1. Did the James River Presbytery act contrary to 1 Corinthians 14.1, 1 Thessalonians 5.19-22, and 1 Corinthians 14.39-40, when on 13 April 1991 it "... for the common welfare of the churches of Presbytery ... disallowed TE Hopper to teach and preach the views of prophecy and tongues found in the writings of his paper titled "Final Report to the James River Presbytery" (cf. Record 6)?

"Follow the way of love and eagerly desire spiritual gifts, especially the gift of prophecy." 1 Corinthians 14.1

Presbytery has acted in conformity with this text of Scripture. It has followed the way of love and eagerly desires spiritual gifts. It can be said that Presbytery acted contrary to the inspired instruction "earnestly to desire spiritual gifts, especially the gift of prophecy," only on the basis of two unproven assumptions: 1) the assumption that the New Testament gift of prophecy is DEFINITELY still given to the Church today. 2) That New Testament prophecy is to be understood as Mr. Hopper defines it in his writings. Presbytery has only disallowed the teaching of his view of this, no other view. In making his charge against Presbytery, Mr. Hopper assumes both that he has defined the New Testament phenomenon accurately, and that God gives that gift, so defined, to the Church today.

However, the Presbyterian Church in America has never said, either in its Constitution, its Pastoral Letter, any deliverance, or in any judicial case, any such thing, i.e. that our Church believes Scripture teaches in 1 Corinthians 14.1 or elsewhere that God gives that gift as defined by TE Hopper to the PCA today.

Presbytery was never convinced that TE Hopper's definition of the New Testament gift of prophecy (a "kind of congregational counseling," (cf. Record 51-67) is biblically sound and accurate. At no time did the Presbytery approve of TE Hopper's position. Even those who argued for its acceptability disclaimed personal commitment to it ("... and while individual members of Presbytery don't agree with these views ..." Record 129). We are not aware of any Reformed theologian who has adopted his view. On the contrary, when Presbytery sustained the complaint of Harrell, *et. al.*, it described his view as "... esoteric, if not idiosyncratic ..." (Record 145 [d]). See also TE Hopper's view compared in table form with the views of other theologians, wherein Mr. Hopper himself admits his view to be unique (Record 6). Thus, Presbytery continues to believe the inspired instruction of 1 Corinthians 14.1, but not Mr. Hopper's interpretation of it.

"Do not put out the Spirit's fire; do not treat prophecies with contempt. Test everything. Hold onto the good. Avoid every kind of evil." 1 Thessalonians 5.19-22

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Again, Presbytery continues to believe and obey this Word from God. It can be argued that Presbytery has violated this text only if the position is adopted that exactly the same kind of "prophecies" are present in today's Church as were present in the Thessalonian church, and that both are to be understood AS INTERPRETED BY THE COMPLAINANT. At best, this thesis remains unproven. The James River Presbytery believes it is an erroneous interpretation of the New Testament text and history. We are glad and grateful that the apostolic Church did desire the gifts bestowed on them by the Holy Spirit, some of which, such as prophecy, were clearly related to divine revelation then being given.

"Therefore, my brothers, be eager to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues. But everything must be done in a fitting and orderly way." 1 Corinthians 14.39,40

Once again, the James River Presbytery continues to believe and proclaim this Word of God. Only upon TE Hopper's construction of the text has Presbytery violated it. Does the Holy Spirit give the same kind of prophecies, tongues, and interpretation of tongues, as defined by the Complainant, to our Congregations? Neither this Presbytery, nor the Church at large have so interpreted the teaching of Holy Scripture. Are we to say that anyone in the Presbyterian Church in America who is not "eager to prophesy", violates Scripture? Are we to say that any Church court which is unconvinced that Corinthian tongues as defined by the Complainant are present in the Church today, and thus disallows his kind of "speaking in tongues" breaks the Scripture? Surely the Presbyterian Church in America has never adopted such an interpretation of biblical teaching.

The Presbytery's duty is to teach and practice the Word of God, but not any particular Teaching Elder's interpretation of it, except as adopted by the Church (cf. "... its doctrinal standards [are] set forth in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* together with the *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*, and the *Book of Church Order*, comprising the Form of Government, the Rules of Discipline, and the Directory for Worship; all as adopted by the Church." *BCO*, Preface, III).

When Presbytery denied TE Hopper's complaint on 13 July 1991, it committed to its minutes the "Refutation of Hopper and Loker Complaint" (Record 153ff). There the point is legitimately made that were Presbytery to sustain this point of the complaint, we would not simply be allowing TE Hopper to maintain his erroneous view, we would be positively endorsing that view, and condemning as being unscriptural all who hold opposing views. This point of the complaint is phrased so that such opponents of TE Hopper's views are opposing the Word of God, an assertion which remains to be proven ... TE Hopper has elevated his erroneous interpretation to the level of Scripture. We are charged to stand not for the fabrications being advocated by TE Hopper, but for apostolic, prophetic, and miraculous ministry, namely, that ministry based on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, now conveyed to us through the completed Canon of Scripture, working miraculously to transform sinners into children of God.

The James River Presbytery further responds to this charge by stating that it has acted responsibly and biblically in disallowing the teaching of Mr. Hopper's views of prophecy, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. In support of this the Presbytery submits that: 1) the Presbytery has acted in conformity with the previous rulings of the General Assembly pertaining to the issue in question; 2) TE Hopper's views of prophecy, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues are founded on unsound biblical exegesis and reasoning therefrom; 3) the views violate the teaching of Scripture; and 4) the views are both confused and confusing in character.

In Conformity With Previous Rulings of the General Assembly

The James River Presbytery acted in clear conformity with all previous rulings of the General Assembly pertaining to the issue in question.

Please note the decision of the Eighth General Assembly in Bogue, *et. al.* vs. Ascension Presbytery, in which the Assembly expressed its opinion as follows:

The Commission judges that simply affirming that the canon is closed, and that supposed new revelations from God add nothing to the deposit of truth already found in Scripture does not cover all the negations concerning new revelations from God in the *WCF* I 1,6, and *BCO*

JOURNAL

7-1. These statements of the standards also negate the idea that any extraordinary ways still continue in addition to Scripture as ways by which God verbally uncovers His will to His people. (M8GA, p. 93)

TE Hopper's view of prophecy, tongues, and interpretation of tongues, notwithstanding his denial that they contain revelation from God, does present these phenomena as extraordinary ways whereby God uncovers His will to His people, with respect to "the unique needs of the Congregation" (cf. Affirmation 7, Record 30), and with respect to how God is to be approached in prayer and praise through tongues (Record 50).

Second, the Fourteenth General Assembly ruled against the views of TE Wm. Hyer, whose views as expressed in the Commission Report bear a similarity to those advocated by TE Hopper (cf. M14GA, p. 226, I. A.B.C.D.). To illustrate, please observe that when Mr. Hyer was asked, "Does the New Testament gift of prophecy continue in the church today?" he answered, "There is a valid gifting of prophecy today. I don't view such as revelatory, however." (M14GA, p. 226). Furthermore, when asked whether the revelation given to prophets in 1 Corinthians 14.29-31 continues today, Mr. Hyer answered, "It can happen today; it is theoretically possible" ... (*ibid.*), and further answered, "I don't deny that God can impress upon someone a future event . . .," and, ". . .As far as communication or a vision -- nothing is impossible to God...prophecy will continue until the Second Coming of Christ in light of 1 Cor. 13." (*ibid.*) TE Hopper says that he denies that a prophet can "INERRANTLY predict the future..." (Record 18), implying that he allows for fallible prophetic predictions. TE Hopper may attempt to distinguish his views from those of Mr. Hyer, but in essence and principle, his views are quite similar.

The General Assembly decided that Hyer's views were out of accord with our Constitutional Standards, and their written opinion speaks categorically against the views not only of Mr. Hyer, but also against those similar views of TE Hopper, saying,

The Constitutional Standards of the PCA do not allow for a type of continuing revelation that is not canonical Scripture (which is complete) but is more than mere illumination and providence; a type of non-authoritative, non-canonical, new revelation. (M14GA, p. 230)

The James River Presbytery concurs with the reasoning of the complaint of Gentry, *et. al.*, as to why TE Hyer's stated views are out of accord with the Constitutional Standards (M14GA, pp. 226-228, II.III.). It also concurs with the judgment rendered by the GA (M14GA, pp. 229, 230, II, III, IV).

The Sixteenth General Assembly's decision in Rayburn, *et. al.*, vs. Missouri Presbytery, which is, to date, the most liberal allowance the General Assembly has afforded on this matter, allowed the action of Missouri Presbytery, to wit, a position statement which says in part, (we quote),

Not only is the canon of Scripture closed, but no gift is to be allowed which has the practical effect of FUNCTIONING as a normative source of truth or divine instruction from God, alongside the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures. (Emphasis in the original.)

and

The Candidates and Credentials Committee has the right to instruct Candidates not to teach this subject until the General Assembly takes a position. (M16GA, pp. 213, 214)

We maintain that the James River Presbytery is in conformity with these points, especially, by implication, point 4.

Unsound Bible Interpretation

Mr. Hopper's interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12-14, especially as it results in his definition of prophecy, is unsound. He defines the gift of prophecy as "a kind of 'congregational counseling' whereby the prophet, under intense illumination by the Spirit of God, is enabled to understand the unique needs of the congregation and hence to apply biblical truth to those needs for the purpose of edification, encouragement and comfort" (Record 51).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TE Hopper describes 1 Corinthians 14 as "unquestionably the most explicit teaching regarding the nature and purpose of this gift" (Record 54). Mr. Hopper seeks to prove his definition of prophecy from this passage, which offers "the most explicit teaching regarding the nature ... of this gift."

He offers ten arguments as support for his definition of prophecy as "congregational counseling". We shall evaluate them. They are as follows:

(1) 1 Corinthians 12.31 exhorts us to desire eagerly the greater gifts, especially prophecy. Love (ch. 13) is the greatest gift, therefore prophecy should be as eagerly sought as love (as he understands 14.1), and that by every Christian (as he would read 14.5a, and 14.39). He goes on to say that, "If those with this gift speak the very words of God which by definition, are infallible and possess absolute authority, then it is inconceivable to me that Paul would actually encourage everyone in the Corinthian church to pursue . . . this gift" (Record 54).

But first, in ch. 13 Paul does not describe love as another gift of the Spirit, alongside prophecy and tongues; instead he contrasts love FROM THESE GIFTS, as what will remain after they are long obsolete (13.8). The Corinthians had been serious about gifts, but careless about being loving in their exercise. So love is not another gift of the Spirit here, and Paul does not equate the value of love and prophecy.

Second, Paul never makes an absolute statement that everyone in the Corinthian church should desire the gift of prophecy. The Apostle's exhortation in 14.1 to "seek...to prophesy" is not an imperative that stands by itself, but a command to desire that gift more than the gift of TONGUES. "...especially that you may prophesy. FOR ONE WHO SPEAKS IN A TONGUE..." (14.1c-2a). Verse 2 begins with the causal conjunction "for". The Apostle's contrast is the relative value of prophecy and tongues, with prophecy much to be desired. So in Corinth, where tongues were so highly valued, Paul is explaining that prophecy ought to be more highly valued. This accounts for the statements in 14.5 and 39 as well. We might paraphrase Paul this way, "seek to prophesy more than what you are seeking, to speak in tongues."

In fact, the Apostle had already written in 12.29,30, "All are not apostles, are they? All ARE NOT prophets, are they?..." It is a well known fact that these are a series of rhetorical questions; they use the Greek construction that ALWAYS expects a negative answer. The Apostle used a question as a figure of speech, for making a positive statement: all are not prophets, just as all are not apostles. Therefore, previous to ch. 14, the Apostle has already made it clear that not everyone in the congregation is expected to prophesy.

Professor Gordon Fee (one not generally persuaded of the Reformed position) writes about ch. 14, "With this section (verses 1-25) and the next (verses 26-40) Paul proceeds at last to offer specific correctives to the Corinthians' apparently unbridled use of tongues in the assembly. He began his argument with them by setting forth the broader theological framework in which these specifics are to be understood ... In vv. 1-5 and 20-25 he urges that they seek prophecy vis-a-vis tongues because, being understandable, it can both edify and lead to conversion." (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 652). (For Fee's view of the nature of New Testament prophecy see pp. 595f.)

(2) TE Hopper argues from 14.3 "...everyone who prophesies speaks to men for their strengthening, encouragement, and comfort", that Paul "DEFINES PROPHECY as speaking to men for 'their strengthening, encouragement, and comfort'" (emphasis ours, Record 55). Mr. Hopper then goes on to develop the idea that because strengthening, encouragement, and comfort are responsibilities laid on all Christians, therefore prophecy is simply a heightened ability to do this, given to some, and identified as a spiritual gift (Record 56).

But notice that Paul does not express or imply the NATURE of prophecy in this verse (or elsewhere in the chapter). He states rather the INTENTION or the EFFECTS of its use. (The reason is that the Corinthians might see that uninterpreted tongues, which are unintelligible, can not edify. The point of the

chapter is edification.) It is an exceedingly unsound principle of interpretation to determine the NATURE of a phenomenon by its EFFECTS.

If we followed the principle of defining a phenomenon by its effects, we might conclude that THE GOSPEL MESSAGE ITSELF IS A MESSAGE OF CONDEMNATION AND DEATH, since on some, the effect of the Apostle's gospel ministry was an "aroma from death to death" (2 Corinthians 2.16). In fact, however, the gospel makes known "the sweet aroma of the knowledge of Him in every place" (2 Corinthians 2.14). Paul's point here is that men twist what is sweet and beautiful, the Gospel of Christ, to their own condemnation. The EFFECT of the Gospel ministry in their case, DEATH, is not a legitimate way to argue for the NATURE of the Gospel ministry.

Again, many things might bring strengthening, encouragement, and comfort to believers. One's next-door neighbor, though a non-Christian, might be more kind to children by God's common grace than a Christian is. By observing that neighbor, a Christian might be strengthened and encouraged to see and practice more kindness to his children. But because that EFFECT followed from his neighbor's example, we would not want to define his neighbor's actions as PROPHECY.

(3) Mr. Hopper argues next for the "counseling" aspect of his definition of prophecy: because the Corinthians are to "evaluate the content of those prophecies", the prophecies must not be "the very words of God because Paul would never tell Christians to *diakrino* those words." Mr. Hopper takes the Greek verb *diakrino* to mean "to sift, to discern, to weigh, to evaluate, to distinguish" (Record 57). He continues, "On the other hand, if prophecy was providing what I have called 'counsel' then this command to carefully weigh and evaluate it would be most appropriate" (Record 56f).

Apparently however, Mr. Hopper does not acknowledge that in the original text of v. 29, the words "what is said," do not appear. Instead 1 Corinthians 14.29 literally rendered yields this: "let two or three prophets speak, and let the others pass judgment" (New American Standard Bible). It may well not be words at all that are to be judged.

Outside 1 Corinthians 12-14, the nearest use of the verb *diakrino* in 1 Corinthians is in 11.29,31. In 11.29 it refers to judging the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but though it might mean "to discern, to weigh, to evaluate, to distinguish" in this verse, it can not mean "to sift." Paul's point here is that the Corinthians need to realize how weighty a matter participation in the Lord's Supper is and not take it lightly, as they have been doing. *Diakrino* here must mean rather, "to discern, to judge," Christ's body, which means to distinguish it from a common meal. In 11.31 Paul's exhortation to the Corinthians is that they "evaluate" their own faith in order that they be not judged by God. Certainly then in 1 Corinthians 14.29 it is equally possible that the congregation is being called upon, not to sift Spirit-given thought from fallible words in one prophetic utterance, but to evaluate whether or not those who claim to be speaking for God are actually doing so. Luke commended the Bereans for doing the latter (using a form of *krino*) as they listened to the preaching of the apostle Paul (Acts 17.11).

Or, it could be that Paul is instructing the prophets themselves to judge who should speak and in what order. Paul uses this verb twice earlier in 1 Corinthians to describe judging between PEOPLE (4.7, "Who made you TO DIFFER (implied, from someone else)?", and 6.5, "...one wise man, who will be able TO DECIDE BETWEEN HIS BRETHREN...", cf Acts 15.9). It is by no means certain that Paul commands the Corinthians "to carefully weigh and evaluate" the words of prophets.

(4) Mr. Hopper writes, "If these prophets brought the very words of God ... to the church, it is very inconsistent that Paul would place such a limit" [in number of speakers]. "In fact, we would expect just the opposite - let as many prophets speak as want to: we dare not limit the amount of time that God is speaking directly to us" (Record 57). Perhaps this is an argument for the suitability of unlimited length in Apostolic sermons. It is not clear that that even the apostles could speak without any regard for the circumstances and edification of their congregations. Paul's regulation of the prophets' ministry is not proof that they spoke as mere "counselors."

(5) Mr. Hopper argues that "Since headship and authority are principles rooted in creation itself, the only way to understand women being given permission to exercise the gift of prophecy (1 Corinthians

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

11.5) is to understand that `prophecy' as being less than authoritative" (Record 59). The premises of this conclusion are that Paul does not forbid but regulates the prophesying of women in 1 Corinthians 11.5 and that he forbids the public teaching of women in 1 Timothy 2.12.

We respond by pointing out that there are other ways to reconcile this problem. If prophecy, as commonly understood, was a gift of inspiration by the Holy Spirit, it would imply no personal authority for the person exercising it. Balaam's donkey (though a female, Numbers 22.25) did not become an authority figure in Israel because she spoke by miraculous inspiration.

Second, teaching (forbidden to women in 1 Timothy 2.12) is of a different character than prophesying. The teacher expounds a text of Scripture. He must have the assent of the people to his authority as a spiritual father, worthy of the Christians' imitation (1 Timothy 3.5). On the contrary, a woman speaking by miraculous inspiration would need no similar qualification. The point is not to argue that one of these is necessarily the only resolution of this difficulty, but simply to suggest that there are more than "the only possible way" offered by TE Hopper for the resolution of it.

(6) We will treat Mr. Hopper's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 13.8-12 below.

(7) Mr. Hopper argues that, "My understanding of the gift of prophecy [is] sound is because it follows a precedent already established - that Paul makes the distinction between apostles (messengers) and those who hold the formal office of Apostle; and between those with the gift of serving and those who hold the formal office of Deacon" (Record 60). He goes on to state that if there were inspired Prophets referred to in Ephesians 2.20, then "the existence of such a group . . . would not negate the possibility that . . . there would be prophets - those who are distinct from these alleged infallible Prophets". We note however that this is no more than a "possibility", even for Mr. Hopper; it is no proof at all.

(8) TE Hopper argues that if New Testament prophets spoke with "the very words of God, then where in the New Testament are these words recorded?" (Record 60). We might suggest the Epistle to the Hebrews as a possibility.

(9) Mr. Hopper argues that because the foundation stones in John's vision of the new Jerusalem were inscribed with the names of the 12 Apostles of the Lamb (Revelation 21.1,2,14), that prophets were not also foundational ministers. "This once again causes me to question the appropriateness of elevating those with the gift of prophecy to the place of equal authority with the Apostles" (Record 61). Of course, arguments from the silence of a text are never conclusive. Furthermore, to our knowledge no one has asserted that prophets had an equal place of authority with Apostles. Instead, it is held that prophets prophesied under divine inspiration like Apostles. Paul's very point in 1 Corinthians 12-14 was to regulate the ministry of those with the gifts of prophecy, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. His regulation of them does not argue that they were uninspired. Neither does their inspiration argue that they were actually of equal authority with him.

But Paul warned the congregation that agreement with his letter was the true standard of the Spirit's presence in a prophet's ministry: "If anyone thinks he is a prophet or spiritual, let him recognize that the things WHICH I WRITE TO YOU ARE THE LORD'S COMMANDMENT. But if anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized" (1 Cor. 14.37f). This warning does imply that the Corinthian prophets were claiming great authority.

(10) Mr. Hopper understands John Calvin to have taught a view somewhat similar to his. We do not agree with his interpretation of the writings of John Calvin, nor would such a point be conclusive for the Church, however fascinating it might be.

We find none of TE Hopper's ten arguments from 1 Cor. 14 for defining prophecy as "congregational counseling" persuasive.

When TE Hopper takes up the question of the meaning of the term translated "revelation" in 1 Corinthians 14.26, he seeks to show that prophecy was not "the very words of God being given and

transmitted" because "it seems rather strange that God would interrupt Himself." Thus, he argues, the term "revelation" does not refer to "infallible communication." (Record 64) Mr. Hopper therefore looks for another definition of the term translated "revelation." He finds this in Ephesians 1.17 where Paul prays, using the same word translated "revelation" to refer to what we commonly understand as the "illumination" of the Holy Spirit.

But Mr. Hopper's surprise at the interruption of one inspired prophet by another inspired prophet is not a sufficient reason to conclude that Paul is referring to illumination, not inspired communication, when he uses the word translated "revelation" in 1 Corinthians 14.29-33. On the contrary, according again to Fee, the word "revelation" here, "... could very easily be a cover word for all other forms of intelligible inspired speech ..." (*1 Corinthians*, p. 691). Fee goes on to describe Paul's concern in verses 29-33, "The appeal is both to self control and to deference. It is difficult to imagine two people prophesying simultaneously. But since they apparently were doing so with tongues, this at least anticipates their also doing so with prophecy - as well perhaps as keeping it in the category of "controlled" speech in contrast to pagan varieties" (p. 695).

TE Hopper believes that the "revelation" of 1 Corinthians 14 is to be understood as we normally understand "illumination"; that is, the enlightening of the mind. But his exegesis falters on another ground: that of history. Virtually all New Testament scholars date 1 Corinthians as one of the earliest of the New Testament documents. According to Professor Donald Guthrie, in *New Testament Introduction*, neither the Gospels, nor Acts, nor Hebrews, nor the Epistles of Peter or John or the Book of Revelation were written by the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians. The only New Testament documents which are likely to be earlier than 1 Corinthians were Galatians and the Thessalonian letters. If the prophecy of 1 Corinthians 14 was not inspired communication, what was being illumined in the mind of the prophet? If it was Scripture, it can only have been Galatians, the Thessalonian letters, or the Old Testament. Does TE Hopper believe that the prophesying of 1 Corinthians 14 or 1 Thessalonians 5 (which was even earlier than 1 Corinthians) was an application of the letter to the Galatians, for instance? Nothing whatever in either context suggests this. It seems clear that the prophecy of 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians was not merely the application of Old Testament Scripture or of Paul's earlier Epistles. The natural and historical reading of it is that it was inspired communication.

Has TE Hopper demonstrated his definition of the nature of prophecy as "a kind of congregational counseling under the intense illumination of the Holy Spirit"? Neither any one in its own right, nor all ten arguments together provide such a demonstration.

TE Hopper appears to be able to produce only such an attenuated definition of prophecy because he is unwilling to interpret Scripture by Scripture, or the unclear by the clear (cf. *WCF* 1.9). For example, Mr. Hopper refuses to interpret 1 Corinthians 12 where there is no definition of the NATURE of prophecy, in the light of Ephesians 2.19,20, which he calls, "a much disputed, inconclusive text" (Record 53).

Mr. Hopper argues that Ephesians 2.19,20, "So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and are of God's household, having been built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone," does not "define the term prophet, identify the nature of the prophet, or hint at a definition of the prophet" (*ibid.*). In his view, to begin with Ephesians 2.20 as many have wanted to do is like trying to teach a child the nature of professional football from the Goodyear blimp. According to Mr. Hopper 1 Corinthians 14, on the other hand, is the most "detailed explanation" of the gift of prophecy "in all of Scripture." (Record 54).

Now it is possible that Ephesians 2.20 is referring, not to two groups of foundational officers, "apostles," and, "prophets," but to one, "apostles who are prophets." Apparently, Mr. Hopper thinks this is the best translation of the text. But near the end of this verse's context, in 4.11, apostles and prophets are quite clearly two separate groups (both being introduced by the definite article, compare also 1 Corinthians 12.28; Revelation 18.20). It is unlikely that Paul is indulging in a special use of the terms in 2.20, which is within the same context. (Compare A.T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, p. 153, along with G. Knight, *Prophecy in the New Testament*, p. 19n.9, J. Eadie, C. Hodge, H. Ridderbos, *Paul*, p. 451, G.E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, and J.R.W. Stott, all *ad. loc.*)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Moreover, what Mr. Hopper apparently objects to in the theological analysis of beginning with Ephesians 2.20 in definition of New Testament prophecy is that the text is shorter than 1 Corinthians 14. But the important point is this: In Ephesians 2.19, 20, the Apostle describes God's purpose for prophets in the whole economy of redemptive history.

In the context, which begins at 2.11 and extends to 4.16, Paul describes God's great building project founded upon Jesus Christ the cornerstone, including Jew and Gentile, which He is building up to "the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ" (4.13). This is nothing less than the new temple of God built upon Christ with living stones, from the time of His resurrection until the time of the Church's glorification. What place do prophets take in that building project? They take the place of a foundation (2.20). Further, they along with the Apostle Paul have received "insight into the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it has now been revealed to His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit" (3.4,5). The Apostle goes on to describe the reception of Gentiles as fellow heirs of God's covenant promise along with the Jews through the Gospel.

In that project of building the Church, prophets play a foundational role. They along with the Apostles received insight into the meaning of what was formerly hidden: God's great plan of salvation of Jew and Gentile alike in one body. This insight came by revelation of the Spirit. In this context, the Apostle uses the same language that he does in 1 Corinthians 14, "apostle, prophet, revelation." This appears to be more than a hint at the role of the prophet. It is not an apostolic statement about prophecy "from the Goodyear blimp." It is instead the apostolic statement of the function of the New Testament prophet in all of redemptive history.

This, of course, has great implications for our view of the nature of New Testament prophecy. If it is part of the foundation, it will not continue to be laid throughout history, but instead will be laid once, and then be built upon. Of course, this would mean that New Testament prophets were, to use the language of our Constitution, "agents by whom God completed His revelation to His Church." And it would follow that, again as we believe, "Such officers and gifts related to new revelation have no successors since God completed His revelation at the conclusion of the Apostolic Age." (BCO 7-1). To be more specific, New Testament prophets have no successors, since they were part of the necessary FOUNDATION of the Church.

TE Hopper is unwilling to allow the more clear in Scripture to interpret the less clear in Scripture. Apparently, wishing not to identify New Testament prophecy with special revelation, he must distinguish the gift of prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14 from the prophecy of Ephesians 3.5 and 4.11, where it is clearly a gift of special revelation.

Moreover, in order to maintain his definition of prophecy, Mr. Hopper must also distinguish the gift of prophecy in 1 Cor. 12-14 from the gift of prophecy found in the book of Acts. There, in 21.10,

"a certain PROPHET named Agabus came down from Judea. And coming to us, he took Paul's belt, and bound his own feet and hands, and said, "THIS IS WHAT THE HOLY SPIRIT SAYS: `In this way the Jews of Jerusalem will bind the man who owns this belt and deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.'"

Agabus is quite clearly a New Testament prophet. He acts in just the same mold as the Old Testament prophet: he speaks in the name of the Lord (compare the characteristic OT phrase "Thus says the LORD:" to "This is what the Holy Spirit says."), and he uses symbolic prophetic actions. But just as the role assigned to prophecy in Ephesians 2.20 must be avoided for Mr. Hopper, apparently because it makes New Testament prophets part of the foundation of the Church, likewise Agabus' prophecy must be distinguished from 1 Corinthians prophecy, because Agabus speaks words inspired by the Holy Spirit.

TE Hopper seems not to have considered the teaching of the Apostle Peter about the nature of prophecy. In 2 Peter 1:20 he affirms "that no prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet's own interpretation." This has to do with the prophecy that resulted in written Scripture before the time of Peter's writing. But Peter then continues to PROVE his statement on the basis of the NATURE of prophecy: "For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were

JOURNAL

carried along by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21). Verse 21 is not a repetition of verse 20 but is a general statement about prophecy which substantiates verse 20. Note that it begins with the word, "for". Why was inscripturated prophecy not the prophet's own interpretation? Simply because "no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God" (2 Peter 1:21). Peter says that there are no exceptions ("...no prophecy...ever") to his definition of prophecy. This is the same apostle who spoke on the day of Pentecost, many years earlier, about the fact that in the New Testament age men and women would prophesy. He wrote his second epistle long after Paul wrote 1 Corinthians. It follows then that no prophecy was ever made except that by which "men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God."

When we turn to the Old Testament and look there at the nature of prophecy, we find that it is in all cases revelation from God. Such is the consistent Scriptural presentation of prophecy from its beginning as a special office with Moses (Deuteronomy 18:18, "...I will put my words in his mouth..."). To maintain his idea of prophecy as mere "congregational counseling", which is not revelatory, the Complainant must not only drive a wedge between Old Testament and New Testament prophecy, but between the prophecy in 1 Corinthians 12-14 and that in Acts and Ephesians as well. We believe that such a wedge can only be found in the Scriptures by reading it in from the outside. TE Hopper's method is eisegetical rather than exegetical.

Finally, we point to a number of places in which Mr. Hopper's views arise from faulty reasoning. For instance, Mr. Hopper asserts that the theological distinction between "revelation" and "illumination" is not biblically sound: "that is a very helpful distinction, but the Scriptures simply do not support such a neat, clean distinction as we so frequently use." (Record 38). To support this striking denial, TE Hopper brings the evidence that the Greek word group translated "reveal/revelation" can refer also to what we commonly understand as "illumination."

But it is not true that the theological distinction between these two ministries of the Holy Spirit, one of special revelation and the other of the illumination of that revelation, is based solely and alone on a one-sided reading of this word group in the New Testament. Mr. Hopper draws from his word-study the conclusion "...our traditional theological distinction between 'revelation' and 'illumination' may be useful and helpful, but it is not consistently biblical" (Record 40).

Traditional theological terminology has defined "revelation" as something objective, the impartation of information by God, and "illumination" as an inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts. Consultation of the standard theological texts would have shown Mr. Hopper that the distinction he calls "not consistently biblical" rests on a much more solid foundation than his conclusion suspects (cf. John Owen, *A Discourse on the Holy Spirit*, Book 4, Chapter 4, in his *Works*, 1979, V. 4, pp. 161-174, and compare with Owen, Abraham Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 1900, pp. 152ff.).

We turn next to Mr. Hopper's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 13.8-12:

Love never fails; but if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away; if there are tongues, they will cease; if there is knowledge it will be done away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when the perfect comes, the partial will be done away. When I was a child, I used to speak as a child, think as a child, reason as a child; when I became a man, I did away with childish things. For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then I shall know fully, just as also I have been fully known.

Mr. Hopper reasons that in this passage, "Paul both raises and answers the question of cessation; and places cessation at the end of this age as we know it" (Record 92). The cessation to which Mr. Hopper refers is that of prophecy. He argues that the "perfect" in verse 10 is the return of Christ and that because when it comes "the partial will be done away," that therefore what is partial, "our knowledge and our prophecy," (verse 9) will also continue until the return of Christ.

But Paul does not specify the time when any particular MODE of revelation will cease. What he does affirm is the termination, when the perfect comes, of the believers' present, FRAGMENTARY KNOWLEDGE, based on likewise TEMPORARY MODES of revelation. The time of cessation of

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

prophecy and tongues is an open question as far as this passage is concerned, and will have to be decided on the basis of other passages and considerations. In other words, it is simply not the case that the apostle Paul equates prophecy with the partial, and then goes on to say that what is partial will continue until Christ returns. Instead he equates our knowledge with what is partial, that is, THE INFORMATION THAT COMES FROM prophecy and tongues, and says ONLY THAT THIS PARTIAL THING WILL CONTINUE AS A PARTIAL THING UNTIL CHRIST RETURNS.

By the same logic which Mr. Hopper employs in interpreting 1 Corinthians 13.8-12, he would also have to interpret Ephesians 4.11 as teaching that APOSTLES continue until the return of Christ, "and he gave some as apostles . . . until we attain to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ." Paul does not specify in this passage when the apostolate would cease, but we all, including Mr. Hopper, grant that it was strictly foundational.

Another example of Mr. Hopper's inconsistency in use of terms is found in his dealing with the question of whether or not New Testament prophets would be church OFFICERS today. He does believe that the gift exercised today would be the same gift, exactly the same gift, as that exercised in the Corinthian church. TE Hopper is not willing to call the kind of "prophets" which he envisages in our churches "officers". (Why not?) But when he refers to the "prophets" listed by the Apostle in 1 Corinthians 12.28,29, he speaks of them as "officers":

It is clear from the context in Romans 12 that Paul is not speaking of formal OFFICES AND OFFICERS but rather the body of Christ generally (12.4,5). When Paul has in mind offices, he speaks of them (1 Corinthians 12.28 29; Philipians 1.1) (Record 44).

Perhaps one could understand distinguishing New from Old Testament prophets. But how could one distinguish prophets in 1 Corinthians 12.28, who are New Testament church officers, from prophets in 1 Corinthians 14, who exercised the same gift as that supposedly given in today's churches, but WE WHO ARE NOT CHURCH OFFICERS? This is special pleading.

TE Hopper's views do not flow from a consistent and careful study and interpretation of Holy Scripture, but from faulty interpretive procedure.

TE Hopper's Views Violate the Scriptures

The Westminster Assembly confessed that the Scriptures are "most necessary." In other words, they could not be any more necessary to us than they are. The reasons for this fact are two: first, that general revelation is INSUFFICIENT to make known the way of salvation, and second, "those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased" (WCF 1.1). In the Form of Church Government adopted the same year as the Confession, the Westminster Assembly said this about New Testament prophets,

The officers which Christ hath appointed for the edification of his church, and the perfecting of the saints, are, some extraordinary, as apostles, evangelists and prophets, which are ceased. Others ordinary and perpetual, as pastors...(Free Church Edition, p. 398)

No one doubts that the Assembly viewed New Testament prophets as agents of special revelation (cf. B. B. Warfield, *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work*, 1972 reprint, pp. 205f., 280f., 285f., 304f.; *Shorter Writings*, II, p. 570; cf. Record 110 n.8 for quotations). It follows necessarily then that the Assembly included New Testament prophets among the ways of revelation, former to Scripture, which it confessed are now ceased.

Along with Reformed theologians from every century (Turretin and Witsius in the 17th, Edwards and Witherspoon in the 18th, Hodge and Dabney in the 19th, and Warfield, Bavinck, Kuyper, and G. Vos in the 20th), the Presbyterian Church has always affirmed that God is still speaking to the Church in Holy Scripture (cf. WCF 1.10), but that he is no longer making His will known through the "former ways" of revelation previously found in redemptive history, including the agents of it.

JOURNAL

Wrote Herman Bavinck in the 20th century with respect to the Apostolic Age and its offices related to revelation,

All of these offices - that of apostle, prophet, and evangelist - have vanished, to the extent that their incumbents have died and they, from the nature of the case, have not been supplanted by any others. They were necessary in the unusual time when the church had to be established on earth. (*Our Reasonable Faith*, p. 535)

Of our PCA, Dr. John H. Gerstner likewise states,

"Prophets." This refers to a group of men and women much more important in the New Testament economy than we often suppose. Their very listing next to the Apostles themselves suggests this. They seem to have performed both of the roles of the Old Testament prophets, namely, prediction and interpretation; or foretelling and forthtelling, as it is sometimes put... Their unique office, being subordinate to that of the apostle, was also not needed after the foundation of the New Testament church was laid. (*The Epistle to the Ephesians*, on Ephesians 2.20; compare Geerhardus Vos' equation of Old Testament and New Testament prophecy in *Biblical Theology*, p. 226.)

The apostle Paul envisaged a time when apostles would no longer be ministering personally in the Church. Gospel ministers were to "hold fast the standard of sound words." (2 Timothy 1:13). Peter clearly saw the prophets' ministry as foundational, not perpetual, "But false prophets also arose among the people, just as also there will be false teachers among you" (2 Peter 2:1). The Reformed Churches have always confessed as part of their faith this distinction between the Apostolic and the post-Apostolic ages of the Church.

Mr. Hopper's teaching on the nature of tongues appears to call this fundamental distinction into question. TE Hopper denies that his view of tongues conceives of it as the reception of revelation. But the James River Presbytery saw that TE Hopper's views contain inner tensions which tend to deny this qualification. (Presbytery noted this when it adopted the Harrell complaint, cf. Record 144, 4) [a].

For instance, TE Hopper distinguishes in his *Final Report* between the kind of prayer and praise that all Christians are required to give to God, and the prayer and praise of tongues. According to TE Hopper, in prayer by "expected in all", "... we pray in our own language by rationally forming the words in our minds and then offering them to God in our own language." (Record 50). However, this is not what happens when one receives the gift of tongues, a "unique enabling" from the Spirit. "... I think we can safely conclude from the text that the tongue-prayer is uniquely endowed with a gift that enables him to pray and praise God WITH THOUGHTS AND WORDS THAT ARE BEYOND HIS MENTAL AND LINGUISTIC CAPACITIES." (*ibid.* Emphasis ours). The first kind of prayer is "rationally formed" in the mind. The second is "beyond . . . mental and linguistic capacities." This is no ecstatic utterance for Mr. Hopper. It is prayer and praise which is to be "interpreted for the edification of the congregation" (Affirmation 6, Record 18).

On 12 January 1991, Mr. Hopper appealed to *Larger Catechism* 182 as Constitutional support for this enhanced ability to pray (Record 117). He apparently did not realize that the *LC* describes the help given to us in prayer by the Spirit in virtually the same words he used to describe the prayer expected of all, FROM WHICH HE DISTINGUISHES TONGUE PRAYER. The Westminster Divines speak of the Spirit's help as "... enabling us to UNDERSTAND both for whom and what and how prayer is to be made ..." But understanding is rational, and Mr. Hopper distinguishes tongues from what is rational; it is beyond mental capacity.

The unique endowment with the ability to pray and praise with thoughts "beyond his mental ... capacities" sounds very much like the impartation of divine revelation. Similarly, if one were enabled by the Holy Spirit to pray and praise with "words that are beyond his ... linguistic capacities" this too is very hard to distinguish from our normal understanding of verbal revelation.

Mr. Hopper writes that "prayer/praise/thanks-giving directed from the speaker to God" and "revelation coming from God to the speaker" are mutually exclusive categories (Record 50). But we see no reason whatever for this. Certainly great sections of Holy Scripture are both

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

prayer/praise/thanksgiving to God AND revelation from God. The book of Psalms could well be characterized this way. Are we not instructed by God about His will for our prayer and praise by means of these inspired prayers? Would not a person praying by the unique gift of the Holy Spirit in ideas and words beyond his mental and linguistic capacities be indicating God's will for how He should be praised? This is very close to special revelation if it is not this.

TE Hopper's answer to this was to state "there is a significant distinction between saying that 'words are coming from God today' (which implies the reception of revelation, which I explicitly deny) and a Spirit enhanced ability to pray" (Record 50). However it is not the James River Presbytery but Mr. Hopper who speaks of "thoughts" and "words" that are "beyond" the recipient's "mental and linguistic capacities." Perhaps Mr. Hopper does not really believe what he has written. But despite his denials, his exposition of the "mysterious" nature of tongues appears to be very much like our normal understanding of special revelation.

Paul wrote in 2 Timothy 3.16,17,

"Every Scripture is inspired of God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be equipped completely unto every good work."

According to this text, there is no good work which God wills for the man of God for which he is unprepared by Holy Scripture, in one or another of its many functions. The Apostle expresses precisely the same principle with respect to the Church as a whole,

He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, for the building up of the body of Christ; until we all attain to unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a mature man ..." (Ephesians 4.11-13).

The Word of God is the tool in his hand used to attain the goal of the full maturity of the body of Christ.

We might ask, "Can there be a need in the Church for which God has not provided in the Scriptures?" Undoubtedly, we must answer in the negative in light of these passages. So would the framers of our Church's confession:

The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture ..." (WCF 1.6).

There is no NEED, either for the HIGHEST GLORY of God (which is very great), or for our believing, or in our practical life, which is not addressed in one way or another in Holy Scripture. This is truly a precious teaching of Scripture. As the reformers declared, "the Word creates the Church." They meant that the Gospel precedes the existence of the people of God and defines that existence. We are to learn who we are and what we NEED as God's people from His all-sufficient Word. This is the teaching of the Scripture and of our Reformed faith.

The *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* defines the word "need" as either, "necessity arising from the facts and circumstances of a case," or "a matter requiring action to be taken; a piece of necessary business," or, "to be needful or necessary to a person or to some end or purpose," or, "to stand in need of, to require" (Oxford, 1973, Volume 2, page 1392). According to the text cited above, the Church has all of the teaching, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness necessary for all its "needs."

TE Hopper's views teach that congregations have "unique needs." The word "unique" means "alone in its own kind." Something "unique" is not only unusual, it is one of a kind. We take it then that Mr. Hopper believes that a given congregation has needs that are theirs alone. Its needs are no other congregation's; other congregations' needs are not its needs.

How then are these "unique needs" to come to the attention of the congregation for TE Hopper? They are to come by the ministry of "prophets". He writes, "... when the prophet receives 'revelation' the Holy Spirit is not giving him new words but rather enabling him to have great depth of insight and

JOURNAL

understanding. Depth of insight or understanding into what? I take it to mean insight into the situation of the congregation that needs addressed by the Lord through His Word." (Record 64). Note that this knowledge of the congregation's unique needs comes not from the Scripture, nor is it an exposition of any passage of Scripture. TE Hopper is clear in his statement that this knowledge does not consist of words coming from God. But equally, it does not consist of the written words of God in Scripture.

It is God the Holy Spirit who enables these "needs" to be discerned, by giving these prophetic utterances to the congregations. If a congregation's necessities are to be discerned, in the case of these prophecies, not from reflection upon Scripture, but by the knowledge of prophets, then it follows that the Scriptures are NOT A SUFFICIENT RULE AND STANDARD ADDRESSING ALL THE NECESSITIES OR NEEDS OF THAT CONGREGATION IN ITS PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES.

Thus, on this understanding held by TE Hopper, members of the church would be taught that their unique needs are to be addressed, God willing, by the ministry of prophetic utterances. (This is, after all, the New Testament view of prophecy, according to Mr. Hopper.) Those members who accepted this teaching about prophecy as true to the New Testament would feel compelled, by conscience, to pay attention to the teaching of the prophets.

All of us have a limited amount of attention. The attention of those church members so persuaded by Mr. Hopper would be directed not to one source of the knowledge of God, Holy Scripture, but to two sources: Holy Scripture and prophetic utterances. We see no way to avoid this conclusion.

The history of Christians in charismatic churches bears this out. The immediate and new "knowledge" coming today from God has a strong appeal over against the written Word, in our day. The written Word has to be explained in its context and then brought to bear by elders who counsel according to it. That is hard work for preacher and hearer. But it would be relatively easy, and therefore attractive to receive a fresh message from God through a prophet.

Though he denies the inerrancy of any prophetic predictions, TE Hopper does not deny prophetic prediction of the future, without the claim to inerrancy (Record 18). Clearly, a prediction of the future brings information to the hearer which is not found in Holy Scripture. This can not be called an "application" of Scripture.

The authority of God's Word is not compromised merely by taking away from it, but just as truly by adding to it. The reformers insisted that Rome's claim to the sole right authoritatively TO INTERPRET the Bible took the Bible from the people. To raise another ministry alongside the regular ministry of the Word, claiming an immediacy from heaven that can not be claimed for the regular ministry of the Word, is to bring in another authoritative source of the knowledge of the will of God into the Church.

In the end, *Sola Scriptura* is every bit as crucial to the Gospel as *Sola Fide*. Two counsels to the church, Scripture and the insight of prophets into the unique needs of the congregation, the latter arising from a source unavailable in Scripture to the non-prophet Christian, tears down the practical function of the Scripture Alone principle.

When the Church intrudes upon its people teachings and moral exhortations not from God, but of men, it creates a new legalism. Rome did this in the Middle Ages, when, no matter how well-intended, it added doctrines and rules of conduct which were not found in Holy Scripture. When the reformers came to see the true authority of the Bible, they cried out *Sola Scriptura!* and sought to liberate God's free-men from their chains. The Bible alone is the rule of the Church, they taught. It was his firm adherence to this principle which enabled Martin Luther to stand against all the powers of the known world who opposed the Gospel and say, "My conscience is held captive to the Word of God. And to go against conscience is neither right, nor safe. Here I stand. I can do no other, may God help me."

Closer to our day, certain kinds of fundamentalism have elevated the moral teachings of men to a supposed level with the teachings of God's Word. They thereby again place chains upon the people whom Christ has made free.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TE Hopper's view would have "prophets" counseling the congregation alongside the Scriptures. Their messages would not be expositions of Holy Scripture, where either by clear and simple expression, or by good and necessary consequence from it, God has made His will known. Though it is not Mr. Hopper's intention, it is nevertheless the result of his views, that the Church of Jesus Christ would be intruded upon by the doctrines and commandments of men, men who would claim unique enabling by the Holy Spirit to ascertain a congregation's needs. This must present a temptation to a congregation to betray true, biblical liberty of conscience.

God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in anything, contrary to His Word; or beside it, if matters of faith or worship. So that, to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commands, out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience: and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also. (WCF 20.2)

The conscience is free only when it acknowledges no lord except the Lord God. A congregation with "prophets" could very easily be put under a yoke of human bondage. Not only are the Scriptures all-sufficient for us; our congregations are deeply in need of a full, practical, and living knowledge of the Scriptures. How can we allow the precious minutes of our worship services to be taken up with merely human teaching, teaching which does not even claim to be an exposition of Holy Scripture? The members of the Presbyterian Church in America have a God-given right to receive a ministry which consists entirely of the pure milk of the Word.

TE Hopper's Views are Confused and Confusing

The James River Presbytery has spent many hours sifting through the various papers involved in this case and trying to come to a clear understanding of Mr. Hopper's views. It found his views esoteric, intricate, and confused. Presbytery believes that Mr. Hopper's views must confuse the people of God as well. We were unwilling to allow that. Because of this, Presbytery disallowed Mr. Hopper's teaching of those views.

What we mean when we describe his views as confused and confusing are some of the following points:

- * Tongues are said to be words and ideas beyond the mental and linguistic capacities of the recipients and are to be interpreted to the congregation by someone with the gift of interpretation. Nevertheless in the same document, tongues and interpretation are said not to be revelation from God.
- * Prophecy supposedly is not divine revelation, but it communicates something from God. It lies at the very heart of the biblical doctrine of inspiration and our belief in the inerrancy of Scripture that no communication from God can possibly err in any way. Yet in Mr. Hopper's view, prophetic communication may be tainted by human fallibility.
- * Prophecy has no authority, yet it is used to counsel and to encourage the congregation in the same worship services in which the Scriptures are so employed.
- * The gift of prophecy given to the Church according to TE Hopper is the same gift given to the Corinthian church as described in 1 Corinthians 12-14. That gift was clearly held and exercised by a Church officer named "prophet" in 1 Corinthians 12.28. Mr. Hopper acknowledges this. But he would teach the people that the present day "prophet" is NOT a Church officer alongside elder and deacon.
- * Historically the term "illumination" has been used to describe an enlightening of the mind to understand the Scripture or Jesus Christ as He is offered in the Gospel. Mr. Hopper has redefined this term as the mind being enabled to perceive some current congregational need or situation.

JOURNAL

* In the PCA, we believe that God gives Elders ministerial authority to teach and exhort the people of God according to God's written Word. In Mr. Hopper's view, to the elders' ministry would be added that of prophets, who supposedly have no authority but who speak to "unique needs" of a congregation and that by virtue of "intense illumination" (Record 18 #7). It is unclear what relative weight ought to be given to the counsel of elders and to the counsel of prophets. This would be especially confusing when the counsel of one disagreed with the counsel of the other, an occurrence easily conceived of in our sometimes divided congregations.

* Mr. Hopper affirms that God may or may not give prophecy, tongues and the interpretation of tongues to a given congregation and that their absence ought not to be understood as a withholding of God's blessing upon a particular congregation or ministry (Record 17 #4). Likewise he writes, "If God never raised up those three trees, that would be fine" (Record 150). The impression is created that this phenomenon is not expected in the church today. But in the very same paragraph he writes, "There are those three trees that are growing (prophecy, tongues, miracles) ... It just so happens that I am not able, by conscience, to take a chain saw to those three trees in that very large forest." (ibid.) Likewise, Mr. Hopper is on record before the James River Presbytery as having stated that the ordinances which Christ the Head has instituted in His Church, as listed in *BCO 4-4*, which does not include prophecy, tongues or interpretation of tongues, is an *INADEQUATE STATEMENT* of the ordinances of public worship. "Ordinances" by definition, are institutions. Mr. Hopper believes that prophecy and tongues may never be given to a congregation, and that such a circumstance would imply no withholding of divine blessing, yet that the PCA's understanding of Christ's ordinances is inadequate because it lacks these phenomena. These two kinds of assertions can not stand together and must confuse anyone who tries to understand them.

* TE Hopper will allow women to prophesy in public worship, such women being permitted to bring a "counsel of encouragement" to the congregation. But the apostle Paul in I Timothy 2.12 prohibits a woman from such activity. TE Hopper would reply that she counsels without authority. But the congregation would not know how to take such counsel. Should it give any weight to the prophetic, or not?

* TE Hopper would prohibit the phrase "thus says the Lord" from preceding, as a verbal introduction, any "prophecy" in the congregation. But, according to TE Hopper, this gift supposedly to be exercised in the congregation is precisely the same gift as the gift given by the Holy Spirit to New Testament prophets. In Acts 21.11 the "prophet named Agabus ... said, 'This is what the Holy Spirit says: ...' What sense can the people of God make of this?"

The James River Presbytery is not blind to the presence of many in our churches who have been strongly influenced by the charismatic movement. We welcome these brothers and sisters in our Lord Jesus Christ. But we are aware also that their thinking and Christian lives are often directed by certain experiences, first; not first by God's Scriptures. We believe that such people will give great authority, authority all out of proportion to what is due, to the message of "prophets" and the interpretations of "tongues" speakers. This will not be for their edification and growth in grace. In fact, it well may be the means of defeat and sin in spiritual warfare.

The apostle Paul reasoned with the Corinthian church that in order for the people to be edified, the words and instruction given to them must be intelligible and coherent: "For if the bugle produces an indistinct sound, who will prepare himself for battle?" (1 Corinthians 14.8) He concluded his argument by saying, "For God is not a God of confusion, but of peace" (1 Corinthians 14.33). The James River Presbytery believes that Mr. Hopper's teaching will produce a confused sound and confused congregations.

2. In "passing judgment" on "what is certainly a disputable doctrinal matter," has the Presbytery "violated Romans 14.1-13" (cf. Record 6)?

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Presbytery agrees that this is a disputable doctrinal matter. However, every doctrine is disputable in some sense. There is no doctrine in the whole corpus of theology that is not disputed today. The doctrine of infant baptism is an example. Does the Presbyterian Church in America violate Romans 14.1-13 by requiring that all of its officers believe in infant baptism? In fact, the James River Presbytery stated its opinion that the matter of Mr. Hopper's particular views is of the "... fundamentals of the biblical system of doctrine as set forth in the *Westminster Standards* and *Book of Church Order* (Record 144). It made this statement when it sustained the Harrell complaint on 13 April 1991, for reasons given therein. Further, TE Hopper would modify the public worship of his congregation in light of his "disputable" views.

In Romans 14.1-13 the Apostle addresses not church courts, but individual Christians: compare v.5, "ONE MAN regards one day above another, ANOTHER regards every day alike. Let EACH MAN be fully convinced in HIS OWN MIND." Further, in this passage, Paul is urging the exercise of forbearance with respect to matters INDIFFERENT, such as whether one is to eat vegetables only, or to enjoy a fuller diet. Paul is certainly not urging the Roman Church to tolerate the propagation of an erroneous opinion respecting elements of worship (cf. Record 154). The Apostle is dealing not simply with different opinions, but primarily with the subjective reaction of weak and strong Christians to the various opinions.

If TE Hopper is arguing that verse 13, "Therefore let us not judge one another any more ..." means that Presbyteries are not to exercise oversight over the teaching of Pastors, such an argument would put the Apostle at odds with his other clear teaching. In his letters to the Galatians and Colossians, he refutes the teaching of the Judiazers and Gnostics. Later, he urged Timothy to remain in Ephesus "in order that you may instruct certain men NOT TO TEACH STRANGE DOCTRINES" (I Timothy 1.3). Part of the Holy Spirit-inspired duty given to every elder is "... to refute those who contradict" (Titus 1.9).

The Form of Government, which we take to be a standard exposition of the teaching of Scripture (BCO 29-1), explicitly gives the right to Presbyteries "to judge ministers," (BCO 13-9 a) and "to condemn erroneous opinions which injure the purity and peace of the Church" (BCO 13-9 f). This is, of course, not only a right but a responsibility. God has given the James River Presbytery an important interest in the preaching of its ministers (cf. Titus 2:7).

Further, the Form of Government gives the Presbytery the right "... in general to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care" (also 13-9). Admittedly, this responsibility calls for discretion in its proper application. We maintain in accordance with the *Book of Church Order*, that the Presbytery itself is best able to judge what circumstances within the churches in its bounds might require the disallowing of certain teachings in the churches.

If Presbytery were in violation of Romans 14:1-13 in doctrinal matters it would be unable to give any evaluation of the conduct of the ministers under its care.

3. Has the James River Presbytery "bound" TE Hopper's conscience, "contra Romans 14, *WCF XX*" disallowing him from preaching and teaching "the whole counsel of God" (See Acts 20.25,27) as he understands it" (cf. Record 6)?

The Presbytery agrees that Mr. Hopper's duty is to preach "the whole counsel of God." But we notice also that the Apostle did NOT qualify that statement of his duty in Acts 20.27 by adding, "as I understand it." The obligation of ministers is to preach God's whole counsel, but they are not obliged to preach and teach erroneous understandings of God's counsel. The James River Presbytery believes that Mr. Hopper's understanding of Bible teaching on prophecy, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues is confused and erroneous. Presbytery is not obliged to allow him to preach that which is not of God's whole counsel.

On 7 April 1990 the James River Presbytery prohibited the preaching of Mr. Hopper's views of prophecy and tongues (Record 12). In response, a Session in the bounds of Presbytery raised a question with the General Assembly Committee on Constitutional Business about the propriety of the James River Presbytery's authority to restrict a minister in his teaching. The Committee answered,

JOURNAL

... Presbyteries do have jurisdiction over Teaching Elders and have the authority to restrict a minister from preaching views which the Presbytery is convinced may be harmful to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care (*BCO* 13-9 and 34-5). (*M18GA*, p. 205, and Record 154.)

We have addressed Romans 14 above.

We take it that next, the Complainant was referring to paragraph two of *WCF* chapter twenty (Record 6 & 152, where it was mistakenly cited as chapter 20, paragraph 4 by typographical error):

God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in anything, contrary to His Word; or beside it, if matters of faith or worship. So that, to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commands, out of conscience, is to be betray true liberty of conscience: and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also. (*WCF* 20.2)

To answer this we begin by noting that since only God can bind the conscience, and since He has left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, "in anything, contrary to His Word; or beside it, if matters of faith or worship," the James River Presbytery has not bound TE Hopper's conscience. However, we understand that TE Hopper means that Presbytery has interfered with the functioning of his conscience according to its definition in *WCF* 20.2.

We reply that Mr. Hopper was not required by any action of the James River Presbytery to believe doctrines which are contrary to the Word of God. Further, Presbytery is not requiring blind obedience of Mr. Hopper. Indeed, he is not even being required to abandon his views, which Presbytery deems to be erroneous, but has been allowed to maintain them as his personal opinion, with the additional allowance that he is free to communicate his views to members of Presbytery for their consideration. Compare the action of 13 April 1991,

TE Hopper is advised to hold his views as his personal opinion, and continue studying the issue in question. He may communicate his views to members of Presbytery for their consideration, if he so desires. (Record 139)

The Presbytery contends that the disallowing of his teaching and preaching these views along with the advice to hold his views as his personal opinion and continue to study the issues in question is a lawful act of church power according to paragraph 4 of the same chapter of the *Westminster Confession*.

And because the POWERS which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, BUT MUTUALLY TO UPHOLD AND PRESERVE ONE ANOTHER, they who, upon pretense of Christian liberty, shall oppose any LAWFUL power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ECCLESIASTICAL, resist THE ORDINANCE OF GOD. And, for the publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity (whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation), or to the power of godliness; or, ERRONEOUS OPINIONS or practices, AS EITHER IN THEIR OWN NATURE, OR IN THE MANNER OF PUBLISHING OR MAINTAINING THEM, ARE DESTRUCTIVE TO THE EXTERNAL PEACE AND ORDER WHICH CHRIST HATH ESTABLISHED IN THE CHURCH, they may LAWFULLY BE CALLED TO ACCOUNT, and proceeded against, by the censures of the Church. (Capitalization ours.)

In other words, full Christian liberty and the exercise of Presbytery's power and responsibility of exercising accountability over its Teaching Elders are wholly compatible, because both are ordained by God. What is more, every Teaching Elder in the PCA has associated himself with this denomination voluntarily. Every TE remains free to associate elsewhere if he so desires. The doctrinal standards and the form of government and discipline are adopted freely, without imposition of any kind (cf. *BCO* Preliminary Principle 2). Full and free exercise of liberty of conscience and submission to God's ordinances of Church government are not in conflict but hold together in perfect consistency.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

One of Presbytery's concerns all along about the teaching of these views has been the likelihood of their compromising the peace and order both of Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church and that peace and order in other churches in our Presbytery. This concern was expressed by Presbytery on 7 April 1990 (Record 12, cf. Record 20, 21). The Harrell, *et. al.*, complaint sustained by Presbytery on 13 April stated, "the presentation of the views of said Teaching Elder to James River Presbytery has in fact occasioned deep division within said Presbytery." (Record 114). The presentation of these views has engendered unrest and controversy from their introduction before the James River Presbytery in 1989, until today.

We might note further that our Constitution grants to "synods and councils" the right ministerially to determine debates about faith, for the edification of the Church. This is a right because it is a responsibility of shepherds: "it belongeth unto synods and councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience ..." *Westminster Confession* 31.2.

So far from binding TE Hopper's conscience, the Presbytery has acted in a patient and pastoral fashion. He was specifically accorded the right to communicate his views to members of Presbytery for their consideration. Thus Presbytery has offered him the proper forum within which to discuss his views.

4. Has Presbytery acted "inconsistently with the counsel of the General Assembly as expressed in the 1974 Pastoral Letter on the Holy Spirit, which does not prohibit tongues but places specific qualifications and limitations concerning them, all of which TE Hopper publicly affirms"? Has Presbytery "not exercised the toleration that is recommended by the General Assembly: 'the General Assembly would also urge a spirit of forbearance among those holding different views regarding the spiritual gifts as they are experienced today'" (Record 6)?

To this specification of error, the Presbytery answers first that the 1974 Pastoral Letter was not written as a constitutional document for the Church. It is true that the letter does not forbid the exercise of tongues, that it suggests qualifications concerning their practice, and that TE Hopper affirms these qualifications. The Presbytery appreciates these facts.

Yet it is likewise true that the Pastoral Letter does not endorse TE Hopper's view of tongues. Note for instance qualification 1 (Pastoral Letter IV.A.1., Record 102):

Any view of the tongues as experienced in our time which conceives of it as an experience by which revelation is received from God is contrary to the finalized character of revelation in Scripture.

Mr. Hopper denies that his view of tongues conceives of it as the reception of revelation. But the James River Presbytery saw that TE Hopper's views contain inner tensions which tend to deny this qualification. (Presbytery noted this when it adopted the Harrell complaint, cf. Record 144, 4) [a]). (This was developed above on pages 36ff.)

Regarding the third qualification of the Pastoral Letter,

"any practice of the tongues phenomenon in any age which causes dissention and division within the body of Christ or diverts the Church from its mission is contrary to the purpose of the Spirit's gifts" (Record 102):

in Presbytery's view Mr. Hopper's theories have caused profound division both in his Session and in Presbytery (cf. Record 144, [3], as adopted by Presbytery on 13 April 1991).

To the charge that "Presbytery has not exercised toleration as recommended by the General Assembly," we reply that Presbytery has exercised great tolerance consistent with its responsibilities and the high calling of the teaching office. The Presbytery allowed Mr. Hopper to continue to hold his views as personal opinion and to communicate them to other Presbyters for their consideration. Mr. Hopper was also encouraged to propose changes to the Church's Constitution in areas with which he disagrees, rather than to seek a judgment via a complaint, which judgment would be binding only on the particular parties involved. The hope of Presbytery is that such conversation and debate with respect to such proposed Constitutional changes would be mutually edifying.

JOURNAL

Humility is evident in this allowance of Presbytery. The process of persuading runs both ways. While many members of this Presbytery, in their interacting with TE Hopper concerning the views at issue, will seek to persuade him to re-adopt more constitutional views, he will be free to endeavor to persuade members of Presbytery to embrace his views. We humbly opened ourselves to this possibility, knowing that our own apprehension of the truth is not perfect. While we may have convictions in this area, we are willing to accept challenges to our understanding. If such challenges are in error they will serve only more deeply to confirm us in the truth for which we are called earnestly to contend. Conversely, if they are based in truth, that too will come to light.

We also point out the recommendations of the General Assembly in its Pastoral Letter:

"... the General Assembly would recommend: ... study of the Church's standards on such areas as Scripture, trinity, doctrines of grace; careful training, examination and selection of officers and others in the place of teaching and leadership in the church to assure a consistency of commitment to Scripture and the Reformed faith and to the health and unity of the Church."

Please note also especially Recommendation 4, "Preaching and teaching of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit and His work, as taught in Scripture and the Standards of the church" (Record 103f).

Finally, the Presbytery responds to this charge by observing that this General Assembly deliverance was given due consideration in the Presbytery debates according to *BCO* 14-7. We also note however that this was the deliverance of one General Assembly, whereas every one of our constitutional documents was ratified by two General Assemblies and two-thirds of the Presbyteries. These constitutional documents are to be given much more careful consideration and should weigh more heavily in the guidance of the church courts.

It is our understanding, drawn from conversations with some of the Committee members who framed it, that the Pastoral Letter was intended to guide Pastors in dealing with the sensitive matters of receiving persons into the PCA from outside the Church, not to give guidelines for the treatment of Pastors with changes in their theological views. The Constitution, by contrast, is binding, because adopted as "standard exposition[s] of the teaching of Scripture" (*BCO* 29-1).

5. Did Presbytery "(other than in the commentary offered in the Harrell complaint) err in forbidding the preaching and teaching of views that have not been declared to be unbiblical and unconstitutional"? That is, has Presbytery not "cited chapter and verse so as to instruct TE Hopper precisely where it is that he is in violation of God's Word and the Constitution of the PCA" (Record 6)?

The James River Presbytery answers this charge with reference to the Harrell, *et. al.* complaint sustained by Presbytery on 13 April 1991 (Record 140-146). That complaint charged that Presbytery had erred when, at its 12 January 1991 meeting, it

"... did allow such change of views as not violating the fundamentals of the biblical system of doctrine as set forth in the *Westminster Standards* and *Book of Church Order*. Furthermore James River Presbytery did wrongly reverse its previous position adopted at a Stated Meeting on the 7th day of April 1990 which position did, 'disallow the teaching and preaching of the views of prophecy and tongues (of said Teaching Elder) ... and that, concurring with the stated views of the majority of the Session (of said Teaching Elder's Church) ..., it likewise disallowed the practice of these phenomena in the public worship of the church in question ...'" (Record 141).

The action then complained against was alleged to violate the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America as follows: the *Confession of Faith* in four particulars,

* Chapter 1, Section 6 dealing with the sufficiency of Scripture and the role of prophecy as making known certain "unique needs" to a congregation;

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

* Chapter 20, Section 2, dealing with the Christian's liberty of conscience from the teachings and commandments of men which are contrary to God's Word or beside it in matters of faith or worship, and the "prophet's congregational counseling" not purporting to be an exposition or interpretation of Scripture, and thus the "prophecy" being beside God's Word and tempting a congregation to betray true liberty of conscience;

* Chapter 21, Sections 4 and 5, and

* Chapter 26, describing the public and private exercise of gifts and especially the "parts of the ordinary religious worship of God", nowhere including as part of the PCA's biblically warranted worship, either prophecy, tongues or the interpretation of tongues.

Further the Harrell, *et. al.* complaint, which was sustained by the James River Presbytery alleged that said previous action was contrary to the *Book of Church Order* in the following particulars:

* *BCO* 47-9 which delineates the Scriptural elements of worship, which do not include "tongues, the interpretation of tongues, and prophecy";

* *BCO* Preface, Section I dealing with the Lord Christ having given to His Church "officers, oracles and ordinances; and especially has He ordained therein His system of doctrine, government, discipline and worship, all of which are either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary inference may be deduced therefrom; AND TO WHICH THINGS HE COMMANDS THAT NOTHING BE ADDED ..."

* Harrell, *et. al.* cited further that TE Hopper affirmed that *BCO* 4-4, the paragraph in the Form of Government delineating the ordinances which "Christ the Head has instituted in His Church," IS INADEQUATE AS A LISTING OF ORDINANCES FOR WORSHIP, BECAUSE IT DOES NOT INCLUDE PROPHECY, TONGUES AND THE INTERPRETATION OF TONGUES;

* *BCO* 7-1, which states that "such officers and GIFTS related to new revelation have no successors since God completed His revelation at the conclusion of the Apostolic Age" and the fact that TE Hopper denies that "the New Testament teaches the necessary cessation of other spiritual GIFTS" excepting apostles;

* *BCO* 7-2 dealing with officers in the Church necessarily being male, and TE Hopper's view that WOMEN OUGHT TO BE ALLOWED TO PROPHECY IN PUBLIC WORSHIP, such women being permitted to bring a "counsel of encouragement to the congregation";

* *BCO* 7-2 stating that the "ordinary and perpetual classes of office in the Church are elders and deacons" and the establishment of a *de facto* third office in the Church, the office of "prophet";

* *BCO* Chapters 8 and 9, setting forth standards for the qualification of offices which include no qualifications for "prophet" and thus nothing being provided in the Standards of the Church for the regulation of a "prophet"'s activity.

Finally, Harrell, *et. al.* alleged that allowing Mr. Hopper's views as not violating the fundamentals of the system of doctrine was "contrary to sound reason and standard use of language." We quote: "The views advocated by said Teaching Elder must confuse the people of God.

* Historically prophecy has always been understood as being true or false, depending on whether it is revelation from God or not. This Teaching Elder espouses a view of prophecy which is somehow from God, yet which may be tainted by human fallibility;

* which purportedly is not divine revelation but which communicates something from God (i.e., unique needs of a congregation);

* which has no authority and which hence may be exercised by women in public worship, and yet which is somehow expected to convey encouragement to the people of God.

JOURNAL

* In sum these views allowed by James River Presbytery are so intricate and esoteric, if not idiosyncratic, that few, if any, will be able to understand them clearly. The trumpet sending forth such uncertain sound will not only fail to prepare the people for spiritual battle, but will do so because it is inconsistent with the perspicuity of the Spirit of truth, who is not a God of confusion and disorder but a God of order" (Record 145).

The above cited complaint was sustained by the James River Presbytery *IN TOTO*. The Commission should note in Presbytery's answer to this specification of error that the Presbytery first sustained this complaint *in toto*, and only then adopted the motion "wherein TE Hopper was for the common welfare of the churches of Presbytery and now again shall be disallowed to teach and preach the views of prophecy and tongues found in the writings of his paper " (Record 138).

Then again on 13 July 1991, by denying the Hopper and Loker complaint, Presbytery acted to reaffirm its view that Mr. Hopper's views are contrary to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America (Record 157).

Presbytery's judgment is that the citations in the sustained complaint of Harrell, *et. al.*, are adequate instruction as to precisely where the Complainant's views violate the Constitution of the PCA. We do not feel it incumbent upon us to prove that "the Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly, together with the formularies of government, discipline, and worship are accepted by the Presbyterian Church in America as standard expositions of the teachings of Scripture in relation to both faith and practice" (BCO 29-1), since all Elders in our Church have taken vows to this effect. In April 1990, Presbytery disallowed the teaching of Mr. Hopper's views for a specific period of time (Record 12). Only AFTER IT HAD DECLARED HIS VIEWS CONTRARY TO THE CONSTITUTION in the numerous particulars found in the Harrell, *et. al.* complaint, DID PRESBYTERY DISALLOW his teaching of these views.

6. In its 13 April 1991 action, did the James River Presbytery "inconsistently" maintain "that a theological view can be promoted in the Church to fellow presbyters, but not to church members" (Record 152, NO CORRESPONDING POINT IN RECORD 6)?

The allowance afforded TE Hopper, wherein he may make his views known to members of Presbytery, is in no way inconsistent with Presbytery disallowing him from teaching those views in his congregation. Presbytery has sought to act with patient forbearance, humility, and pastoral responsibility in granting the allowance in question.

Pastoral responsibility is evident in the disallowing of the teaching of the views at issue in TE Hopper's congregation. Those views have been deemed unbiblical and unconstitutional, and to allow them to be taught to a people who have a biblically directed right to expect the nourishment of truth to be ministered by their pastor, would be pastorally irresponsible on the part of Presbytery.

Patient forbearance is evident in the allowing of TE Hopper to maintain his views as his personal opinion and to communicate them to members of Presbytery.

By his sharing of these views and whatever further reasons he may find in support of them in Presbytery, he has the opportunity to interact with his fellow presbyters, who are men called, and equipped themselves rightly to divide the Word of truth. The members of Presbytery will not be as inclined to be led to embrace false doctrines as would be members of a pastor's own congregation. Indeed, in process of the exchange of thoughts on this subject, members of Presbytery are better equipped to convince TE Hopper that his views are in error. Members of this Presbytery are willing patiently to work with TE Hopper to persuade him to readopt more constitutional views.

Humility is evident in this allowance of Presbytery. The process of persuading runs both ways. While many members of this Presbytery, in their interacting with TE Hopper concerning the views at issue, will seek to persuade him to readopt more constitutional views, he will be free to endeavor to persuade members of Presbytery to embrace his views. We have humbly opened ourselves to this

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

possibility, knowing that our own apprehension of the truth is not perfect. While we may have convictions in this area, we are willing to accept challenges to our understanding. If such challenges are in error, they will serve only more deeply to confirm us in the truth for which we are called earnestly to contend. If such challenges are based on truth, they will serve to lead us into deeper liberty in the truth, which alone sets us free, and in which we shall heartily rejoice.

IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, we believe that the members of the Presbyterian Church in America within the bounds of the James River Presbytery have the right to a ministry of the Word which gives that Word its full weight and adds nothing alongside it, that may distract God's people. We believe that Mr. Hopper's views introduce a radical change in the doctrine, government, and worship of the Presbyterian Church in America. The Presbytery has granted him the freedom to discuss these matters further. But we believe we have an obligation to our own people to protect them from what is novel, and not clearly the teaching of Holy Scripture.

None has ever argued that these views find support in our Constitutional Standards. We believe that the Presbytery is in the best position to evaluate the conditions and needs of the people within its bounds. Therefore we believe that we have an obligation to them, in order to preserve the health-giving teaching of the Gospel, to guard it from this intrusion.

TE Hopper denies "that the New Testament teaches the necessary cessation of other spiritual gifts" (excepting apostles and infallible revelation given them), and that "the gifts of tongues and prophecy in particular" have not ceased (Record 29). Our Constitution in its basic statement about Church officers in general says, "... agents by whom God completed His revelation to His Church. Such officers and gifts RELATED TO NEW REVELATION have no successors since God completed His revelation at the conclusion of the Apostolic Age." BCO 7-1. Every serious view of New Testament prophecy, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues acknowledges that these gifts were RELATED TO new revelation in the New Testament. Mr. Hopper's views too relate these gifts to new revelation. His views are manifestly contrary to this provision of the Constitution, as well as others.

The James River Presbytery believes that it has acted within its rights as a court of the Church with jurisdiction over the Teaching Elders under its care, and responsibility for the welfare of all its churches. It has not gone beyond the teaching of Scripture or the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America. It has dealt pastorally and lovingly with TE Hopper as well as calling him to account for his changes in theology. Finally we believe that we have not compromised TE Hopper's rights as a minister in the Presbyterian Church in America. May God be glorified in the deliberation and action of this Judicial Panel.

Sincerely,

/s/ TE Howard Griffith

/s/ TE Robert Wilson

/s/ TE William Harrell,

for the James River Presbytery

12/19/91.

APPENDIX : REFUTATION OF HOPPER & LOKER COMPLAINT

Point #1:

The Word of God does indeed teach that believers in the churches at Corinth and Thessalonica were to allow the exercise of such spiritual gifts as prophecy and tongues. But the directives in these verses were specifically applicable to those particular churches at that particular time. For those churches were endowed with the extraordinary gifts known as "signs of the Apostles" (2 Cor. 12:12). A careful reading of Scripture will show that such gifts as tongues, the interpretation of tongues, the casting out of demons, and miraculous, full, and instantaneous healing were given to the Apostles and were conferred upon others only by them. When we read the list of spiritual gifts detailed in a letter written to a church not founded by an Apostle, such as the church at Rome, we find no mention of these sign gifts (Rom. 12:6-8). It is true that prophecy is mentioned in Rom. 12:6, but that was a gift neither confined to the

JOURNAL

Apostles nor conferred by them upon others. As for the extraordinary gifts, where they were not conferred by an Apostle, we find no record in Scripture of their existence or exercise. That these gifts were absent from the church at Rome and that their being given to the church there was dependent upon their being conferred by an Apostle is clear from Rom. 1:11, where Paul states: "For I long to see you in order that I may impart some spiritual gift to you..."

With respect to the gift and exercise of prophecy, a true understanding of that gift maintains that prophecy is in all cases revelation from God. Such is the consistent scriptural representation of prophecy from its beginning with Moses (Dt. 18:18), through all of the prophets—Old Testament and New Testament, and especially with respect to our Lord Jesus, our prophet, priest, and king. No example or teaching regarding the sort of prophecy TE Hopper advocates can be found. His confusion on this point no doubt derives from the fact that he has sought an understanding of this gift, not in the clear teaching of Scripture, allowing Scripture to interpret Scripture, but rather he has disregarded the many passages which teach or demonstrate that prophecy is revelation from God (1 Pet. 1:20,21). He has discounted the verse which clearly says that New Testament prophecy is a foundational gift based upon Christ, the chief cornerstone (Eph 2:20), and he has chosen, instead to believe that the starting place for an understanding of prophecy is to be found in I Cor. 12-14, wherein the Apostle Paul is not so much giving positive teaching regarding the exercise of this gift, as he is writing to correct abuses thereof. TE Hopper's hermeneutical method is eisegetical, rather than exegetical, and his conclusions are, at best, subtle fabrications mistakenly drawn from obscure data.

Finally, were Presbytery to sustain this point of the complaint, we would not simply be allowing TE Hopper to maintain his erroneous view, we would be positively endorsing that view and condemning as being unscriptural all who hold opposing views. This point of the complaint is phrased so that such opponents of TE Hopper's views are opposing the Word of God, an assertion which remains to be proven. According to the complaint, anyone who does not "desire spiritual gifts, especially the gift of prophecy," is in violation of Scripture. By inference, he invites us "to be as open as I can be" on this subject, viewing prophecy, tongues, and miracles as three trees planted by God and now growing. Whereas such openness may appear virtuous, the Scriptures warn us to test these things by the standard of Scripture, not by eisegetical interpretations thereof; and whereas such imagery may seem apt, it does not accord with Scripture, which employs the image of a foundation with respect to prophecy. TE Hopper has elevated his erroneous interpretation to the level of Scripture. We are charged to stand not for the fabrications being advocated by TE Hopper, but for apostolic, prophetic, and miraculous ministry, namely, that ministry based upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, now conveyed to us through the completed canon of Scripture, working miraculously to transform sinners into children of God.

Point #2:

The complaint sustained at the April 1991 meeting of Presbytery was directed not only against TE Hopper's view of tongues, but more substantially against his views of prophecy. However, this Presbytery has forbidden TE Hopper from teaching his views on tongues also for two reasons: 1) That his view on tongues is contrary to our Confessional Standards, and 2) That the teaching of his views on tongues has in fact occasioned dissension and division within the body of Christ, and hence runs contrary to the third of the critical qualifications regarding this phenomenon stipulated in the 1974 Pastoral Letter to the GA.

Point #3:

The issue at point is not forbearance respecting matters which are unclear. It is the forbidding of the teaching of views which by this Presbytery are deemed to be in error and against the Confessional Standards of the PCA.

Regarding the example cited of demonstrating forbearance toward theologians, recall the Presbytery examination of TE Duncan, wherein he was not allowed entrance into James River Presbytery due to his views on theonomy. Many presbyters disagreed with that decision, but no complaints were issued, it being rightly deemed within Presbytery's discretion to act as it did. So, too, has this right of Presbytery been specifically upheld by the GA (cf. Stony Point Constitutional Inquiry in Minutes of the 18th GA, p. 205).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Point #4:

The analogy attempted by citing Rom. 14:1-13 is fallacious. In that passage, Paul is urging the exercise of forbearance with respect to matters indifferent, such as whether one is to eat vegetables only, or to enjoy a fuller diet. We certainly are not being urged to tolerate the propagation of erroneous opinion respecting elements of worship.

Furthermore, the contention that the views in question have never been declared by this Presbytery to be unbiblical or unconstitutional is simply false. The Complaint sustained at the April 1991 meeting of Presbytery explicitly stated that the views in question were contrary to, 1) The Bible, 2) The Westminster Standards, 3) The Book of Church Order, as well as 4) Sound reason and standard use of language. It is precisely for such reasons that TE Hopper is disallowed the teaching of these views. Additionally, the adoption of a motion which stated, "That Presbytery reaffirm its confessional position maintained at the April 1990 stated meeting, wherein TE Hopper...shall be disallowed to teach and preach...(the views in question)," by clear inference indicates that James River Presbytery has deemed these views to be unconstitutional.

Finally, TE Hopper's conscience has been in no way bound by the action of this Presbytery. He is not being required to believe doctrines which are contrary to the Word of God. He is not even being required to abandon his views, which we deem to be erroneous, but is being allowed to maintain them as his personal opinion with the additional allowance that he be free to communicate his views to members of Presbytery for their consideration. By such allowance, this Presbytery has acted with a sense of humility and pastoral responsibility. It is grievous that TE Hopper sees this allowance more as grounds for complaint (cf. point #5), than as an opportunity for him to exercise his freedom of conscience within the forum of those called and equipped rightly to divide the Word of truth.

Point #5:

The allowance afforded TE Hopper, wherein he may make his views known to members of Presbytery, is in no way inconsistent with Presbytery disallowing him from teaching those views in his congregation. Presbytery has sought to act with patient forbearance, humility, and pastoral responsibility in granting the allowance in question.

Pastoral responsibility is evident in the disallowing of the teaching of the views at issue in TE Hopper's congregation. Those views have been deemed unbiblical and unconstitutional, and to allow them to be taught to a people who have a biblically directed right to expect the nourishment of truth to be ministered by their pastor, would be pastorally irresponsible on the part of Presbytery.

Patient forbearance is evident in the allowing of TE Hopper to maintain his views as his personal opinion and communicate them to members of this Presbytery. By his sharing of these views and whatever further reasons he may find in support of them, he has the opportunity to interact with his fellow presbyters, who are men called, and equipped themselves rightly to divide the Word of truth. The members of Presbytery will not be as inclined to be led to embrace false doctrines as would be members of a pastor's own congregation. Indeed, in process of the exchange of thoughts on this subject, members of Presbytery are better equipped to convince TE Hopper that his views are in error. Members of this Presbytery are willing patiently to work with TE Hopper to persuade him to readopt more constitutional views.

Humility is evident in this allowance of Presbytery. The process of persuading runs both ways. While many members of this Presbytery, in their interacting with TE Hopper concerning the views at issue, will seek to persuade him to readopt more constitutional views, he will be free to endeavor to persuade members of Presbytery to embrace his views. We have humbly opened ourselves to this possibility knowing that our own apprehension of the truth is not perfect. While we may have convictions in this area, we are willing to accept challenges to our understanding. If such challenges are in error, they will serve only more deeply to confirm us in the truth for which we are called earnestly to contend. If such challenges are based on truth, they will serve to lead us into deeper liberty in the truth, which alone sets us free, and in which we shall heartily rejoice.

5. That the judgment in the case of Herman Gunter, III., and Donald Monroe vs. Central Florida Presbytery (SJC Docket 91-5) be approved. *Adopted*

Requesting their negative votes on Case #91-5 be recorded were RE Robert H. Miller; TE James Bowen; TE David Gilleram; TE Grover G. Dunn III; TE Frank J. Smith; RE Stephen L. Davis; and RE Eric Beardslee.

**HERMAN GUNTER III, ET. AL.
VS.
CENTRAL FLORIDA PRESBYTERY**

JUDICIAL CASE NO. 91-5

I. A Statement of the Facts

On December 6, 1990 the Session of Community Presbyterian Church, Live Oak, Florida, did not approve the examination of Herman Gunter III and Donald Monroe for the office of ruling elder. The Session approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, theonomy is an unsettled issue in the Presbyterian Church in America, and

WHEREAS, theonomy is a divisive issue in the Presbyterian Church in America, and

WHEREAS, theonomy is out of accord with Chapter XIX, Paragraph IV of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and

WHEREAS, by their own admission, Herman Gunter III and Donald Monroe embrace the primary teachings of theonomy,

THEREFORE, the Session of Community Presbyterian Church in Live Oak, Florida disapproves the examination of them both for the office of ruling elder in this church.

FURTHERMORE, the Session of Community Presbyterian Church denies the privilege of teaching in this congregation to anyone who espouses the theonomic position or uses theonomic literature.

Approved by the Session of Community Presbyterian Church at its stated meeting on December 6, 1990 with all elders present and voting in favor of this motion.

On January 2, 1991 Herman Gunter III and Donald Monroe (hereafter, "Complainants") complained to the Session of Community Presbyterian Church "in connection with the disapproval of their examination for the office of ruling elder..." On January 20, 1991 the Session of Community Presbyterian Church denied the complaint.

On January 23, 1991 the Complainants carried their complaint to Central Florida Presbytery. At its April 20, 1991 Stated Meeting, the Presbytery appointed a commission to hear the complaint and to bring the ruling to the next Presbytery Meeting. The commission heard the complaint and acted to deny the complaint on the basis of divisiveness. Presbytery also ruled, "That the third statement of the Session

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

dated December 6, 1990: "Whereas, theonomy is out of accord with Chapter XIX, paragraph IV of the Westminster Confession of Faith' be annulled according to *BCO* 43-10 based on insufficient clarity." This action was approved by the Presbytery at its next Stated Meeting.

On July 26, 1991 the Complainants forwarded their complaint to the General Assembly. It became Standing Judicial Commission Case No. 91-5. A hearing was held before a Judicial Panel on January 22, 1992. A judgment was rendered to deny the complaint. The Complainants requested a review of the case by the full Standing Judicial Commission. This request was granted and the review was held on March 6, 1992. The Judicial Panel's judgment was not sustained; the following became the judgment and the opinion of the full SJC.

II. A Statement of the Issues

1. Did the Session of Community Presbyterian Church have the right to disapprove Complainants for the office of ruling elder based on theological issues which it judged to be out of accord with the Scriptures and Constitution or may disturb the peace, purity or progress of the church?
2. Was divisiveness properly included as a reason for disapproving Complainants for the office of ruling elder?

III. Judgment of the Case

1. Yes. Therefore, the complaint is denied.
2. Yes. The record shows that the issue of divisiveness was considered by the Session, which had the right to examine Complainants on that issue.

IV. Reasoning and Opinion of the Court

The specific focus of this case is the right of a church court to determine the acceptability of theological issues that have not been clearly defined by the broader Church. While the view of theonomy was the specific theological issue before the Session of Community Presbyterian Church, it could have been another theological issue which the Church is debating. A court has the responsibility to make a judgment of such an issue in light of what promotes the peace, purity or progress of the Church.

The Book of Church Order states:

All Church courts are one in nature, constituted of the same elements, possessed inherently of the same kinds of rights and powers, and differing only as the Constitution may provide (*BCO* 11-3).

With regard to a court's rights the *BCO* states:

Every court has the right to resolve questions of doctrine and discipline seriously and reasonably proposed, and in general to maintain truth and righteousness, condemning erroneous opinions and practices which tend to the injury of the peace, purity, or progress of the Church (*BCO* 11-4).

As a court, the Session of Community Presbyterian Church exercised its right to determine the issue before it in such a manner that would promote the peace, purity and progress of the local church. When an issue is not clearly defined and/or is still being

debated within the Church, and/or where the issue is judged to disturb the peace or progress of the church, deference should be given to the court of original jurisdiction with regard to its judgments, which may be reviewed by higher courts.

It is clear from the *BCO* that a court, upon hearing a candidate's examination, judges whether his views are in conformity with the system of doctrine taught in the Confession. The court may also judge whether a noted exception is acceptable in light of the system of doctrine expressed in the Confession. In either case, the court has the responsibility to determine the acceptability of the views given and to judge their conformity to the Confession.

This right of a court to determine acceptability may result in differing positions being taken on the same issue by various courts in the Church. When a theological issue is not uniformly received in the Church, this may result in different judgments being rendered by different courts on the same issue. This disparity may continue until the issue is resolved by the broader Church. For example, one court may interpret what is permissible in the area of Christian liberty broadly, while another court may interpret it narrowly.

As the Church deliberates and gives definition to issues being discussed and debated within the Church, all courts can rely on these clearer definitions to judge what is in conformity with the system of doctrine taught in the Confession (Cf. Case No. 90-8, *M19GA*, 1991, p. 84. The issue was whether a Session could grant exceptions in the areas of Infant Baptism and Limited Atonement. The judgment of the General Assembly was that these two theological issues are essentials of the system of doctrine taught in the Confession, thus giving clearer direction to all the courts of the Church).

The Complainants argued that past General Assemblies had spoken on the issue of theonomy, and thus the Session's action to exclude the Complainants from office was on extra-constitutional grounds. But a careful reading of the relevant actions indicates that prior General Assemblies have not spoken clearly on theonomy, and, in fact, they laid the groundwork for courts to determine acceptability.

The Seventh General Assembly adopted the following:

That since the term "theonomy" in its simplest definition means "God's Law," the General Assembly affirms the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, Chapter 19, and *Larger Catechism*, Questions 93-150, as a broad but adequate definition of theonomy (*M7GA*, 1979, p. 115).

That General Assembly also adopted the following:

That the General Assembly affirm that no particular view of the application of the judicial law for today should be made a basis for orthodoxy or excluded as heresy in so far as this view is in accord with paragraph "a" above (*M7GA*, 1979, p. 115 and corrected in the minutes of 1982).

Who determines when a view is in accord with the simple and broad definition of theonomy given by the Seventh General Assembly? It is the court of original jurisdiction.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Eleventh General Assembly answered five questions posed to it from Gulf Coast Presbytery (see *MIIGA*, 1983, pp. 96-97). Question 1 asked: "Is the Presbytery denied the right to examine a man and to judge him to be in error or heretical on the basis of Chapter 19 of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and particularly on the basis of Chapter 19, paragraph 4? The answer:

No. The judicial decision of the Tenth General Assembly did not deny this right of the Presbytery. Such a judgment should be supported by specific evidence so that the error or heresy might be demonstrated or proved....

The Session of Community Presbyterian Church exercised its judgment to determine acceptability and found the Complainants' views out of accord with the Confession 19.4.

It should also be noted that the issue of the general divisiveness of theonomy was mentioned in the resolution of the Session of Community Presbyterian Church. While a Session is not Constitutionally required to catalogue all reasons for its decision not to sustain an examination, it is obvious from the record taken as a whole that the Session of Community Presbyterian Church was much concerned about the potential divisiveness of theonomy as subscribed to, taught and practiced by the Complainants.

Question 2 asked: "Are all views defining themselves by the term 'theonomy' excluded as a basis for examination for licensure or ordination?" The answer in part stated:

There is no single well-defined school of thought known as "Theonomy." The term simply means "God's Law" ... Neither the Statement of the Seventh General Assembly on "theonomy" nor the judicial decision of the Tenth General Assembly eliminated views of "theonomy" from theological examinations. No view of the application of the judicial law contrary to the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, Chapter 19, paragraph 4, is acceptable.

Question 3 asked if all views of the applicability of God's judicial law for today were acceptable in the PCA. The answer was similar in nature to answer 2. All views on the application of the judicial law not contrary to the Confession 19.4 were to be considered as acceptable in the PCA.

Again, the issue is that of determination. If the simple and broad definition of theonomy is "God's Law," then a court has the right to determine whether a particular view of theonomy is consistent with (or not contrary to) the Confession 19.4 and this simple definition. On hearing and examining a view, it alone judges its acceptability.

The Eleventh General Assembly concluded its response to Gulf Coast Presbytery's questions by acknowledging that there were differences of opinions with regard to the application and "general equity" of the various penal sanctions. It appears from this acknowledgment that there was a lack of clear agreement then on the definition of theonomy. This lack of clarity continues to exist in the Church. Because of this, it is the judgment of this court that we entrust the issue of determining acceptability of the views of candidates for office in the court of original jurisdiction.

JOURNAL

We affirm in this decision that we are not making a judgment on the issue of theonomy, but on the right of a church court to determine the acceptability of theological issues that have not been clearly defined by the broader Church.

March 7, 1992

/s/ TE Dominic A. Aquila

/s/ TE Paul D. Kooistra

/s/ RE John White, Jr.

V. Voting on Proposed Disposition:

APPROVED by SJC: 21-0, 1 disqualified

Three members submit the following concurring opinion, to wit:

CONCURRING OPINION

CASE NO. 91-5

While we concur with the statement and judgment as written, we would like to express concerns which this case touches on that we feel were not adequately addressed.

The *BCO* clearly permits a court to determine its membership. The Session has the responsibility to examine potential officers and to make recommendations to the congregation of those who the Session deems fit to serve. This does not require justification or reasons on the part of the Session.

In the present case, petitioners were denied presentation to the congregation as potential Ruling Elders which the Session of Community Presbyterian Church stated was due to "Theonomy". The Session subsequently submitted a resolution relating to theonomy. Two items from their resolution are noted:

WHEREAS, theonomy is a divisive issue in the Presbyterian Church in America, and

WHEREAS, theonomy is out of accord with Chapter XIX, Paragraph IV of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and

On appeal to Central Florida Presbytery, the Presbytery ruled the paragraph stating theonomy was out of accord with WCF as being unconstitutional and contrary to the 1983 G.A. judicial action. Presbytery then found the complainants to be "divisive" and upheld the decision of the Session to not place the complainants before the congregation as potential Ruling Elders.

The panel from the SJC originally held the Session could disapprove petitioners based on theonomy and that divisiveness could not be used as it was not clearly stated in the resolution of the Session of Community Presbyterian Church.

At oral argument before the SJC, respondent (Presbytery) stated they had to pull the divisiveness out of the Session by their questioning. The record shows the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Moderator of the Session saying he did not view the brethren as particularly divisive in that there was no church split. The record also states one of the petitioners demonstrated a gentle spirit.

Petitioners held the Session did not define theonomy and that they were not given opportunity to adequately discuss the divisive issue.

First, we would like to consider the issue of theonomy. The Session states theonomy is out of accord with the *WCF*. The Presbytery was proper in striking this from the record as it does not meet with the G.A. definition from 1979, p. 115, 7-49, III, 22.

"The definition of and recommendations regarding Theonomy:

- a. That since the term "theonomy" in its simplest definition means "God's Law", the General Assembly affirms the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, chapter 19, and *Larger Catechism*, questions 93-150, as a broad but adequate definition of theonomy.
- b. That no further study of the subject of theonomy be undertaken at the General Assembly level at this time, but that individual Christians, sessions, and presbyteries having particular interest be encouraged to study the subject in a spirit of love, kindness, and patience.
- c. That the General Assembly affirm that no particular view of the application of the judicial law for today should be made a basis for orthodoxy or excluded as heresy.
- d. That the General Assembly encourage pastors and sessions to instruct their people in the law of God and its application in a manner consistent with our confessional standards."

During discussion, the SJC noted theonomy was not defined. The United States Supreme Court justice's remark on pornography, "I know it when I see it," was applied to theonomy by many of the brethren in attendance. Another matter that was echoed by the SJC was that the Session of Community Presbyterian Church was probably not sophisticated to permit them to adequately deal with an issue such as theonomy. Based in part on these issues, the SJC by reasonable inference theonomy was an issue that the Session of Community Presbyterian Church could use to deny petitioners from presentation to the congregation.

We believe it could be reasonably inferred the Session acted improperly by not adequately defining theonomy if they used it to determine the fitness of Ruling Elder candidates. As Elders the responsibility of Christ's Church rests directly on their shoulders. They do not have the option of indecisiveness, ignorance, or misapplication of doctrine. Thus, the Session erred by an inadequate definition of theonomy. Attempts to justify this weakness on the Session fall short.

The next issue is that of divisiveness. The record is almost non-existent from the Session level, the only mention being the item listed is in the resolution where theonomy was listed as being divisiveness, not the petitioners. Factual evidence of divisiveness was mixed in the report and it was scanty (in light of the seriousness of the

issues at stake). Presbytery dealt more with this than did the Session. The matter is questionably before the court as it was not clearly identified in the lower court. SJC ruled it was reasonably inferred by the statement of divisiveness in the resolution. We believe it could be as reasonably inferred that the information is inadequate to made a decision.

If the issue of divisiveness is present, the Session has dealt poorly with it. It was not clearly set forth in the record at the Session level. When Presbytery was asked at the SJC hearing why the Session did not deal with the petitioners on this issue, the response was they did not know. If divisiveness was an issue approaching the importance Presbytery gave it, the Session erred in the manner in which they failed to deal with it. In Romans 16:17, Paul warns about those who bring divisions.

As a final issue, we are uncomfortable that the petitioners have now been labelled theonomic (by their own admission as I understand it) and divisive. As I understand the case, petitioners have not had due process to define their total views on theonomy in a church court where it is recorded nor have they had opportunity to answer the charge of divisiveness. For these matters the courts have failed to adequately clear the air as there are now as many questions unanswered as have been answered. If the charges are as serious as Presbytery made them to be, petitioners should be charged with theological error and divisiveness and trial should be held so the matters could be presented to either clear the brethren or to properly deal with a chargeable offense in the church.

As one who concurred, we do agree with the majority decision in principle that a Session can declare a man is not to be presented to the congregation for election to church office and that the SJC reasonably inferred an element of divisiveness existed. We are not convinced the issues were adequately and fully dealt with in the present case. If asked, "Was justice done in this case?", We would need to respond, "We believe that decision is reserved in this case for a Higher Court than the GA of the PCA."

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Stanley D. Wells M.D.
/s/ Harrison Brown
/s/ Morton H. Smith

JUDICIAL PANEL'S JUDGMENT

JUDICIAL CASE 91-5

[NOTE: The following judgment of the Judicial Panel was not affirmed by the SJC. BCO 15-5 requires that "any recommended judgment of the judicial panel" be reported to the General Assembly. The SJC, after a full hearing, returned the judgment found in the previous pages.]

III. Judgment of the Case

1. Yes. The Session had the right to disapprove Complainants for the office of ruling elder based on the issue of theonomy. Therefore, the complaint is denied.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. No. While the Session had every right to examine Complainants on the basis of character, e.g. divisiveness, the issue of character was not clearly stated in the Session's original resolution. The Presbytery denied the complaint on the basis of divisiveness, an issue that was not mentioned in any of the Session's records.

March 7, 1992

/s/ Dominic A. Aquila
/s/ Paul D. Kooistra
/s/ John B. White, Jr.

COMPLAINANT'S BRIEF

JUDICIAL CASE NO. 91-5

I. INTRODUCTION

The complaint of Messrs. Gunter and Monroe is originally against the action of the Session of the Community Presbyterian Church of Live Oak, FL, and now against the response of the Presbytery of Central Florida on that complaint. It will therefore be necessary in this brief to specify the errors at both court levels.

We will demonstrate that the action of the Community Presbyterian Church Session was:

1. To deny Messrs. Gunter and Monroe approved as candidates for the office of Elder.
2. That this denial was specifically and solely on the basis of the "theonomy" of the candidates.
3. That this denial of office was illegal.

We will demonstrate that the action of Central Florida Presbytery (through its commission and approved by the court) was:

1. To allow improper and new evidence to be introduced into the hearing, i.e. the character of the complainants.
2. That these aspersions upon the character were made against one of the complainants, not both, yet both were denied.
3. That the Session had previously approved both men in character as a part of their exams for ordination, and had taken no disciplinary or administrative action to deal with either man on matters of "conduct".
4. That the decision of the Presbytery is improper in that the declaration that "theonomy is out of accord" with the WCF and is to be annulled was on the basis that there was "insufficient clarity" and in not sustaining the complaint.

We therefore assert that hearing of the complaint was improperly conducted, and that the complaint should have been sustained by the Presbytery.

We request that the Commission render the decision that should have been rendered; to sustain the complaint, and to rule the exclusion of these men from office on extra-constitutional grounds is unconstitutional and that their eligibility for office be determined only on constitutional grounds.

A. Re: the Complaint against the action of Session

1. That Messrs. Gunter and Monroe were denied approval as candidates for the office of Elder in Community Presbyterian Church.

Since this specific is unchallenged by either party, we would simply refer the court to the Minutes of the Session dated December 6, 1990.

2. That this denial was specifically and solely on the basis of the "Theonomy" of the candidates.
 - a. The Minutes of the Session for December 6, 1990, record a statement that Messrs. Gunter and Monroe were disapproved for the office of ruling elder in the congregation.
 - b. This statement is the "THEREFORE" clause of the statement.
 - c. All of the "WHEREAS" clauses preceding the statement deal with "theonomy".

- d. The motion whereby the statement was adopted is in the paragraph preceded by the sentence "Elder nominees, (sic) Herman Gunter and Donald Monroe were further examined by the Session."
- e. The motion of adoption of the statement approves the "resolution" as "the Session's position as to the examination of Messrs. Gunter and Monroe".
- f. The letter regarding the termination of Mr. Gunter's Sunday School class (p.5 of the record) was issued and distributed less than one week following the examination. This letter supposes that "most of you have never heard of theonomy", but gives no other reason for the termination of the class.
- g. The Session, in response to the original complaint, (p. 8 of the record) reaffirmed the previous position and added that the Session denied the privilege of teaching in the congregation to anyone who espoused "the theonomic position" or used "theonomic literature to promote the theonomic position."
- h. In oral arguments before the Commission of the Presbytery, the question was put to TE Walkup (p.75, II.24f of the Transcript of the Record [hereafter referred to as Transcript]) "That's a long way of putting it, but I'm basically asking you, 'would you keep someone who is a theonomist who had none of the other associated 'whereas' No. 2 problems (ed. note. character) associated, would you want to keep that kind of a person out of your Session?'" The response by TE Walkup was "If he were going to promote theonomy, I would."
- i. The complainants assert that no questions regarding "divisiveness" were put to them, nor were accusations of the same made to them, in the examination which was denied (See p.17f. of the Transcript).
- j. To the contrary, the examination in Christian Experience was waived by allusion to approval in previous examinations.

3. The denial of office was illegal.

- a. The General Assembly has acted (See Minutes of the GA, 1979, p.115, 749, III, 22, c [corrected in the minutes of 1982]) to state "That the General Assembly affirm that no particular view of the application of the judicial law for today should be made a basis for orthodox or excluded as heresy, insofar as this is in accord with paragraph "a" above."
- b. Paragraph "a" of that report defines "theonomy" in terms of the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Westminster Larger Catechism.
- c. The General Assembly of 1983 adopted an answer to the inquiry from Gulf Coast Presbytery (see Minutes of the GA, p. 96, 11-36, III, 29) which said that a man could be judged to be out of accord with the Constitution in matters referred to in the Confession of Faith, chapter 19, 4, but that "Such a judgment should be supported by specific evidence so that the error or heresy might be demonstrated and proved."
- d. The Session of Community Presbyterian Church failed to demonstrate that the views of Messrs. Gunter and Monroe were out of accord with the Constitution at any point, but merely asserted that "theonomy is out of accord" with the WCF.
- e. The Judicial Decision of the General Assembly of 1983 (in Stephen M. Lee, et. al., vs Gulf Coast Presbytery), Herman complaint was lodged that Mr. Brad Fell was denied licensure on the basis of "theonomy", ruled that the presbytery must re-examine Mr. Fell and instructed the presbytery to give specific and careful consideration to the statement of the Assembly cited above.
- f. The General Assembly, in adjudication of the Complaint of the Peace Congregation, Cary, NC against the Presbytery of Eastern Carolina (see Minutes of the General Assembly, 1982, p. 109, 10-79) ruled that the presbytery had acted improperly when it called upon its members to adhere to an unconstitutional position (total abstinence from alcohol) in part because such a position went "further than Scripture" as interpreted by our Standards and our Church.
- g. The Tenth General Assembly adopted the position (Minutes of the General Assembly, 1982, p. 103, 25, A to Q 2&3 [re-affirmed by the Assembly of 1984]) that "It would be unwise, improper, and unconstitutional for the General Assembly to determine abstractly apart from the process afforded by our Constitutional Standards what would disqualify a man from holding office in the Presbyterian Church in America."

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- B. Regarding the Complaint against the Decision of Central Florida Presbytery**
- 1. The court allowed improper and new evidence to be introduced into the hearing, i.e. the character of the complainants.**
 - a. There is nothing in the record of the hearing before the Session to indicate that the character (Christian Experience) of the candidates was at issue.
 - b. That part of the examination had already been passed over in the examination by the Session (See p. 17f of the transcript of the hearing).
 - c. In its disposition of the original hearing of the complaint, the Session did not even allude to the subject of Christian Character. Instead, they strengthened their statement against "theonomic literature".
 - d. Unsubstantiated allegations were made against Mr. Gunter, and received into consideration.
 1. It was alleged without support that there was difficulty obtaining Deacons because "he's intimidated the Board of Deacons" (Transcript, p. 32, see also 34, 35), yet not only were no names given, but no one has ever spoken to either complainant regarding this allegation.
 2. It was asserted by the Respondents that the Complainants would not submit to their brethren in the Lord. This assertion was made despite the affirmation of the Complainants that they would do so, and in the absence of evidence that there would be no such submission.
 - 2. Aspersions upon the character were made against one of the complainants, not both, yet both were denied.**
 - a. Each of the aspersions on the character of the complainants was made against Mr. Gunter.
 1. That he had "come under the influence of Greg Bahnsen at Reformed Seminary and evidently bought what he had to say." (Transcript p. 23). Note that Mr. Bahnsen came to RTS after Mr. Gunter had already left. (Transcript p. 65).
 2. That he opposed time length of the loan for the purchase of the church in 1982 (Transcript p.24)
 3. That he distributed a paper on the tithes to the Diaconate as they were studying stewardship. (Transcript p.24)
[Note: Many other aspersions were made, including where he attended church three times when out of town, that he is a survivalist, etc. If the court desires, we can reproduce the entire list but see no point in going beyond these samples.]
 - b. Even the Respondent acknowledged that Mr. Monroe "has a sweet spirit". (Transcript p.45)
 - c. Both men were denied in the same action.
 - 3. The Session had previously approved both men in character as a part of their exams for ordination, and had taken no disciplinary or administrative action to deal with either man on matters of "conduct".**
 - a. Mr. Gunter was ordained and served as elder in this church, and resigned from his active office. Regarding the terms of the loan (during this time of active Eldership, the Respondent asserts that "I think it was divisive in that he disagreed". He has never been divested of that office.
 - b. Many of the alleged "divisive" aspects are utterly without Biblical foundation, some are contrary to fact, and nearly all affirm the confession of the Respondent that the Complainants are considered divisive because they are willing to disagree with the Respondent.
 - c. Messrs. Gunter and Monroe have both previously been elected, ordained, and have served (at the time of the complaint) as Deacons. Their approval for that office (in 1988) was after most of the "divisive" incidents cited by the Respondent.
 - d. The Respondent acknowledges that neither man has been divisive in the congregation at large. "As far as being real divisive in the congregation, I would say not. Frankly, I don't think most of the congregation is aware of what's going on. We stopped his Sunday School class...but I think most of the members of the church don't even know about it." (Transcript p.36)

JOURNAL

4. The decision of the Presbytery is improper and inadequate in its decision that:
 - a. The declaration that "theonomy is out of accord" with the WCF and is to be annulled was on the basis that there was "insufficient clarity".
 1. There is sufficient clarity regarding the position of the PCA to demonstrate that the statement of the Session is contrary to that position.
 2. The decision leaves standing the assertion that "theonomy is an unsettled issue in the PCA". It has been settled: we will not determine things by such titles, but examine individuals and individual teachings by the Scripture and the Constitution. See again the Minutes of the General Assembly, 1982, p. 103, 25, A to Q 2&3 [re-affirmed by the Assembly of 1984] regarding how such issues will be settled.
 3. The decision leaves standing the assertion that "theonomy is a divisive issue in the PCA". The evidence presented to the Presbytery does not sustain that assertion.
 - a. Nothing had been presented to indicate that this was the case in Live Oak. Even the Respondents concede that there was no significant division in the congregation that could be attributed to "theonomy" or the conduct of the Complainants.
 - b. It is asserted, but yet unproven and unsubstantiated, that there are four other PCA churches disturbed over "theonomy" (Transcript p. 23). Even if this were to be provable and proven, this amounts to less than one half of one percent of the PCA.
 - b. The failure to sustain the complaint.
 1. Since the entire record of the Session's actions indicate disapproval on the basis of undefined "theonomy", the complaint should have been sustained.
 2. The Commission agreed that theology (i.e. theonomy) was the sole issue. "The one thing, I guess, I want to assure everybody, both the Respondents and Complainants, is that we're not questioning a person's morality or their Christianity, or their purity, we have an honest difference of opinion between the Session and a couple of its members. So, as far as I'm concerned that is not in question. The application of theology, the issues of Statement 4 [*Editorial note: this refers to "WHEREAS, by their own admission, Herman Gunter III and Donald Monroe embrace the primary teachings of theonomy"*], yeah, they are important for us to discuss, as we have discussed them. At no point in time do I see us questioning your quest to mature in Christ in the sanctification process." (Transcript p.55)

CONCLUSION

We have shown that the action of the Session was to exclude Messrs. Gunter and Monroe from election to office as Ruling Elders in the Community Presbyterian Church on extra-constitutional grounds. (Pending adjudication of this complaint, they are still excluded even though one of the Complainants was again nominated this year.)

We have shown that the Presbytery erred in its disposition of the matter by receiving improper evidence; evidence on matters denied on the face of the original activities of the Session, and evidence which is admittedly only "hearsay". It further erred in its self-contradictory ruling.

We therefore ask that the Commission sustain the complaint.

ADDENDUM TO THE BRIEF OF THE COMPLAINANTS SUMMATION OF ORAL ARGUMENTS TO BE GIVEN BEFORE THE STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION OF THE PCA CASE 91-5

Fathers and Brethren,

It is our desire today that you adopt a judgment in this case that differs in part from that of the Panel. We wholeheartedly agree with the panel's decision on the "Statement of the Issues" #2; that the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Presbytery erred in allowing allegations of character to be introduced. We agree that the single issue involved was the disallowance of Messrs Gunter and Monroe by the citation of "theonomy" as the basis.

We also would agree in part with the argumentation under the "Statement of the Issues" #1. The argument advanced in the center paragraph of page three of the Decision is the heart of the argument as to why the decision of the panel must be reversed.

"It is clear from the *BCO* that a court, upon hearing a candidate's examination, judges whether his views are in conformity with the system of doctrine taught in the Confession. The court may also judge whether a noted exception is acceptable in light of the system of doctrine expressed in the Confession. In either case, the court has the responsibility to determine the acceptability of the views given and to judge their conformity to the Confession."

The reality of this case is that the Session of the Community Presbyterian Church of Live Oak, FL did not examine the views of the candidates in the light of the Confession, did not display any areas where it is alleged that the candidates are out of accord, but did simply label these men as "theonomists" and declare that, bearing that label, they must be out of accord and therefore ineligible.

I would call your attention to the Minutes of the Session on November 20, 1990 and December 6, 1990. The record reflects that "the men were examined at length", resulting in a "Resolution" denouncing "theonomy" in general. In reality, very little of the "examination" dealt with theology, and less specifically on "theonomy" (Transcript of the hearing before the Presbytery, hereafter referred to as Transcript #1, pl 17). No specific grounds of error are even mentioned. To the contrary, the testimony before the Commission of presbytery reveals this statement by one of the Complainants (uncontested by the Respondents): "We were examined, or not examined, but in the examination, some of which took place before December 6, I specifically spoke to the ceremonial law in question, those which had been fulfilled in the sacrifice of Christ and specifically done away with by that. And the judicial laws, whatever they may be, the same thing as to the applicability except for the general equity thereof, as the Westminster Confession states." (p. 10 of Transcript #1, elaborated further in the following pages)

This pattern continues in the arguments of the Respondents (the Session) before Presbytery. The bulk of the testimony is an assault on the character of the Complainants. In passing, a question on the duration of loans (p. 24 of Transcript #1, referring to events in 1982) and the tithes (p. 24 of Transcript #1, events of the same time) and capital punishment (p. 34 of Transcript #1) are mentioned. No demonstration is even attempted to show that any of the views ascribed to the Complainants are out of accord with the Standards, only that the Session disagreed. Even the Presbytery concluded that "4. The doctrinal stance against theonomy *per se* was not adequately supported by the session, nor thoroughly investigated by the commission" and agreed that the statement that "theonomy is out of accord" with the WCF was to be annulled.

Finally, note the telling response to questions asked at the hearing before your Judicial Panel:

KOOISTRA: That the Session, does the Session believe that when they say that these two men are theonomists that they know what that means? Could they describe what they mean by this theonomy?

WHITED: I'm not sure.

KOOISTRA: Theonomy on the simple level could simply be people who love the Law of God which on that level we're all theonomists.

WHITED: If you were to ask them to define it, I don't know how well they'd do then. (Transcript of the Panel Hearing, hereafter referred to as Transcript #2, p. 42)

Brethren, the conclusion is both appalling and obvious: the Session had no idea where, if anywhere, these men were out of accord with the Standards, but decided to exclude them anyway. They did not examine them and reject them because they were found to be out of accord with the Standards.

Instead, what the Session did was simple. They simply pinned a label on these men. They knew that "theonomists" are bad people, so these men were bad. This is what is so terrible about the action of the Session. We do not deny the right and responsibility of the Session to make theological decisions based on a man's examination. We do insist that these decisions must be made on the basis of the Confessional Standards.

It is at this point that the terrible danger of the principle set by the Panel's proposed decision must be considered. The Panel concludes that it is not "theonomy" that is being judged, but the right of the courts to make judgments. Rather than affirming the historic right of the lower courts to make judgments on the basis of the Standards, the Panel's decision asserts the "right" of the court to make judgments on the basis of labels.

The very portions of historic decisions cited argue against the position they are cited to support. The citations of the definition of "theonomy" from the 7th GA are exactly the position of the Complainants. We assert that no particular view of the application of the judicial law for today should be made a basis for orthodoxy or excluded as heresy, except in so far as that view is defined by the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter 19, and the Larger Catechism, Questions 93-150. The decision of the Panel would instead allow the mere labeling of views as the basis for determining orthodoxy or heresy.

The case of Stephen M. Lee *et.al.* against Gulf Coast Presbytery (1982) is particularly pertinent. Just as in this instance, the court was influenced to reject a man on the basis of a broad condemnation of "theonomy"; this specification of error was sustained. Further, the final specification was that no Scriptural evidence had been cited in the rejection of the man for ordination; that specification was also sustained.

The following year Gulf Coast Presbytery asked if a man could be denied on the basis of Chapter 19 of the Confession of Faith. Note that even the question of rejection was couched in terms of comparison to the WCF. The answer was that such a judgment could be made and added "Such a judgment should be supported by specific evidence so that the error or heresy might be demonstrated or proved...." This is specifically the position of the Complainants. Neither the Session, nor the Presbytery, nor even the Panel has cited where the Complainants are supposedly out of accord with the Standards.

We submit that to allow exclusion on the basis of a label is a deadly error. Suppose the basis cited were "premillennialism" rather than "theonomy". It might be well argued that there is no fixed position in the PCA on eschatology, and that there are certain premillenarians that are divisive. There are others (thankfully few) whose views go beyond the Standards and into Dispensationalism. Shall we then say that we will exclude premillenarians from office? That a local church or presbytery can refuse a man on these grounds? Then what do we do about the abstinence vs liberty divisions? Can we not simply label anyone who believes in total abstinence from alcohol as not eligible without showing any of his particular views to be contrary to the Standards?

The outcome eventually will be this; that the Standards are irrelevant. Men are found acceptable or not acceptable apart from the Standards. We have already determined that men may be received without their embracing the whole of the Standards. Now, if this decision is adopted, we are saying that men may be rejected who have not been shown to be out of accord with any of the Standards. What then is the purpose of claiming to be a Confessional Church?

It is for this reason that the PCA has historically required a Constitutional basis for determination of eligibility for office. The General Assembly, in adjudication of the Complaint of the Peace Congregation, Cary, NC against the Presbytery of Eastern Carolina (see Minutes of the General Assembly, 1982, p. 109, 10-79) ruled that the presbytery had acted improperly when it called upon its members to adhere to an unconstitutional position (total abstinence from alcohol) in part because such a position went "further than Scripture" as interpreted by our Standards and our Church.

The Tenth General Assembly adopted the position (Minutes of the General Assembly, 1982, p. 103, 25, A to Q 2&3 [re-affirmed by the Assembly of 1984]) that "It would be unwise, improper, and

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

unconstitutional for the General Assembly to determine abstractly apart from the process afforded by our Constitutional Standards what would disqualify a man from holding office in the Presbyterian Church in America."

It has been the continual position of the PCA that we will make these decisions only on the basis of the Word of God as understood in our constitutional documents. A statement made in Systematic Theology class years ago has application. The statement was made with reference to those who would impose standards of piety without a Biblical warrant. "Those who begin by forbidding what God allows will end by allowing what God forbids." We might paraphrase this principle for the current situation as this: "Those who begin by refusing those that the Westminster Standards would allow will end by allowing those whom the Westminster Standards would forbid."

On the basis of the material submitted to you, you can reach only one decision. You must sustain the complaint, and require that the Session either specify the alleged "theonomic" errors which disqualify the candidates or find a different constitutional basis on which to deny them, or find them eligible to stand for election.

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

CASE NUMBER 91-5

In 1957, Teaching Elder Jim Walkup was installed as the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Live Oak, Florida. On September 9, 1982 the ministers and officers of First Presbyterian Church were removed by the Presbytery of Suwanee of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Over 90% of the members of the First Church moved to the Garden Club and continued worshipping with Jim Walkup as pastor. The Community Presbyterian Church was formed. On February 26, 1984, the congregation was officially organized as a church in the Central Florida Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in America.

Herman Gunter has been involved in the Live Oak Church for more than 15 years. Donald Monroe has been involved for several years. Both Gunter and Monroe are deacons with Gunter having been the Chairman of the Diaconate.

When these two men stood for examination for ruling elder, they were unanimously rejected by the Session of the Community Presbyterian Church.

The reasons for this rejection are described in the Session letter of December 6, 1990, which stated:

"WHEREAS, theonomy is an unsettled issue in the Presbyterian Church in America, and
WHEREAS, theonomy is a divisive issue in the Presbyterian Church in America, and
WHEREAS, theonomy is out of accord with Chapter XIX, Paragraph IV of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and
WHEREAS, by their own admission, Herman Gunter III and Donald Monroe embrace the primary teachings of theonomy,
THEREFORE, the Session of Community Presbyterian Church in Live Oak, Florida, disapproves the examination of them both for the office of ruling elder in this church.
FURTHERMORE, the Session of Community Presbyterian Church denies the privilege of teaching in this congregation to anyone who espouses the theonomic position or uses theonomic literature.

Approved by the Session of Community Presbyterian Church at its stated meeting on December 6, 1990, with all elders present and voting in favor of this motion."

Mr. Gunter and Mr. Monroe then appealed the Session's decision to the Central Florida Presbytery and a Presbytery Commission was established at the April, 1991, stated meeting of Presbytery.

As the Presbytery Commission pursued its questioning at the hearing of May 23, 1991, it became evident to all members of the Commission that theonomy was not the only issue. Time and again the respondents, representing the Session, would speak to the issue of divisiveness. Under thorough

questioning by the members of the Commission, the Session respondents gave examples of divisiveness. The word "divisiveness" was expanded to get a broader definition. And the definition, as they used the word, included contentiousness, quarrelsome, dogmatic, and unreasonable.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission met and unanimously approved the decision. Here is the action of the Commission:

"The Commission came to the following conclusions:

1. The complaint argued that disapproval of the complainants for the office of ruling elder was based on one doctrinal issue alone, that being theonomy.
2. The Session actually acted on the basis of two issues, theonomy and divisiveness.
3. Upon examination it was clear that the second statement of the Session dated December 6, 1990: "WHEREAS, theonomy is a divisive issue in the Presbyterian Church in America" was intended to include past conduct by the two Complainants.
4. The doctrinal stance against theonomy *per se* was not adequately supported by the Session, nor thoroughly investigated by the Commission.

The Commission ruled the following:

1. That the complaint be denied.
2. That the third statement of the Session dated December 6, 1990: "WHEREAS, theonomy is out of accord with Chapter XIX, Paragraph IV of the Westminster Confession of Faith" be annulled according to BCO 43-10 based on insufficient clarity."

The Presbytery upheld the action of the Commission at its July 1991 stated meeting.

The Presbytery upheld the ruling of the Presbytery Commission that the second statement of the Session's letter of December 6, 1990: "WHEREAS, theonomy is a divisive issue in the Presbyterian Church in America" was intended to include past conduct by the two Complainants.

Therefore, since the Presbytery decision is based on the issue of past conduct and divisiveness and not theonomy, we believe the issue before the court is:

Did the Presbytery Commission have adequate evidence of divisiveness concerning Mr. Gunter and Mr. Monroe to sustain the Live Oak Session in the rejection of these two men as ruling elders?

Here is the evidence to prove the divisiveness of Mr. Gunter and Mr. Monroe:

Teaching Sunday School Class

When Mr. Gunter is denied teaching a class with his curriculum in the church building, he holds the class in his home. The evidence put forth by the Session was that in September of 1984, the question arose as to whether Herman would teach his class in the facility or in his home. He had indicated "... that if we didn't permit him to teach in the church, he would teach at home." The representative of the Live Oak Session said, "Out of harmony and peace, we permitted him to teach at the church. The ones coming were his wife and older son who, incidentally, should have been in one of our high school Sunday School classes and he still is not in our high school Sunday School class." While it may not be in the best interests of a church for a member to hold his own Sunday School classes in his home during the same time the church is offering classes, it is divisive (self-willed) for an elder nominee to do so. It would give the Session a problem of spiritual oversight if one of its ruling elders was conducting a class outside the normal auspices of the church.

Relations with the Diaconate

When Mr. Gunter was Chairman of the Board of Deacons, the work of the diaconate was greatly impeded. The representative of the Session stated, "He has intimidated the deacons so that they have just done nothing as a Board of Deacons because they are afraid to argue with him. Last year when we asked for nominations for elders and deacons, we didn't get a single nominee for deacon because nobody wanted to serve with him."

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Presbytery Commissioner: "Did you hear words from people to that effect?"

Session Representative: "Absolutely."

When the Diaconate was asked by the Session to promote stewardship, Herman came up with a paper on the tithes which the Session ruled as out of hand as legalistic. The Session Representative stated that as a result, "... it brought the deacon's efforts toward promoting the stewardship program to halt."

The Suicide of Susie Stanstill

Susie Stanstill was a student at Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando, Florida, and she was hired to work with the young people at the Community Presbyterian Church for the summer of 1990. About the fifth week she was on the job she committed suicide, which, as one would understand, caused an emotional trauma within the congregation, particularly with the young people. Miss Stanstill was found dead after the morning services in the place where she was staying. On that Sunday evening, the pastor called the congregation together and spent 1 to 2 hours discussing suicide and death. The pastor's intent was to help the grieving process through discussion and counsel. Herman Gunter called the pastor. The pastor reports that Herman said, "He told us we should not ever have mentioned suicide. We should have kept it under cover. We should have kept it confidential. He got on to Mark Rogers, one of our deacons. (Mark Roger's wife was in the home when Miss Stanstill's death was discovered.) He was very dogmatic with me about it."

Consider the position of the pastor. A beloved youth worker commits suicide and he has a whole congregation grieving and crying and asking questions. While he is trying to help over 200 people come to grips with the awful tragedy, he has a man, who wants to be a ruling elder, rebuking him for publicly mentioning the suicide. Such an attitude and disposition would harm the unity and effectiveness of a Session.

Assault Machine Gun

Mr. Gunter brought an automatic machine gun to a Bible study one night. According to a person who was there, the people were so startled that the group disintegrated, only to meet a few more times before disbanding.

Capital Punishment

When they were examined by the Session, Gunter and Monroe were asked some questions on capital punishment. They both affirmed that they believed in capital punishment for certain sexual offenders, like homosexuals. They also believe a man who curses his parents should be executed. While they have the right to their views, the Session would have great difficulty in counselling homosexuals or other sexual offenders if part of the Session believed they should be put to death, if legally permitted.

Incorporation

When the Community Presbyterian Church was incorporated on February 18, 1983, Mr. Gunter was strongly opposed to the church being incorporated because he said that incorporation "makes you subject to the State." If Mr. Gunter and Mr. Monroe served as ruling elders on the Session, the Session would encounter a number of problems on a practical basis and the Session would be tied up every time it wanted to make a corporate move.

Borrowing Money

Mr. Gunter believes it is wrong for a church to borrow money for more than 6 years. In 1984, the Community Presbyterian Church borrowed \$300,000 payable over a 12-year period. Mr. Gunter strongly opposed the action of the Session. It is not all uncommon for PCA churches to borrow money for more than 6 years. In the Community Presbyterian Church, the creditors are being paid, a beautiful church was built, the church has grown, and glory has come to Jesus Christ. It has not been the position of the PCA to limit borrowing to under 6 years. Again, if Gunter and Monroe served as ruling elders, the Session would be tied up in discussion, disagreement, and inactivity. As ruling elders, they would cause divisiveness over the issue of borrowing money.

JOURNAL

It seems to the Presbytery that the accumulated objective and subjective experiences known to the Session of Live Oak concerning Gunter and Monroe provided adequate evidence that Gunter and Monroe should be denied because of their divisiveness and potential divisiveness.

Here is some testimony from the May 23, 1991, hearing:

Presbytery Commissioner: "Would this be your understanding of what the two of you, as representatives of your Session that in part what you mean by "Whereas Statement #2" - those sorts of things you have been saying, these hard things you have been saying. I appreciate the fact that you have, because I know your hesitation to say these things is an attempt to protect and I think that is good and honorable and I appreciate that. And I hope everyone here knows you have been hesitant and that you are not forthcoming with all these cases and I've had to sort of pull that out of you and I appreciate that a lot. But is this sort of what you meant? Are these the things behind statement (whereas) number 2? In other words, when you use the word "divisive", do you have in mind the specific cases like this going on in your church for the last however many years?~"

Session Representative: "Yes."

Presbytery Commissioner: "Could you say, as a member of Session, that if one or both of these gentlemen were elected to the office of elder to serve on the Session, that they could fulfill vow 5 in BCO 24-5: "Do you promise subjection to your brethren in the Lord?" Let me read the next vow: Do you promise to strive for the purity, peace, unity, and edification of the Church?" I'm trying to get down to specifics here. You said you do think they have a tendency toward quarrelsomeness, toward divisiveness, and that the Session would not work with them on it, and I'm asking you do you think you could expect a reasonable expectation of the fulfilling of these vows?"

Session Representative: "Cosmetically they could."

Presbytery Commissioner: "In reality?"

Session Representative: "No."

At another time during the hearing, the conversation went as follows:

Presbytery Commissioner: "Would you as representatives of the Session say that you believe that if Herman and Don were to be members of the Session they would be cooperative with the Session, upholding the vows they would be taking, submissive to the brethren, striving for the purity and peace? Is it your opinion they would be able and have given evidence they would be able to or not able to?"

Session Representative: " I honestly don't think they would be able to."

The *Book of Church Order* requires that the Session examine, ordain, and install Ruling Elders (12-5). In Chapter 24 of the *Book of Church Order*, it states that "the Session shall examine those nominated and then report to the congregation on election day those eligible for election." Who is eligible for election is left to the discretion of the Session. Unless it can be shown that the Session acted in a capricious manner, the decision of a Session should be sustained. Further, the decision of a Session can be based on objective and subjective experience as long as it acted in good faith.

The Presbytery believes that the Session of the Community Presbyterian Church produced adequate evidence to prove that Monroe and Gunter are divisive and therefore sustained their decision. Further, it is the Presbytery's contention that the evidence before it is adequate for the Regional Judicial Commission to sustain the decision of the Central Florida Presbytery.

One penultimate note. It is obvious that most of the cases cited involved Mr. Gunter. When questioned and examined by the Session, Mr. Monroe said he agrees with Mr. Gunter's views. Further, it was evident to the Presbytery Commission that Donald Monroe, as a disciple of Herman Gunter, does exactly what Mr. Gunter wants.

Then, lastly, it should be noted that the hearings were not done in a spirit of bitterness or acrimony. Both the complainants and respondents showed great maturity and love toward one another. Yes, there is

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

divisiveness, but they have all worked hard to keep it contained and not make it an issue or schism within the church.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Rodney W. Whited
Respondent

6. That the judgment in the case of W. Austin Kenly vs. Potomac Presbytery (SJC Docket 91-7) be approved. *Adopted*

**W. AUSTIN KENLY
VS
POTOMAC PRESBYTERY
JUDICIAL CASE 91-7**

I. A Statement of the Facts

In the spring of 1990 a dissolution of a Pastoral relationship at the Timonium Presbyterian Church (TPC), in Timonium, MD occurred which led to a series of complaints. At a Congregational Meeting on 4/1/90, the Committee on Ministerial Responsibility of Potomac Presbytery, issued a report of its observations/recommendations in this matter. In July of 1990, the original Complainants requested that the Session of TPC clear the name of a pastor whose relationship had been dissolved, stemming from these events. The Session of TPC heard the Complaint and denied it (p. 39 of the Record of the Case. Page numbers in parentheses hereafter are to the Record of the Case.).

Thereafter, the Complainants forwarded their Complaint to Potomac Presbytery, asking that the earlier Report (4/1/90) be corrected and the entire matter be re-investigated. The Complaint was filed on 9/5/90 (p. 38) against these actions (some of which occurred 5-6 months earlier.), and Potomac Presbytery at their 11/13/90 Meeting appointed a Commission to adjudicate the matter (p. 35). The Commission held hearings and met for a period of months (12/20/90 - 4/11/91). On February 28, 1991, this Commission voted to deny the Complaint (p. 33).

At its May 14, 1991 Meeting (p. 25) the Commission's adjudication was heard, with the Presbytery again sustaining its original position, i.e., to deny the Complaint. Complainants filed a Complaint vs. Potomac Presbytery on 6/12/91 (p. 19-21), complaining against the Presbytery's Commission. At the next Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery (9/21/91), a Committee was then appointed (pp. 17-18) to respond to complaint. At this same meeting, Potomac Presbytery ruled that Complaints #2 and #3 be found not in order (p. 12, 16, and 18) in that they were not timely filed (BCO 43-2). This Committee, reporting at the 11/12/91 meeting of Potomac Presbytery also ruled Complaint #1 in order, with #2 and #3 not being timely filed.

On 10/18/91 a Complaint against this 9/21/91 action (i.e., to deny the timeliness of #2 and #3) was received (p. 12). Upon receipt of this case, at the suggestion of the Presbytery's Stated Clerk, the Officers of the SJC approved a delay, until the 11/12/91 meeting of Potomac Presbytery (p. 9). Thereafter the Officers of the SJC found the case

to be "administratively in order". At the 11/12/91 meeting Potomac Presbytery again denied the Complaint (p. 6). Accordingly, the Complaint (pp. 3-5) on Specification of Error no. 1 was received on 12/11/91.

The Panel concurs with the judgment of Potomac Presbytery's Commission (and Committee) re: the timeliness (See pp. 16, 22) of the amends sought, originally as #2 and #3 (cf. also *BCO* 43-2). On 2/28/92 the Panel ruled that Complaints #2 and #3 were improperly filed (due to untimeliness), and found such parts of the Complaint to be "not judicially in order" (SJC Manual 7.6 and 6.1 {b}), and further incapable of being remedied within 30 days. The SJC, on 3/7/92 ratified the dismissal of aspects #2 and #3 of this Complaint (SJC Manual 7.6) in that these Complaints, originally filed 8/9/90 were concerned with actions taken by the Session 4-5 months earlier. Hence, only the most recent Complaint (p. 3) was found to be "judicially in order", and a Hearing on such was held on 3/6/92. Further, we are of the opinion that the dismissal of #2 and #3 in no way prevented the adjudication of the timely received Complaint of 12/11/91.

Hence the issue before this Panel was as follows:

II. **A Statement of the Issues**

1. Did Potomac Presbytery err in its 11/12/91 adjudication of the Complaint?
2. Was complaint #2 in order?
3. Was complaint #3 in order?

II. **Judgment**

1. Complaint Not Sustained

III. **Disposition**

2. Complaint #2 was dismissed as not timely filed.
3. Complaint #3 was dismissed as not timely filed.

IV. **Reasoning**

The Complaint expresses the dissatisfaction that a court of the Church would pass judgment on what is deemed a vital issue with seeming rapidity, and without more input from the Complainants. However, the higher court is not in a position to overturn a lower court, merely upon the ground of Complainants' assertion that not enough input from the complainants, or time was spent on the issue. One court is not allowed to prescribe for another court, the amount of time, or the quantity of deliberations which must be given to the floor deliberation of that court. Each court is presumed competent to adjudicate its own matters, unless proven to the contrary. Further, the Constitution does not prescribe that "explanation or justification" (p. 3) be given, if a court is satisfied with a decision, leaving such to the discretion of the court. Unless clear violations of the Constitution are demonstrated, the SJC should not overturn the adjudication of a competent court.

In this case, Commissions and Committees did lengthy labor, in a highly sensitive matter, and sought the peace, purity, and unity of the church. Furthermore, the Record of the Case indicates that this matter had a considerable history in Potomac Presbytery, first arising in 9/5/90. The Presbytery appointed a Commission, first on 11/13/90.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Thus the duly appointed agents of Presbytery heard this matter for a year, before finalizing its action. It is our opinion that indeed Presbytery did devote sufficient time and deliberation to this matter. Nothing in the Record proves that Potomac Presbytery did an incompetent, or unconstitutional job. It is sufficient to overturn another competent court, only upon the ground of dissatisfaction with the outcome. Actual defects, or unconstitutional procedures must be clearly demonstrated. This being absent, hence the Presbytery is Sustained, and this Complaint is Denied.

We urge the parties to pursue resolution in this case, and work together for health and growth of the churches in Potomac Presbytery. We further enjoin all parties to strive to "Make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace" (Ephesians 4:3).

/s/ RE Harrison Brown

/s/ TE David W. Hall

/s/ TE John Sartelle

VI. Voting on Proposed Judgment and Disposition:

The Judgment and Disposition were

APPROVED by SJC: 21-0, 1 disqualified

COMPLAINANT'S BRIEF

JUDICIAL CASE 91-7

I. A Statement of the Case

This is an Appeal relating to the actions of Potomac Presbytery (Presbytery) which Appellant asserts were inconsistent with provision of the *Book of Church Order (BCO)* and biased to the point of inequity, thus prompting the filing of two Complaints by Appellant on October 18, 1991, and December 11, 1991, (Record [hereinafter "R."] #12 and #3, respectively).

II. A Statement of the Facts

On November 13, 1990, Presbytery appointed a Commission (R. 35) whose charge was ". . . to adjudicate the Complaint . . ." (R. 40) filed by Appellant and others against the Session of Timonium Presbyterian Church (TPC). The Complaint relates to the Session's failure to take any action on a document (R. 41-52) entitled "RESPONSE to the POTOMAC PRESBYTERY'S CMR REPORT of MARCH 28, 1990, to the SESSION of the TIMONIUM PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (TPC), and REQUEST FOR ACTION ON THE PART OF THE TPC SESSION" (hereinafter "Response and Request"). The Response and Request document was filed by several complainants on July 12, 1990, as a rejoinder to the CMR Report (R. 57-72) as distributed by the Session on April 1, 1990, and it was the first filing with the Session by complainants following a series of three Congregational Meetings held in April 1990, the first of which was called as a direct result of a Petition signed by about 140 TPC members (inserted into the Record) which was filed with the Session on March 7, 1990 under *BCO* Section 25-2.

At the Commission's initial meeting with the three complainants on January 31, 1991 (R. 31) the Convener, TE David Bryson, expressed an understanding of the Commission's charge in exceedingly restrictive terms, an interpretation not even remotely consistent with the understanding complainants had been given by the Presbytery and its Moderator when the Commission was appointed. Immediately complainants expressed their opinion that the Commission's interpretation of their charge was not correct.

JOURNAL

At the January 31, 1991, Hearing, complainants also expressed a special concern that unless the requested independent investigation was undertaken, the TPC congregation would never learn the truth to which they were entitled concerning (a) the accuracy [or lack thereof] of the CMR Report and (b) the contributing adverse impact upon the church stemming from certain actions taken by the TPC Session as a body, and/or some of its members acting individually, which actions violated their ordination vows, were clearly not in the best interest of TPC and its congregation, and which completely ignored the direction mandated by the congregation in the duly called Congregational Meeting of April 1, 1990 (see motions passed as per 4/1/90 Agenda, inserted into the Record). Examples were then cited for the Commission (see document inserted into the Record entitled "Outline before the Commission - January 31, 1991"), such as:

1. Gross inconsistency with respect to the CMR Report characterization of the January 24, 1990, Congregational Meeting (R. 63, last line), as contrasted to the TPC Minutes of that meeting which referred more accurately to exchanges during the meeting as being "offered and received in a loving and caring manner" (See Minutes page 3, top, inserted into the Record).
2. Gross inaccuracy regarding the careless presentation of the TPC Visitor Report as expressed in the CMR Report (R. 63, para 3), when contrasted to the true facts concerning same (top of R. 47).
3. The Session's failure to follow-up on its written commitment to the congregation, as per Proposals on the April 1, 1990, Agenda concerning Biblical reconciliation between the parties involved (Agenda Proposal #1), and with respect to dealing with residual or recurring grievances and problems affecting TPC members (Agenda Proposal #4): -
 - a. by taking no action to halt solicitation of signatures to a petition seeking dissolution of the pastoral relationship with Rev. Frett, which petition was being actively and openly circulated at the Palm Sunday evening presentation of the TPC Easter Concert (alluded to in the second paragraph of TE Frett's April 12, 1990, letter, which has been inserted into the Record).
 - b. by taking no action to curtail origination and active participation on the part of some CHURCH OFFICERS and/or their wives concerning the aforementioned petition.
 - c. by taking no action to remove the aforementioned petition from the CHURCH OFFICE where it was being made readily available for signature by church members being solicited by telephone.
4. One or more Session members issued a directive to the church administrator instructing her to delete from the computer certain "sensitive" files concerning the dispute (to eliminate any "trail").
5. One or more Session members placed telephone call(s) to the Virginia headquarters of the Biblical Principles organization and slandered Rev. Calvin F. Frett and his performance at TPC.

At the February 9, 1991, Presbytery meeting (Minutes inserted into the Record) TE Bryson informed Presbytery that the nature of the Commission's charge was not uniformly understood nor agreed upon by the Commission and complainants, and he requested an extension of time and a clarification of the charge, pointing out that none of the commission members were present when the charge was established at the November 13, 1990, Presbytery meeting. Subsequently on that same day, TE Bryson informed complainants that Presbytery and/or its authorized agents had advised him that the scope of the Commission's charge was as broad as its members wanted to make it. In the presence of another Commission member, TE Bryson then assured the three complainants that a complete investigation would be undertaken, a position with which complainants were perfectly satisfied and accepted in good faith, especially given the source, even though it was only verbally made. Complainants' willingness to rely upon this assurance was further partially influenced by renewed statements made by TPC Session representatives at the Commission's recently conducted January 31, 1991, Hearing that Presbytery should investigate the entire matter, and that the Session's August 9, 1990, action was based on advice and counsel received from the then Presbytery Moderator, RE W. H. Moore IV, that the investigation requested by complainants would, in fact, be conducted by another Presbytery committee (R. 23, para. 2).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

However, on April 11, 1991, at the second and final meeting complainants had with the Commission, the Commission informed complainants that its sole purpose was to determine if the TPC Session had acted within its jurisdiction to deny our Complaint of August 9, 1990, a moot point never even raised by complainants. Thus, the Commission reverted to an unduly restrictive mode with respect to its authority and responsibility, a position entirely inconsistent with the spirit of Presbytery's charge "to adjudicate" as understood and accepted by complainants, and with Convener's own assurances given on February 9, 1991, as cited above. Complainants were also informed at this meeting that the Commission had decided to recommend denial of our Complaint (R. 34).

On May 6, 1991, complainants sent a letter to TE Bryson (inserted into the Record) requesting the Commission to carefully and diligently consider observations expressed in said letter supporting complainants' assertion that the Commission had erred in its conclusion. However, no response to the letter was ever received by complainants.

At the suggestion of the Commission, Appellant and one other complainant met on May 11, 1991, for 3+ hours with six members of the CMR committee, including those who authored the March 28, 1990 CMR Report, for the purpose of discussing various concerns and positions relating to said report. Although this meeting was cordial and informative, no ideas were presented nor discussed as to what steps, if any, could be taken to resolve the issues that were still pressing (i.e.: determination and dissemination of the whole truth). Minutes of that meeting have been inserted into the Record.

At the May 14, 1991, Presbytery meeting the Commission reported their rejection of our Complaint, which report was accepted by Presbytery without comment or discussion (R. 25).

On June 12, 1991, Appellant filed a Complaint (R. 19) against Presbytery's May 14, 1990, action on the grounds that (1) the Commission failed to address the main objectives of the initial Complaint' (2) the reasons cited by the Commission for denying our Complaint were not germane; and (3) failure of the Presbytery to conduct the requested independent investigation, especially with respect to the accuracy [or lack thereof] of the March 28, 1990, CMR Report, is unwarranted in light of the counsel and commitments expressed elsewhere in the Complaint, and the intent of the procedures and obligations set forth in the *Book of Church Order* to which we are all bound (see especially R. 20, item #3 [A through H]).

At the September 21, 1991, Presbytery meeting the CMR Chairman recommended that the June 12, 1991, Complaint be denied (R. 17), but this recommendation was not accepted by those present. In lieu thereof, a motion was passed that points #2 and #3 be found not in order, but rather within the purview of the next higher court; and that point #1 was in order. With respect thereto, a five (5) man committee was appointed to study the Complaint and report at the November Presbytery meeting.

Subsequently on October 18, 1991, a Complaint was filed with the Clerk of General Assembly (R. 12) against the action of Presbytery, which on September 21, 1991, had summarily rejected and denied paragraphs numbered 2 and 3 of the complaint filed on June 12, 1991. No explanation nor justification for denying the allegations contained in those paragraphs was furnished, but the Presbytery, in lieu of discussing and then ruling on the merits of such allegations, merely concluded that said paragraphs "be found not in order, but rather within the purview of the next higher court". Appellant continues to contend that Presbytery's failure to conduct the requested independent investigation is unwarranted in view of numerous obligations imposed by the *BCO*, and especially 31-2. Moreover, Presbytery's duly appointed Commission, to the knowledge of Appellant, never visited TPC nor sought to obtain from TPC sources other than the Session, information, evidence, or documentation relating to a church which had been clearly affected with disorder (*BCO* 13-9 [f] and 15-2).

On November 12, 1991 the Report of the Committee appointed on September 21, 1991 was presented to Presbytery by the Convener (R. 8), with the concluding recommendation that

Presbytery "deny the Complaint". Although not specifically stated, this recommendation was a reference to Point #1 of the June 12, 1991, Complaint (R. 19). With respect to the Committee's report, Appellant makes the following observations:

- a. The Committee commented upon their state of confusion with respect to the case in point #6. The Committee also reported they had but a cursory understanding of the facts and that they made no attempt to judge them. But they then proceeded to make a recommendation to deny the Complaint , without any objection or questions being raised by those present. Appellant contends this is tantamount to confessing "We don't know what took place or where we are in the process right now, but we recommend that the Complaint be denied anyway."
- b. In point #4 the Committee stated, again without any contradictory comment from Presbytery, that the TPC "Session apparently wanted Presbytery to take over jurisdiction, an act that Presbytery was reluctant to do". Appellant has been continuously frustrated in all efforts to learn the truth concerning this particular issue, as cited in item 3 of Appellant's December 11, 1991, Complaint (R. 3). Appellant asserts that failure of the Presbytery to respond to such a request is in violation of BCO 13-9.
- c. The Committee noted, seemingly critically, in their point #7 that complainants had "chosen to carry their complaint to the General Assembly (GA) without waiting for the results of the investigation". The principal reason for Appellant's initial filing with GA (R. 12) was simply to meet the timing requirements for filing of complaints following the decision of a lower court. Complaint's initial filing did NOT relate to the point which was the object of the Committee's charge.
- d. As accurately reflected in the Minutes (R. 6 & 7), the Committee suggested that if complainants pursued the matter further, they would do so at the risk of being charged as "litigious". Appellant submits that all steps in this matter to date have been taken in accordance with rights granted under various provisions of the BCO, thus the suggestion of a potential "litigious" charge is UNWARRANTED and COERCIVE. Appellant especially wants to point out that, while the Minutes indicate Presbytery's rejection of the Committee's terminology re: litigious, the Minutes are silent as to the FACTS why it was rejected. The rejection occurred primarily because immediately after the motion was seconded containing the alleged litigious terminology, the Senior Pastor of complainants' church (TE T. M. Moore) voluntarily informed the assembly that "the brethren are not litigious and are contributing in a very positive way at TPC. We believe they are operating within prescribed boundaries of the BCO." In addition, complainants respectfully submit they have had no choice but to appeal to Presbytery because of the refusal of the TPC Session to be responsive, or to even admit the issues are addressable at their level (R. 23, paragraphs 4 and 5).

On December 1991, a second Complaint was filed with the Clerk of General Assembly (R. 12) against Presbytery's action of November 12, 1991, in denying the paragraph numbered 1 of the Complaint filed on June 12, 1991. The tenacious failure of Presbytery to conduct the requested independent investigation relating both to the actions of the TPC Session and the deficiencies and unwarranted conclusions contained in the CMR Report constitute the root causes of this Appeal.

ARGUMENT

As indicated in the Statement of Facts, the initial document directed to the TPC Session by complainants following a series of three Congregational Meetings concluding on April 29, 1990, was a "Response and Request" rejoinder to the Presbytery's CMR Report as distributed by the Session. The deficiencies, misstatements, and unsupported conclusions of that very damaging Report were specifically detailed in the "Response and Request". Thus Appellant submits that the underlying cause of the turmoil created at TPC by the improper actions of its Session, compounded by the incomplete, biased, and cursory so-called "investigation" by the CMR committee, must be the starting point which leads to a meaningful discussion of the subsequent improper actions of Potomac Presbytery. From that perspective it is believed the following are the relevant arguments which support Appellant's position that the remedy sought from the beginning , namely the discovery and dissemination of the truth and relevant facts in this entire situation, still remains to be meaningfully addressed.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. TPC Session exceeded their authority re: certain actions taken, especially with respect to Rev. Frett, on February 28/March 1, 1990, which actions had a devastating impact upon TPC and its members (Minutes of 2/28/90 Session meeting [inserted into Record]).
2. Subsequent actions of the TPC Session as a body and those of some individual members ignored the direction determined by the TPC congregation at the Congregational meeting of April 1, 1990, and continued to be such as to violate the peace and purity of the church. Clearly these actions were not in keeping with the manner in which men ordained to the office of ruling elder should conduct themselves.
3. The Presbytery and its CMR Committee were contributing parties to the resultant turmoil via a highly inaccurate report.
4. Even after the inaccuracies of the aforementioned report were brought to their attention, neither the TPC Session, the CMR Committee, nor Presbytery have been willing to take any meaningful steps to correct same.
5. TPC Session has not acted in good faith.
 - a. They failed to give a report to the congregation at the April 1, 1990 Congregational Meeting and to provide any explanations for their actions, despite having stated in their March 23, 1990, (entered into Record) written communication they would do so;
 - b. They failed to make a full disclosure of the CMR Report by withholding 5 pages of the report from the congregation (the 5 pages have been inserted into this Record), which pages included (1) CMR recommendations contrary to the direction the Session and the Senior Pastor adamantly wanted to pursue, (2) were somewhat critical of the Session and the Senior Pastor, and (3) contained information of vital importance to the congregation's decision-making process;
 - c. Despite the fact CMR's recommendations did NOT support those of the TPC Session and the Senior Pastor, the Session requested the CMR to be prepared to express their (the CMR's) AGREEMENT with the Session's conclusion regarding TE Frett (last paragraph of the Minutes of the 3/29/90 Session meeting [entered into the Record]). Such action does not appear to be representative of the integrity expected of men serving at the Session level, and it certainly is not in keeping with the characteristics expected from the office of Elder as set forth in the BCO. For its part, Presbytery's representatives were silent and non-committal during the April 1, 1990 congregational meeting with respect to the statements made by the Session.
 - d. On April 1, 1990 the Session informed the TPC congregation at the Congregational Meeting that THEY HAD ADOPTED the CMR Report AS THEIR OWN, leading the congregation to believe the full report had been released to them, when in fact 26% of the pages in the original CMR Report had been withheld by the Session. Compounding this deceit, the Session has subsequently tenaciously disclaimed any "ownership" of said report and has asserted they should not be involved in resolving concerns relating to said report (R. 23). At the same time, the Presbytery has taken the position that the Report is the province of the TPC Session (see 7/5/90 letter from TE Frett, inserted into the Record);
 - e. The Session knew, or should have known they were misleading Appellant and others continuously throughout this process by virtue of their having repeatedly stated, both verbally and in writing, that their denial of Appellant's Complaint was based upon their belief and advice from Presbytery that Presbytery was going to appoint another committee to investigate the matter and consider the "Response and Request", when in fact they had been informed such was NOT the case UNLESS they (the TPC Session) requested Presbytery to do so (R. 14). Thus, control remained in the Session's hands, but they never submitted the required request to Presbytery.
6. Appellant asserts that Presbytery's adoption of its Ad Hoc Committee's report and recommendation against any investigative activities has resulted in prejudicing Appellant's right to obtain a fair and impartial consideration and response to the Complaints filed with Presbytery because subsequent Presbytery appointees have been "locked in" to a previously established position regarding the matter (Point 1 [4] of the Ad Hoc report and page 36 of 6/5/90 Minutes, both inserted into the Record).
7. Presbytery's subsequent follow-up of Complaints regarding this matter seem to have been executed to circumvent addressing the validity of objections to their CMR committee's report, and to avoid

JOURNAL

- any suggestion that the Presbytery's responses to the crisis at TPC was in any way deficient or contributory to the turmoil experienced.
8. Presbytery has not proceeded in a totally independent, unbiased fashion. The Convener of the Commission appointed by Presbytery on November 13, 1990, was also the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee (see #6 immediately above). With respect to the Presbytery Committee appointed on September 21, 1991, the Convener had served as a member of the initial Hunt Valley Session, and one Committee member was also one of the authors of the CMR Report. These appointments certainly seem to represent conflicts of interest.
 9. To complainants' knowledge, neither the Commission nor the Committee ever heard the testimony of any TPC member(s), except for the Session and to a much lesser degree the complainants, in pursuit of even a minimal effort to determine if there were, in fact, grounds to even warrant an investigation.
 10. The full Presbytery would not even permit the reading of TE Frett's 7/31/90 letter (inserted into the Record) on the floor of Presbytery, thus demonstrating an egregious lack of concern and interest for the legitimate point of view and pleas of a brother Teaching Elder, choosing instead to relegate him back to the CMR who had already turned him away (see paragraph 1 of the 7/5/90 letter from TE Frett).
 11. As a direct result of the actions taken by the TPC Session and Potomac Presbytery, the peace and purity of a church have been shattered, as have relationships that had been in place for many years, even including family relationships.

CONCLUSION AND REMEDIES SOUGHT

Appellant recognizes that a logical question possibly in the minds of the Panel is "Why is this matter being pursued in view of the fact that the two principal pastors involved in the matter have been called to presbyteries elsewhere in the PCA?" The answer to that rhetorical question is multiple-faceted:

1. purely as an important matter of principle. Is the Presbyterian Church in America, as an institution, serious about upholding the standards espoused in the *Book of Church Order*, even when the result may be embarrassing or uncomfortable to some of its leaders?
2. to give credence to the CMR's own observation (page 16 of its Report [entered into the Record]) that if the TPC Session pursues its course, ". . . what kind of integrity would such a continuing ministry have? Could you still preach or teach about a Christ who truly reconciles without the words sticking in your throats?" Unfortunately the TPC Session did pursue the course upon which it initially embarked.
3. to recognize the fact that the forces unleashed by the unwarranted actions of the TPC Session and its Senior Pastor far transcend the impact upon the pastors involved, having had a devastating and permanent effect upon the lives of hundreds of TPC members, both current and former, as well as unsettling ramifications upon persons beyond the TPC congregation.
4. as a protest to the prejudicial manner in which Potomac Presbytery has handled its response to Appellant's Complaints.
5. to assure that all PCA churches can learn from this unfortunate experience, and all Sessions will recognize that they will be held accountable to the high standards of judgment and conduct applicable to the responsible office to which they have been elected. In the words of the CMR, "the sadness we all feel will be greatly multiplied if all this suffering is allowed to go to waste" (CMR Report, page 15).
6. in the belief that to model the Kingdom of God in the world, the Church must be committed to truth, as opposed to expediency, regardless of the cost and circumstances.

But the single most significant answer that rhetorical question can be best expressed in the words of the great Dutch reformer, Abraham Kuyper, to wit: "WHEN PRINCIPLES THAT RUN AGAINST YOUR DEEPEST CONVICTIONS BEGIN TO WIN THE DAY, THEN BATTLE IS YOUR CALLING, AND PEACE HAS BECOME SIN; YOU MUST, AT THE PRICE OF DEAREST PEACE, LAY YOUR CONVICTIONS BARE BEFORE FRIEND AND ENEMY, WITH ALL THE FIRE OF YOUR FAITH."

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this appeal from the actions of Potomac Presbytery be sustained, and that the following remedies be granted by this Panel:

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. That the Presbyterian Church in America appoint and oversee a competent and unbiased Commission to investigate the entire matter at Timonium Presbyterian Church which led to the turmoil at the church, said Commission to be composed of men independent of and having no connection with the Potomac Presbytery, Timonium Presbyterian Church, and/or Hunt Valley Presbyterian Church.
2. That the PCA Commission's objective will be to ascertain and disseminate the whole truth concerning the entire unfortunate episode.
3. That the Commission prepare and publish a comprehensive report of their findings, said report to be distributed to the PCA General Assembly, the Potomac Presbytery, the TPC Session, the Teaching Elders involved, and all members of the congregations at Timonium Presbyterian Church and Hunt Valley Presbyterian Church, and as a part of said report, if warranted, the name and reputation of TE Calvin F. Frett be totally and honorably cleared.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ W. Astin Kenly, Appellant
511 Wyngate Road
Timonium, MD 21093
[410/561-1430]

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

JUDICIAL CASE 91-7

Preface:

In section I of the brief the respondent will set forth the particular charges of the complainant as found in the complaints against Potomac Presbytery dated December 11, 1991, October 18, 1991 and June 12, 1991. Following each CHARGE in the complaints will be the ANSWER to the CHARGE. Section II will consist of other reasons why the complaint should be denied. References to the Record of the Case page numbers are those circled as distributed by the Stated Clerk's office in Atlanta. Page references labeled K-1, K-2, etc. are documents added to the Record of the Case by Mr. Kenly. Page references labeled B-1, B-2, etc. are documents added to the Record of the Case by Dr. Bryson.

The burden of proof is that of the complainant to show that Potomac Presbytery erred in denying the complaint against the Timonium Presbyterian Church session of August 9, 1990, (Record of the Case, p.40).

I. Complaints:

A. Against Potomac Presbytery December 11, 1991

Record of the Case, pp.3,4,5.

- #1. **CHARGE:** "No substantive explanation or justification for denying the paragraph numbered 1 of the June 12, 1991 Complaint was presented to, or discussed by, the Teaching and Ruling Elders in attendance at the November 12, 1991 Presbytery meeting...." (Record of the Case, p.3.)

- a. June 12, 1991 Complaint Against Potomac Presbytery, item #1. (Record of the Case, p. 19.)

CHARGE: "The Commission failed to address the main objective of the complaint by unduly restricting its authority and responsibility."

- b. November 12, 1991 Potomac Presbytery Minutes. (Record of the Case, pp. 6,7.)

ANSWER:

1. Neither Presbytery nor a commission to adjudicate a complaint is required "to justify", nor are either required to offer "substantive explanation". The *Book of Church Order* is very clear in its requirements of the court. It states in 43-9, "...After the hearing has been concluded, the court or the commission should go into closed session, and discuss and consider the merits of the complaint. The vote should then be taken as to what

disposition should be made of the complaint, and the complainant and respondent notified of the court's decision."

2. However, not only is the court not required to justify its decision but the charge that the commission failed to do so is also in error.
 - a. Minutes of the Commission dated February 28, 1991, (Record of the Case, p.33) the last motion states, "It was moved, seconded, and passed to meet with the Complainants, Respondents, and the CMR Committee prior to the reporting the decision of the commission to the Presbytery."
 - b. Minutes of the Commission dated April 11, 1991, (Record of the Case, p.34.) The decision of the commission was given. The options for the complainants were explained and, "Dale Linder offered an explanation of the commission's decision and the basis for denying the complaint."

The next paragraph reads, "The balance of the evening was spent in a pastoral attempt resolve the differences between the complainants and the respondents."

- c. Record of the Case, p. B-45, Letter from Dr. Michael A. Rogers to complainants for the purpose of exchange and understanding. The letter states, "...the purpose of this meeting is informal discussion for clarification of CMR's viewpoint..." Then further, "Let our goal together be an endeavor to understand and be understood."
- d. Record of the Case, p.B-46, Minutes Committee on Ministerial Responsibility May 11, 1991. The meeting was held and lasted over three hours from 9:30 until 12:45 and, "could be characterized as intense and amiable".
- e. Record of the Case, p.25, Potomac Presbytery Minutes, May 14, 1991, p.75. When the Commission gave its report and its recommendation, the actions of presbytery were seconded and time for discussion was given and the vote was to approve the recommendation to deny the complaint and to dismiss the commission. HOW CAN THIS BE COMPLAINED? How did the Potomac Presbytery violate the *Book of Church Order* or Roberts Rules of Order or any other rules in placing its report and recommendations for action. It can not be successfully charged that Presbytery erred in denying the complaint because the teaching and ruling elders present did not ask a lot of questions or debate the findings or recommendations of the Commission. The fact is the Presbytery agreed with the commission and its recommendations and disagreed with the complainants.
- f. Record of the Case, pp. 17, 18. Minutes of Potomac Presbytery September 21, 1991, pp.86, 87. The Committee on Ministerial Relations responded to the Complaint Against Potomac Presbytery for its decision to deny the complaint at its May 14, 1991 meeting. The motion from CMR was that, "the decision of the Commission in May 1991 (Minutes of the Sixth Stated Meeting of the Potomac Presbytery, item 13 b., page 75) be declared correct and that the complaint be denied." Within the context of that motion the minutes clearly read, "Mr. Austin Kenly was given the privilege of the floor upon proper motion." Mr. Kenly had many opportunities to argue his case on more than one occasion. A complaint against Potomac Presbytery on these grounds is in total error.
- g. Record of the Case, pp. K-23-25. "Outline before the Committee" October 12, 1991. Here you have two and one half pages of written documentation in which Mr. Kenly set forth his case to yet another committee/commission of Potomac Presbytery.
- h. Record of the Case, pp. 6,7. Minutes of Potomac Presbytery November 12, 1991, pp. 94, 95. The report of the November meeting referred to in the Complaint Against Potomac Presbytery dated December 11, 1991, (Record of the Case, p.3), was a report of a committee whose recommendations were before the presbytery. Every motion was open for discussion and debate by any member of the court. Anyone could have requested privilege of the floor for a non-member of the court and presbytery would have acted on such a motion. Further, the report was that of a committee and not that of a commission and therefore the motions, in the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

belief of the respondent, would have been open for full discussion by any recognized member of the court. Potomac Presbytery can not be faulted at its November 1991 meeting. The lack of Presbytery discussion or debate is not a "complainable" act of Presbytery.

- #2. **CHARGE:** "The Ruling Elder presenting the Committee's November 12, 1991 report..." The charge is that of confusion of a "Ruling Elder" of a committee.

ANSWER: I submit to the Panel that the state of the mind of one ruling elder or that of a committee is not what is at stake here. The ISSUE is, "Did Potomac Presbytery err in denying the complaint against the Timonium Presbyterian Church Session?" Furthermore, the committee is not Potomac Presbytery. It is the action of Potomac Presbytery that is at issue. While there may have been confusion on the part of the committee there certainly was none in the mind of Potomac Presbytery. The action of the Presbytery was unanimous in each vote on this issue. Furthermore, if the Presbytery had been in confusion, the burden of proof lies with the complainant to prove such confusion on part of the Presbytery which he has failed to do. He cites the committee's confusion, not the Presbytery's.

- #3. **CHARGE:** "TPC Session apparently wanted Presbytery to take over jurisdiction, an act the Presbytery was reluctant to do". The complainant cites "representatives of the TPC Session".

ANSWER: The charge is irrelevant for two reasons. First, (Record of the Case, p.8.) The findings of the committee making the statement are not the findings of the presbytery. The opinions and understandings of the committee are not the opinions and understandings of the presbytery. The recommendations of the committee were the actions of presbytery; one of which was, "That the Potomac Presbytery deny the complaint."

Second, the thoughts and beliefs of representatives of the TPC Session are not at stake in this complaint. The complaint is against the action of Potomac Presbytery in denying the complaint. This line of argument is totally irrelevant. Contrariwise, the Session of Timonium Presbyterian Church voted NOT to call for such a presbytery investigation. See Record of the Case, pp. 23, 39, 55, 76. The complainant wanted a new investigation, the TPC Session did not.

- #4. **CHARGE:** The Ruling Elder's telephone conversation with complainant of November 6, 1991. The Ruling Elder's belief that "activities [relating to the paragraph numbered 1 of the Complaint filed with Presbytery on June 12, 1991] were not appropriate any more" [at TPC].

ANSWER: This charge can be answered by two points. One, the telephone conversation between the complainant and an individual ruling elder is not the issue in this complaint. The question is, "Did Potomac Presbytery err in denying the complaint against the action of the Timonium Presbyterian Church Session?" These comments are totally irrelevant to that question. Two, this quote from the ruling elder is not proven. It is alleged. There is nothing in the Record of the Case to substantiate this claim in any way. This charge by any standard is NOT an act of Potomac Presbytery and can not be complained, therefore, it can not be argued in overturning the action of Presbytery.

CHARGE: The actions of Presbytery and its representatives, as well as those of the TPC Session constitute a pattern to avoid delving into the merits of the issues....The motive(s) for such a pattern may be that one or both of those bodies seek to "wear-down" complainant through various delaying tactics in order to: (a) suppress knowledge of their role in actions taken beyond the scope of their authority as granted by the BCO; (b) suppress knowledge of actions taken by members of their body which are unethical and most certainly not in keeping with the behavior of ordained members of such a body;....

ANSWER: It is deeply regrettable that the complainant has now taken the course of personal attacks upon the integrity of individuals in the courts before which his complaint was heard. These are slanderous charges at worst careless at best. No such motivation can be proven. There is nothing, absolutely nothing in the Record of the Case at any point to justify the charges made in point four of his complaint. These charges are very serious charges and the Panel should consider warning the complainant of the serious consequences of such unproven charges.

CHARGE: The message of CMR not conveyed nor implied in the cited 15-page report.

ANSWER: Record of the Case, pp. 60-67 The CMR report to the TPC Session, Section II History. The section entitled "History" is just that. It is not the judgment nor the recommendations of the report. It simply sets forth the difficulties and perspectives of the principles in the dispute. It was intended to be simply the "history" of the problem. Furthermore, the clarification of such an interpretation is found in the CMR report to Potomac Presbytery, Minutes of September 14, 15, 1990, Record of the Case, pp., K-12, B-37. In addition, the Clerk of the Session of TPC in a letter to the congregation dated November 6, 1990 made the clarifications to the Timonium Presbyterian congregation. See, Record of the Case, pp. K-12, 12.

**B. Against Potomac Presbytery
October 18, 1991**

Record of the Case, pp. 12, 13

#1. **CHARGE:** No explanation or justification or discussion of action.

ANSWER: Same as above. See 1. & 2, a-h

#2. **CHARGE:** "New and vital information which has never been presented to the Presbytery or any of its Commissions or Committees..."

ANSWER: By the complainants own admission this is "new and vital information which has never been presented to the Presbytery". It is therefore, inadmissible. If it is new and if presbytery has never seen it, how, can this be complained? Presbytery has not acted on the information therefore it can not be complained.

CHARGE A: "Spokesmen for the TPC Session have consistently expressed the position that the Presbytery should investigate the entire matter relating to the turmoil at TPC...."

ANSWER: This is totally irrelevant. Potomac Presbytery has responded to the ONLY OFFICIAL response of the Timonium Presbyterian Church Session. The TPC Session voted to deny the complainants request for a commission to investigate the entire matter. See Record of the Case, pp. 55, 23, 39, 76. If the TPC Session had requested Potomac Presbytery to appoint a commission to investigate the turmoil at TPC the presbytery would have most surely complied. The presbytery in fact did comply with the Session's action by denying the complaint.

CHARGE B: January 31, 1991 verbal expression by spokesmen of TPC Session.

ANSWER: Irreverent. It is Potomac Presbytery's action that is being complained. Whatever the discussions of individual TPC elders or its Session is not a matter before this court. Potomac Presbytery was never asked to act on verbal expressions from TPC Session.

CHARGE C: That the TPC Session withheld information which is significant and pertinent to the conduct of this entire matter, and that by their deportment the Session has continuously and knowingly attempted to mislead complainants and sought to deflect apparent responsibility for any investigation from themselves to the Presbytery.

ANSWER: This is answered by two points. One, the action of the TPC Session is not the object of this complaint. The complainant consistently clouds the issue by bringing in irrelevant detail and charges. The question before this Panel is, "Did Potomac Presbytery err in denying the complaint?" The CHARGE C is an attack on the TPC Session. This is not an action of Potomac Presbytery. The Presbytery is not charging the TPC Session with "continuously and knowingly attempted to mislead...deflect apparent responsibility..." Once again, the complainant is at best careless in making serious and slanderous charges against a court. The Panel should consider these statements when it renders its judgment and when it addresses the complainant and the respondent.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- #3. **CHARGE:** Application of the provisions of the *Book of Church Order*. No supporting evidence at the September 21, 1991 Presbytery meeting (Record of the Case, pp. 17, 18.). The acquiescence by teaching and ruling elders present renders the judgment of the court to be "uninformed, arbitrary and without merit".

ANSWER: It is somewhat difficult for the respondent to understand what is being stated. The Potomac Presbytery would certainly affirm every provision of the *Book of Church Order* in all of its procedures and actions. The burden proof is on the complainant to show exactly how either the TPC Session or Potomac Presbytery has acted out of accord with the provisions. The complainant has not shown the courts to have violated any of our rules.

The call for "supporting evidence" is not required by the *Book of Church Order*. The charge of being "uninformed, arbitrary and without merit" is yet another swipe at the integrity of the court. The Panel will have to judge from the Record of the Case if it believes, that after two years of trying to accommodate the complainant, and, after three different committees and one commission the Presbytery is uninformed and judge whether its actions were arbitrary and without merit.

C. Against Potomac Presbytery

June 12, 1991

Record of the Case, pp. 19, 20, 21.

- #1. **CHARGE:** Commission failed to address the main objective of the complaint by unduly restricting its authority and responsibility with respect to the charge.

ANSWER: Record of the Case, p. 21

The Original Complaint, August 9, 1990

The original complaint against the Session of TPC dated August 9, 1990 requested three actions of TPC Session:

1. That Potomac Presbytery appoint a competent and unbiased Commission to promptly investigate the entire situation at TPC which led to and/or furthered the turmoil experienced by said church in March and April 1990.
2. That the Commission referred to in (1) immediately above prepare, publish, and distribute a new report setting out the findings of said Commission in detail;
3. That appropriate disciplinary measures based upon the findings of said Commission be meted out where appropriate.

The Judicial Commission was appointed by Potomac Presbytery November 13, 1990 (Record of the Case, p.35). In the opinion of the Commission it had the following options after hearing the complaint:

1. The Commission could have sustained the Complaint. If the complaint had been sustained then the three request items of complainants would have been granted one of which was to appoint a "competent and unbiased Commission to promptly investigate the entire situation at TPC".
2. The Commission could have remanded the complaint back to the TPC Session to rehear the complaint in part or in whole.
3. The Commission could have denied the complaint.

Regardless of the action the Commission might have taken, at no point was the responsibility of the Commission to investigate the entire matter as requested in the complaint. To have begun to do so would have in effect sustained a portion of the complaint before deciding the recommendation to Presbytery. The Commission decided to deny the complaint. In denying the complaint it meant that the court would not investigate the entire matter.

The Commission did not fail to address the main objective of the complaint. The problem is that the complainant and the respondent disagree on what the main objective of complaint

was. In the mind of the Commission the matter before it was whether or not the Session of Timonium Presbyterian Church erred in denying the complaint before it on August 9, 1990.

The burden of proof was upon the complainants to prove that the TPC Session acted out of accord with the standards and procedures of our judiciary. This the complainant failed to do. The TPC Session acted fully within its powers and jurisdiction in denying the complaint. It did not violate either procedure or standard in its decision to deny the complaint of August 9, 1990.

The *Book of Church Order* in 12-5. e., "The church Session is charged with maintaining the spiritual government of the church, for which it has power...to determine the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the church and congregation;" Thus, the TPC Session exercised its discretion in matter. An individual or a presbytery may disagree with its discretion and judgment in any matter but unless it can be proven that the court erred in its procedures or in violating the standards of our church, then no court can overturn its action. You may disagree and disagree strongly, however, you may not overturn its decision just because you think it should have been something else. The complainant has constantly confused the limitations of the Commission to adjudicate the complaint and the proper issues before the courts.

CHARGE A: The Presbytery charged the commission to adjudicate the complaint.

ANSWER: The Commission did adjudicate the complaint. See Record of the Case, pp. 28-34, Minutes of the Commission. The complainant defines "adjudicate" (Record of the Case, p. K-23 and the comments of James A. Biddison, Jr., Record of the Case, p. K-15, #5.) in a way to suggest that to adjudicate means a thorough investigation of all the issues in the original complaint by interviewing and taking testimony of persons having personal knowledge of the matters and facts. The matter before the Commission was not the substance of the original complaint, but, rather to determine if the TPC Session erred, not in its judgment, but, in its actions. That which was adjudicated was the TPC Session's action in denying the complaint. Questions before the Commission were such as the following: (1.) Did TPC Session hear the complaint?; (2.) Was there due process in hearing the complaint?; (3.) Were the complainants fairly heard and given every opportunity to present their concerns and complaints?; (4.) Did the TPC Session rule in any way contrary to its authority?; (5.) Did the TPC violate our *Book of Church Order* in denying the complaint? These were the issues before the Commission. These were the issues adjudicated. IT WAS NEVER THE POSITION OF COMMISSION TO JUDGE THE FAULTS OR THE MERITS OF THE CMR REPORT AS ADOPTED BY THE TPC SESSION. NOR WAS IT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COMMISSION TO JUDGE THE MERITS OR FAULTS OF TEACHING ELDERS K. ERIC PERRIN OR CALVIN F. FRETT.

CHARGE B: Commission's understanding of the scope of Presbytery's charge to the Commission and "promises" made to the complainants.

ANSWER: It is true that there were initial questions concerning the nature of the Presbytery's charge of November 13, 1990, (Record of the Case, p.35.) primarily because none of the members appointed to the Commission were present at that time during the meeting. However, the Minutes of the first meeting of the Commission of January 10, 1991, (Record of the Case, p.28.) indicate clearly that the Commission requested the exact wording of Presbytery's charge for the purpose of clearly understanding the role of the Commission. The Commission's judgment was communicated to the complainants in a letter dated January 21, 1991, (Record of the Case, p.22.). The ruling of the Commission was challenged at the hearing of the case on January 31, 1991, (See Record of the Case, p.31.). Copies of the statements of James A. Biddison, Jr. and W. Austin Kenly are found in the Record of the Case, K-14-17. The Commission went into executive session to determine its response to the challenge of its ruling. The complaint was then heard and the complainants and respondents were dismissed. The Commission then requested an extension to make its report to Presbytery at the February 9, 1991 meeting in order to give the benefit of the doubt to the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

complainants by requesting clarification of Presbytery's charge to the Commission and also to give the Commission time to seek to pastorally resolve the remaining differences.

Later at the February 9th meeting of Presbytery the chairman asked for clarification of Presbytery's charge to the Commission on November 13, 1990. The Moderator's response to the question was, "It was as broad or narrow as you as a commission wish to make it. That was the response of the Presbytery". (Source: typed transcript of the taped meeting of Potomac Presbytery discussion at its September 21, 1991 meeting. This transcript is not a part of the Record of the Case. However, this fact is not in contention as the complainant states the same in Complaint Against Potomac Presbytery dated June 12, 1991, Record of the Case, p. 19, item B.. The assurance given to the complainant by the chairman of the Commission at that time was an assurance that the concern of the complainants would be clarified. Further, assurance was given to the complainants that the option of looking into the entire matter, thus, "as broad or as narrow" would be considered by the Commission. The chairman was never in a position to speak for the Commission until the Commission had acted. All of the options broad and narrow were considered by the Commission and the Commission made its decision on the scope of its investigation and responsibilities.

CHARGE C: Sole purpose of the Commission's hearing to determine if the TPC Session had acted within its jurisdiction.

ANSWER: There really isn't a charge in the statement. The meaning of "jurisdiction" as used by the Commission is spelled out in the respondent's ANSWER to CHARGE A: above.

CHARGE D: The Commission's interpretation of its charge is erroneous, i.e. "self-imposed limitations".

ANSWER: This is a matter which the Panel will ultimately determine. Did Potomac Presbytery err in its procedures and fail to adjudicate the complaint? The Presbytery believes it made a proper judgment in denying the complaint against the Timonium Session. The respondent believes that the Presbytery Commission acted as an appellate court and not as the court of original jurisdiction. The matters before the Commission had to do with the actions of the lower court, in this case the Timonium Session, and not the matters of the original complaint.

#2. Grounds for denying the Complaint cited by Commission.

CHARGE I: Commission was wrong in ruling of thirty day deadline.

ANSWER: There are two possibilities in looking at this question. In each instance, however, the complaints can not be sustained. First, if it were granted that the complaint had been filed in a timely manner, still it would have been the burden of the complainants to prove that the TPC Session was wrong in denying the complaint by showing that the Session acted contrary to the rules and procedures set forth in our *Book of Church Order*. The complainants simply disagree with the judgment of the Session and believe it to be wrong. A disagreement with the Session, however, is not enough to overrule its action.

Second, everything that the complainant wants to correct is with respect to the action of the TPC Session at its February 28, 1990 and March 28, 1990 meetings. In the February meeting the Session sought to remove Teaching Elders Frett and Olson. A power struggle ensued resulting in a petition dated March 7, 1990, (Record of the Case, K-26, 27) to call a congregational meeting in order for the congregation to be informed so it could "ratify, modify, or annul recent actions taken by our elected officers (the Session)". Prior to the petition, however, the Session had requested that the Potomac Presbytery's Committee On Ministerial Responsibility (CMR) offer "counsel and advice" to the TPC Session. This request was made on March 2, 1990, (See Record of the Case, p.59.) The TPC Session complied with the petition and the *Book of Church Order* in 25-2 and called for a congregational meeting within the thirty day demand of the BCO on April 1, 1990. At the Session meeting of March 28, 1990, just prior to the congregational meeting, the Session received and adopted the CMR report. It chose to distribute the first three sections of that

CMR report to the congregation in preparation for discussions at that meeting. The final section, "IV. CMR's RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SESSION:" was not made public.

HERE IS THE POINT OF THIS CHRONOLOGY: It is that CMR report which every letter of concern and complaint by the complainants is concerned. In each document before each court, Session, Commission, Committee, Presbytery and this General Assembly Panel the goal of the complaints is the same. The goal is to, (1.) get a new report after a "competent and unbiased" commission is appointed; (2.) distribute the new report; and, (3.) discipline those found lacking by that new report. These are the actions being requested from the letter of July 12, 1990 (Record of the Case, p. 41.) up through the last communication by way of Complaint Against Presbytery dated December 11, 1991, (Record of the Case, p. 5.) under the title of "REMEDY REQUESTED". The whole object of the complaints is to overturn the decision of the Timonium Session in adopting and distributing that CMR report. They disagree with the findings of that report and they want that report replaced with a new one. So, the question is, "When did the TPC Session adopt and decide to distribute the CMR report against which every complaint is made?". The answer: March 28, 1990. The next question: "When did the complainants make their first complaint to correct the findings of that report which the TPC Session adopted March 28, 1990?". The answer: August 9, 1990 (See Record of the Case, pp. 40, 78.) 134 days AFTER the adoption and distribution of the report. When did the complainants first raise issue with the act of Session's report to the congregation? Answer: July 12, 1990, (Record of the Case, p. 41.) 106 days AFTER the TPC Session adopted and distributed the report. The time to complain against that report had fully expired by the time complainants brought their concerns before the Session. THEREFORE, this entire matter is out order. It should not be before us today. The debate on the merits or faults of found in that report and the "Response to the CMR Report" as found in the Record of the Case on pages 42 to 52 and again on pages 80 to 90, along with other supporting documentation such as the "Minutes of 1990 Annual Meeting" (Record of the Case, p. K-1.), and Cal Frett letters dated April 12, 1990 and July 31, 1990 (Record of the Case, pp. K-6-11) are totally irrelevant to the issues before this Panel. The question before the Panel is in determining if Presbytery erred in denying the complaint. It will not judge the rightness or wrongness of Frett or Perrin. (See Calendar attachments A and B)

CHARGE II: Charge against Session not proved.

ANSWER: This was the judgment of the Commission. Nothing that the complainants argued was convincing for the Commission to recommend overturning the Session's denial of the complaint before it.

The matter of the Moderator's "advice and counsel" to the Timonium Session is denied by the Moderator in a letter dated September 11, 1990 to the moderator of the Timonium Session. (See Record of the Case, pp. 4 & 74.) Also, the official action of the TPC Session was to deny the complaint. Potomac Presbytery has never received any communication, verbal or written, from the TPC Session expressing its desire for the Presbytery to appoint a commission to investigate the situation at Timonium. Therefore, Presbytery can not be charged with a failure of acting on a nonexistent request.

#3. Failure of Presbytery to conduct requested independent investigation.

ANSWER: Presbytery has never been asked to conduct an "independent investigation". The Session voted to deny a complaint which requested a commission to investigate. The only issue before Potomac Presbytery was to determine if the TPC Session erred in denying the complaint against it.

II. Other Considerations

A. The Session of Timonium Presbyterian Church has attempted to accommodate the concerns and complaints of the complainant.

1. It heard their concerns.
2. It heard their complaint.
3. It circulated the CMR clarification statement to the entire congregation at Timonium.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

4. The actions of the Session failed to satisfy the complainant.
- B. The Potomac Presbytery has attempted to accommodate the concerns and complaints of the complainant.**
1. The CMR attempted to advise and counsel in the issue in its initial meetings with the TPC Session. It also met with the complainant in an attempt to clarify and resolve the continued concerns of the complainant.
 2. An Ad Hoc Reconciliation Committee was appointed to bring about reconciliation on all sides of the issues. The leadership of both the Timonium and Hunt Valley churches adopted a Confession and a Covenant and lead the respective congregations in making the confession and covenant. (See Record of the Case, B-28-32.)
 3. A Commission was appointed to resolve the concerns and complaint. The Commission held additional meetings in order to accommodate the remaining concerns of the complainant.
 4. Presbytery once again heard the complaint against it.
 5. Presbytery appointed yet another committee chaired by ruling elder Doig in a further attempt to accommodate the complainant.
 6. The actions of Presbytery failed to satisfy the complainant.
- C. Potomac Presbytery's Declarations Concerning Teaching Elders Calvin F. Frett and K. Eric Perrin**
1. Potomac Presbytery declared the principal teaching elders in the dispute to be men in good standing in its statement of May 8, 1990, "It was M/S/A that the Potomac Presbytery finds no reasons to question the doctrine, morals or fitness for the ministry of TEs K. Eric Perrin, Calvin F. Frett and Jack Skeen."
 2. Potomac Presbytery demonstrated that the teaching elders were members in good standing by sending their credentials to Evangel and Palmetto Presbyteries.
 3. These actions of Presbytery failed to satisfy the complainant.
- D. Calvin F. Frett's Satisfaction**
1. At the September 14, 15, 1990 meeting of Potomac Presbytery Cal Frett expressed before the Presbytery his degree of satisfaction concerning the resolution of the problem.
 2. Although Cal Frett was satisfied with the resolution of the problem the complainant was not.
 3. At this point the matter should have been dropped by the complainant but it was not. Proverbs 26:17 warns against getting involved in matters that no longer concern you, "Like one who seizes a dog by the ears is a passer-by who meddles in a quarrel not his own."
- E. The Serious Consequences of Overturning the Presbytery's and the Session's Denial of the Complaint.**
1. The ministry of Timonium Presbyterian Church would be greatly disrupted.
 2. The healing process that has begun in the Timonium and Hunt Valley relationship would be significantly hindered.
 3. The profitable ministries of Cal Frett in Alabama and Ric Perrin in South Carolina would be disrupted.
 4. These factors do not seem to be of concern to the complainant.
- F. The Unreasonableness of the Requests of the Complainant.**
1. The complainant wants the new report of the new commission to be distributed to the full extent of the distribution of the original CMR report.
 2. When the complainant states on page 5 of the Record of the Case, "Complainant strongly believes this issue is of vital importance to the entire Presbyterian Church in America so that all Presbyteries and local Sessions will learn from this experience...." he means just that and nothing less than that. This is no idle or passive request. He wants every presbytery and session to get this report.

CONCLUSION:

Potomac Presbytery believes that the Timonium Presbyterian Church Session acted properly and used sound discretion in denying the complaint. Nothing that has been said or done by any court or by any individual has been successful in persuading the complainant to cease from pursuing his complaint. Under our rules he has every right to bring his complaint before this Panel. That right is very deeply respected by Potomac Presbytery and the respondent. However, if the Panel judges that the complaint be denied it is the hope of the respondent that the Panel would instruct the complainant that this matter is now over and if he continues the complaint in any fashion it could result in further action by the court.

/s/ David Bryson
Respondent
For the Presbytery

7. That the finding in the case of Richard E. Olson and S. Edd Cathey vs. Heritage Presbytery (SJC Docket 92-3) be confirmed. *Adopted*

RICHARD E. OLSON, ET. AL.

VS.

HERITAGE PRESBYTERY

JUDICIAL CASE NO. 92-3

I. A Statement of the Facts

- A. In the fall of 1990 a Session approached Heritage Presbytery with a Reference concerning the following two questions:
1. Is it Scripturally permissible for a Session to require total abstinence from beverage alcohol use for all church officers for reasons of Christian prudence not on basis of principle?
 2. Is it constitutionally permissible for a Session to make such a requirement of its officers?
- B. In February 1991 the moderator of Heritage Presbytery appointed a committee of three to draft a response.
- C. In May 1991 this committee brought a study paper to Heritage Presbytery for distribution and comment.
- D. On September 14, 1991 the four recommendations in the committee's report were adopted by the Presbytery.
- E. On October 14, 1991 Olson *et. al.*, complained against the action of Presbytery in adopting the committee's recommendations.
- F. On November 9, 1991 the Presbytery heard the complaint and voted to deny it.
- G. On December 12, 1991 the complainants filed their complaint with the General Assembly.

II. Statement of the Issues

- A. Did the complainants file their complaint in a timely manner?
- B. Can the response of a court to a non-judicial reference be considered a complainable matter?

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

III. Disposition of the Case

- A. The case is administratively out of order and not properly before us since it was not timely filed with the General Assembly.
- B. The response of a court to a non-judicial reference is not a matter for complaint, therefore, the case is not properly before us. The record of the case makes it clear that the Presbytery was approached with a reference concerning two questions. It appears that the reference was seeking advice only (*BCO* 41-3), thus making it a non-judicial reference. There was no judicial case that the Presbytery was being asked to adjudicate. The Manual of the Standing Judicial Commission, Section 9.1, states the following:

The only reference which the Commission may entertain is the reference of "a judicial case with a request for its trial and decision by the higher court" (*BCO* 41-3).

It is our understanding that judicial references should be heard by the SJC and non-judicial references should be referred to the Committee on Constitutional Business.

In essence, The Heritage Presbytery was asked for advice, the advice was given, and this action of the Presbytery is not one against which a complaint may be raised. If the complainants desire, they may submit their questions to the Committee on Constitutional Business of the General Assembly.

March 18, 1992

/s/ TE Robert M. Ferguson
/s/ RE John B. White, Jr.
/s/ TE Dominic A. Aquila
/s/ RE John W. Lane

IV. Voting on Proposed Disposition:

CONFIRMED by SJC: 23-0

8. That the finding in the case of William A. Conrad, *et al.* vs. Central Carolina Presbytery (SJC Docket 92-4) be confirmed. *Adopted*

WILLIAM A. CONRAD, *ET. AL.*
VS
CENTRAL CAROLINA PRESBYTERY

JUDICIAL CASE NO. 92-4

I. A Statement Of The Facts

- A. In a letter dated February 3, 1992, the Complainants brought a complaint "against the action of the Session of Prosperity Presbyterian Church whereby the Session, in a called meeting on February 2, 1992, did act upon a majority

vote of the congregation of Prosperity Presbyterian Church and did dissolve itself; and ask Presbytery to appoint a Commission to act as Interim Session for six months.

- B. In a complaint dated February 6, 1992, the Complainants allege that "the Session and Pastor failed and refused to convene a meeting of the Session when requested."
- C. These complaints were denied or not acted upon by the Session and were carried to Central Carolina Presbytery.
- D. At a Called Meeting of Central Carolina Presbytery on February 17, 1992, the following actions were taken:
 - 1. The Presbytery responded to the request of the Prosperity Presbyterian Church that a Commission be appointed to act as Interim Session for a six-month period until a new Session is elected.
 - 2. With regard to the complaints, the moderator ruled that they be remanded to the Commission appointed to act as an Interim Session, and that it hear the complaints as the court of original jurisdiction.
- E. In a complaint dated February 19, 1992, the Complainants brought their complaint to the General Assembly.

II. A Statement of the Issue

- A. Did Central Carolina Presbytery "fail to act" when it remanded the complaints to the Commission appointed to act as the Interim Session, so that it might act as a court of original jurisdiction to handle the complaints?

III. Disposition of the Case

It is our opinion that Central Carolina Presbytery did not fail to act on the complaints before it when it remanded the complaints to the Interim Session of Prosperity Presbyterian Church. This Commission of Presbytery (also acting as the Interim Session for six months of Prosperity Presbyterian Church) is the court of original jurisdiction and should adjudicate the complaints in a timely manner. The complainants are reminded of their right to carry their complaints to the next higher court if they deem it necessary.

We judge that the complaint is administratively out of order and remand it to the Interim Session of Prosperity Presbyterian Church for adjudication.

March 18, 1992

/s/ TE Robert M. Ferguson

/s/ RE John B. White, Jr.

/s/ TE Dominic A. Aquila

/s/ RE John W. Lane

IV. Voting on Proposed Disposition:

CONFIRMED by SJC:

19 concurring with 1 dissenting vote.

IV. ADDITIONAL INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

The Standing Judicial Commission made some minor revisions to the Manual in order to provide clearer, more efficient service. This Manual is an operational and not a policy manual and as such does not require General Assembly approval. The Manual is

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

distributed to all Clerks of Presbytery and to all parties when a case is received. Copies are available from the Office of the Stated Clerk.

At its March 6-7, 1992 meeting the Commission elected the following members to be its officers for next year, beginning after the 20th General Assembly:

Robert M. Ferguson - Chairman
John B. White, Jr., - Vice-Chairman
Dominic Aquila - Secretary
John Lane - Assistant Secretary

We urge you to be in prayer for your Standing Judicial Commission as they seek to serve you in this important function in the Lord's work.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Robert M. Ferguson
Chairman

20-70 Dissent to Judicial Case #91-5

The following dissent from RE Dale Peacock was received and ordered spread upon the minutes.

The 20th General Assembly by its ruling affirming the Standing Judicial Commission's decision in Case #91-5 (*Herman Gunter III and Donald Monroe vs. Central Florida Presbytery*) proved well our acknowledgment that "All church courts may err through human frailty...." [*BCO Preface II(7)*]. This case also exemplifies the tremendous authority given the SJC whose judgments are not subject to "question or debate or discussion" (*BCO 15-5*). Had the GA been allowed to question the SJC regarding its decision, it would have discovered many troubling aspects of this case which will now be immune from scrutiny by our church court.

For example, the original SJC panel opinion stated "The Presbytery denied the complaint on the basis of divisiveness, an issue that was not mentioned in any of the Session's records." (*Handbook, p.2070*) In direct contradiction of that the full SJC opinion stated, "The record shows that the issue of divisiveness was considered by the Session...." (*Handbook, p.2071*) Both of those assertions cannot be true. Inquiry and discussion by the GA would have revealed the true situation. However, the effective gag order extant in *BCO 15-5* will prevent the GA from ever learning the full facts of this case.

The SJC opinion correctly cited the pertinent statement by the 11th GA that a judgment denying a potential elder's examination "should be supported by specific evidence so that the error or heresy might be demonstrated or proved...." *M11GA, 1983, pp.96-97*. However, the SJC then proceeded to ignore this pronouncement. In fact, the record of this case contains no proper, specific evidence demonstrating error or heresy in either candidate.

The Presbytery properly recognized that the Session of Community Presbyterian Church could not disqualify the candidates by simply declaring them to be theonomists, a word referring to those who adhere to God's Law. The Session made no attempt to establish that the candidates adhered to a particular view of theonomy that was out of accord with Scripture. Furthermore, the record is devoid of any such evidence. Realizing this dilemma, the Presbytery then sought on its own accord to establish that the candidates were divisive. The Session's ruling denying the candidates' examinations on the issue of theonomy was sustained by the Presbytery on its newly-found ground of divisiveness. The SJC furthered the "shell game" with its contradictory findings by the panel and the full Commission.

It is not disputed that the Session is the court of original jurisdiction given the authority to determine the acceptability of a candidate's theological views and his moral fitness. However, this authority is not unrestricted and is subject to review by the higher courts. To hold otherwise denies the minority protection from the majority.

JOURNAL

The 11th GA wisely set forth the protection available to elder candidates: specific evidence of the purported error or heresy must be demonstrated. In this case, neither the Session nor the Presbytery received specific evidence that Herman Gunter or Donald Monroe entertained any theological error. Nor was there demonstrable evidence of divisiveness, although the Presbytery did allow the introduction of hearsay evidence which it agreed it would not consider. Not surprisingly, it clearly did consider this unsupported, impermissible evidence through cross-examination and investigation.

This entire sad process resulted in denying the complainants' fundamental fairness and due process. Justice was not served in this case. For these reasons, I respectfully dissent to the GA's judgment.

Adding their names to the dissent were the following commissioners: TE Rodney T. King; RE Rick Trumbo; TE J. Mark Duncan; TE J. Steven Wilkins; RE John J. Marshall; TE Peter J. Leithart; RE Dwight Carter; TE John Owen Butler; RE Ross Blankley; RE John B. Harley III; RE John G. Thompson; TE Ronald L. Bossom; TE Carl W. Bogue; RE Larry Pratt; RE Douglas W. Latimer; RE Floyd T. Veatch; TE Michael L. Coleman; TE Michael J. Ahlberg; TE James L. Shull; RE Richard R. Larson; TE Ken Gentry; TE Jim Bordwine; TE George A. Crocker; TE Alan R. McCall; TE Dennis P. Stack; RE Howard C. Lane; TE Ross Lindley; TE Byron Snapp; RE Mark Hecht; RE Edwin Johnston; TE Edd Cathey; TE Larry Ball; TE Jerry W. Crick; RE Kim D. Conner; RE Phil Soldan; TE James M. Hope; TE Michael E. Mang; TE Henry E. Johnson; RE Larry Hambrick; RE John Z. Leigh; RE Will Thompson; RE Royce C. Seifert; RE Roger Schutz; TE Carl D. Russell; TE Philip R. Blevins; TE James T. (Ted) Lester, Jr.; RE Neil S. Smith; TE G. Brent Bradley; RE Joe L. Reynolds; TE Donald S. Stone; TE Robert C. Peterson; RE Jeffrey D. Brotherton; TE Michael Chastain; TE J. Robert Thompson, Jr.; TE Jerry I. Maguire; TE Frank E. Smith; RE Philip Fanara, Jr.; TE John R. Maphet; TE Jeff Meyer; TE Tom Sullivan; TE J. D. Dusenbury; TE Brad Stewart; TE Carl Howell; RE Gerard Berghoef; TE Philip G. Kayser; TE Darwin Jordan; TE J. Ray Bobo; RE Richard E. Olson; TE Jonathan Seda; TE Tom Wenger; TE Dwight Dolby; TE Jack Lash; RE Jack L. Brown; TE David Coffin; TE Dwight Dunn; TE Norman A. Bagby, Jr.; RE Chester Deas; RE David C. Lachman; TE Joel Beezley; TE Michael Obel.

TE Anthony R. Dallison recorded his objection (*BCO 45-4*) to the action on Case #91-5 on the same reasons as those expressed in RE Dale Peacock's dissent.

20-71 Committee on Review of Presbytery Records

RE Donald Comer, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's report. Recommendations were acted upon as follows:

- I. A list of the Presbytery Minutes received by the Committee**
(See III below)
- II. A list of the Presbyteries which have not submitted Minutes**
Covenant, Great Lakes (See notes under III below)
- III. A Report concerning the Minutes of each Presbytery**
 1. That the Minutes of Ascension Presbytery:
 - a. Be approved without exception for: **July 13, 1991; September 20-21, 1991; November 9, 1991; January 10-11, 1992; March 14, 1992.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
May 3-4, 1991; June 1, 1991.
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

The following are the responses adopted by the Presbytery of the Ascension at its September 20-21, 1991, stated meeting (91-102.6) to the exceptions taken to its minutes by the 19th General Assembly:

EXCEPTION: September 14-15, 1990: "Page 13, Presbytery appointed a moderator of Session without consent of Session *BCO* 12-3" [see 90-019.2].

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception, regrets the error, and promises to be more careful in the future.

EXCEPTION: January 11-12, 1991: "Page 5, 91-5 No mention of candidate for licensure actually preaching before presbytery or committee."

RESPONSE: The candidate in question did preach before the Candidates for Church Vocations Committee of Presbytery, but that fact was omitted from the minutes of Presbytery. We hereby correct the minutes of the meeting January 11-12, 1991.

Adopted

2. That the Minutes of Calvary Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception for: **April 26, 1991; July 27, 1991; October 24, 1991; January 25, 1992.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: **None.**
- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 17th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **Response to 17th, 18th and 19th GA Exceptions:**

The committee met on September 20, 1991 at the Second Presbyterian Church.

1. **17th GA:** As to the exceptions of substance to the minutes of Calvary Presbytery by the 17th GA the following recommendations are made and were adopted by the Presbytery on October 24, 1991:

Item 1 - April 28, 1988

EXCEPTION: "Page 4, Candidate's Committee #3. No evidence that *BCO* 18-2 was met."

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and promises to be more careful in the future. All other requirements of *BCO* 18-2 were met except noting the Sessional Recommendations. They were: Allen Dayhoff from Woodruff Road Presbyterian Church, Simpsonville, SC. Wes Alford from Westminster Presbyterian Church, Rock Hill, SC.

EXCEPTION: "P. 7 Examination Committee, no record that *BCO* 19-16 internship requirement was fulfilled."

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. The record that the internship was fulfilled is to be found on page 5 of the same minutes, under the Subcommittee Internship Report.

Item 2 - July 23, 1988

EXCEPTION: "P. 5 Administration Committee #4, no record of written complaint included in minutes."

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. The complaint was against an individual on a personal matter. It was handled correctly, being given to a Judicial Commission. The Commission reported to Presbytery that the complaint was withdrawn, without further action needed, to the satisfaction of all parties involved. Not to cause unnecessary embarrassment the personal details of the matter were not brought before the Presbytery (see Oct 27, 1988, p. 3)

EXCEPTION: "P. 6, no Sessional Recommendation (*BCO* 18-2) for candidate."

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and promises to be more careful in the future. Charles Hart's Sessional Recommendation was from First Presbyterian Church, Jackson, MS.

Item 3 - October 27, 1988

EXCEPTION: "P. 3, Judicial Commission, no full record of Judicial commission was entered into the minutes (*BCO* 15-).

JOURNAL

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. The Judicial Commission did reply to Presbytery of its findings. No action was taken since the complaint was resolved with all parties involved. It was not deemed necessary to record in the minutes the details due to the personal matter. The original letter of complaint is on file with the Stated Clerk.

EXCEPTION: "P. 8, Examination Committee, a man was examined for ordination but was not examined in Church History nor is there any record of internship being approved.

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. All examinations were for licensure and transfer, no one was ordained. There was no need for a Church History examination or internship approval.

Item 4 - General

EXCEPTION: "No annual report on candidates (*BCO* 18-6).

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and promises to be more careful in the future. This was an oversight. Our present procedure includes this.

EXCEPTION: "Reports on interns not given at each stated meeting (*BCO* 19-12).

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and promises to be more careful in the future.

EXCEPTION: "Only five churches had Sessional Records examined during the year (*BCO* 12-7 - 13-9, *BCO* 40-1).

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. These five churches were those which were late in having their records examined. The rest of the churches were approved in January, 1988.

EXCEPTION: "No directory, no roll, no standing rules."

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. We always include these in our printed minutes and submitted them for review.

2. **18th GA:** As to the exceptions of substance to the minutes of Calvary Presbytery by the 18th General Assembly the following recommendations are made and were adopted by the Presbytery on October 24, 1991:

Item 1 - July 22, 1989

EXCEPTION: "Page 4 'Candidate' 4th paragraph: Either the internship must be designated as one year in duration, (*BCO* 18-2), or as approved on previous experience (*BCO* 19-16) but neither is mentioned here."

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and promises to be more careful in the future. The internship was one year in duration.

EXCEPTION: GENERAL

"(2) Directory of presbytery not included, (3) Roll of presbytery not included, (4) Up-to-date copy of Standing Rules of presbytery not included."

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. Directory and manual are included as a standard practice in minutes and have been sent to Review and Control.

3. **19th GA:** As to the exceptions of substance to the minutes of Calvary Presbytery by the 19th General Assembly the following recommendations are made and were adopted by the Presbytery on October 24, 1991:

Item 1 - April 26, 1990

EXCEPTION: "PP. 1 & 2 No listing of absent teaching elders not excused. No indication of which church did not send ruling elders. *RAO* 14-10 c-6, 7."

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and promises to be more careful in the future.

EXCEPTION: "Commission report received, but no record of Presbytery approving action. *BCO* 15-1."

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. The commissions report was approved as received.

EXCEPTION:

"P. 6 Committee acted in way that only a commission can, but no by-laws to see if that is proper."

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception. Our By-Laws [416-B(7)] do indicate the committee can act as a Commission. These are submitted yearly to the Review of Presbytery Records.

EXCEPTION: "P. 6, 7, 8 No quorum determined for three commissions BCO 15-2."

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception. We operate on a two Teaching and two Ruling Elder quorum. We promise to be more careful in recording this.

EXCEPTION: "P. 1,2 No listing of absent teaching elders not excused or which churches did not send elder delegates RAO 14-10 c.6.7."

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and promises to be more careful in the future.

EXCEPTION: "P. 6 1, 2, 3, 4 Commission reports received but not adopted BCO 15-1."

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully agrees with the exception. The reports were adopted when the motions were adopted. We promise to be more clear in the future.

Adopted

3. That the Minutes of **Central Carolina Presbytery**:
 - a. Be approved without exception for: **January 26, 1991; July 20, 1991; November 21, 1991.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: **None.**
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

4. That the Minutes of **Central Florida Presbytery**:
 - a. Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
April 20, 1991; July 16, 1991.
October 19, 1991:
Page 56, 12-C: There is no record of transfer of membership (BCO § 13-6).
January 21, 1992:
Page 57, 11-C: There is no record of the Moderator having asked the questions required by BCO § 19-3.

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

- d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

April 15, 1989, July 18, 1989 and October 20, 1989

RESPONSE: Minutes do not reflect candidates completing exegesis and theology papers or completing internship. This reflects an error in reporting by the clerk. These candidates papers were received by the Candidates For the Ministry Committee along with reports on their internships. This was presented and approved by Presbytery in the context of the examinations, but not recorded separately.

January 16, 1990

RESPONSE: Same explanation as above.

April 21, 1990

RESPONSE: Same explanation as above. Written sermons are also received by the committee, but again this is not recorded.

July 17, 1990

RESPONSE: Commission consisted of 3 TEs and the REs from the session of Seminole Presbyterian Church. The clerk in error did not record the individual names in that group.

JOURNAL

REs that participated in the commission for Steve Doan were: RE Bud Blanton, RE Lou Brown, RE Greg Fisher and RE Frank Taylor - all from Seminole Presbyterian Church.

January 15, 1991

RESPONSE: Protest recorded, no explanation given. Explanation was provided in Appendix D of the minutes. The letter which documented the verbal protest and proposed a solution was not in the standard form for a protest and may not have been so recognized by the reviewer.

General - no directory, roll, list of candidates or licentiates, no standing rules.

RESPONSE: This was an error on the part of a novice clerk. Having submitted the above to the Stated Clerk's Office for their use in publishing the *Yearbook*, I was not aware that copies needed to be included as well with minutes for review. Copies are attached.

General - No report on interns in any minutes.

RESPONSE: Reports were brought to Presbytery on all candidates, licentiates and interns as a regular part of the Candidates For the Ministry Permanent Committee Report. This was not reported in error in the Presbytery minutes.

July 22, 1988

RESPONSE: I queried the Presbytery regarding the examination of this licentiate. A thorough exam was done according to the *BCO*. A temporary clerk was serving at that meeting and did not record the proceedings.

October 15, 1988

RESPONSE: Internship for this licentiate was approved. Not recorded in error. It was reported to the Presbytery that the dissolution of this pastoral relationship was agreed to by the congregations. Not recorded in error.

General

RESPONSE: Eight sets of minutes were submitted to the 19th General Assembly covering four meetings held throughout 1989.

Adopted

5. That the Minutes of **Central Georgia Presbytery**:
 - a. Be approved without exception: **None**.
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
April 9, 1991; July 19-20, 1991; January 18, 1992.
October 8, 1991: The sermon for ordination examination was not preached before the entire presbytery. *BCO* § 21-4.
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**
6. That the Minutes of **Covenant Presbytery**:
Were not presented.
7. That the Minutes of **Eastern Canada Presbytery**:
 - a. Be approved without exception: **None**.
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
February 21-23, 1991; June 12, 1991; October 3-4, 1991.
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

Adopted

Adopted

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

8. That the Minutes of Eastern Carolina Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception for: April 20, 1991; June 12, 1991; July 20, 1991; October 19, 1991; January 18, 1992.
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: None.
 - That their responses to the exceptions of the 18th and 19th General Assemblies be approved as satisfactory.
 - Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

From p. 104 Regarding the Eastern Carolina Presbytery Minutes of May 19, 1990, p. 7 & 8, that "motions 70-76 & 79 are contradictory and unclear."

The actions cited above involve a background which includes a complaint to Presbytery from Mr. Ed Chappell regarding actions of a Presbytery Commission to the Fuller Memorial Church dated January 22, 1990, and Mr. Chappell's later complaint to General Assembly on January 25, 1990, against Presbytery's upholding of the Commission's action.

Between the January and April Stated Meeting of Presbytery the Commission discussed additionally the possibility of charges against Mr. Chappell. Because the charges were not yet properly before the Presbytery, motion #70 was to send whatever might now arise back to the court of original jurisdiction. At that time the Commission was the Session at Fuller Memorial Church. (This was later ruled unconstitutional by the GA Judicial Commission and Presbytery acknowledged itself being in error).

In Mr. Chappell's reading of his prepared statement the moderator determined he had begun to argue the case and was not speaking to the motion regarding sending charges back to the Session/Commission. All subsequent motions (#71 thru #79 in question) relate to Presbytery putting the matter in the hands of the original court for proper handling.

While the Minutes may not reflect all of this, it was well understood by Presbytery. We respectfully submit in answer to the citation that Presbytery was not acting in a contradictory manner but the flow of the Minutes do appear to be unclear to one not involved in the actions at that time.

We will be more observant in the future to both accurately record our proceedings but also seek to insure better clarity.

If indeed there is a contradiction, please specify its nature and we will be pleased to respond.

Our thanks to you for your time and efforts.

Adopted

9. That the Minutes of Evangel Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception: None.
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

May 14, 1991:

Page 11, C-3: The full text of a pastoral call is not recorded or referenced and there is no indication of congregational action. (BCO § 20-6; § 20-2)

September 24, 1991:

Page 9, D-6: The full text of a pastoral call is not recorded or referenced and there is no indication of congregational action. (BCO § 20-6; § 20-2)

January 28, 1992:

Page 7, D-6: The full text of a pastoral call is not recorded or referenced and there is no indication of congregational action. (BCO § 20-6; § 20-2)

- That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

JOURNAL

d. That their response to the exceptions of the 18th General Assembly not be approved as satisfactory: a motion was made by presbytery to approve a response, but no action is recorded (September 24, 1991).

e. Response to 18th and 19th GA Exceptions:

Evangel Presbytery wishes to respond to the exceptions of the 18th GA to our minutes as follows:

September 26, 1989

1. Same reply as 1. above.
2. (Should be 11:B-1) Again this was a unanimous vote and we just failed to note that it was a 2/3 and we will seek to be more careful in the future.
3. Do not see what is noted. This is what we have been putting in our minutes as the terms of the call for years. Surely you are not saying that we put in all the wording of a printed call every time.
4. We have assumed that a preached sermon which is not required for licensing is accepted as well as a written sermon. Please tell us if we are wrong.
5. They were all reviewed without any major exceptions.
6. I followed a committee report and failed to check their reference. It should have been 38:2 and 38:3.
7. Again, I am not sure that we had any interns at this particular time, but we just had not had this time in the *BCO* brought to our attention before. We will seek to have that report from now on.

January 30, 1990

1. Same reply as the 1st item under May 9, 1989.
2. I don't think your report meant *BCO* 3-2. We think you must have meant 38-2. We do believe that it fulfills the intent of 38-2.
3. John Weed is a member of Briarwood Presbyterian Church and in all of the discussion of the motion to receive him without his being present, I as the Stated Clerk failed to catch that we did not have the Sessional Endorsement presented to Presbytery, although the committee did have it. I will seek to be more alert.
4. (It should have been p. 10, 14-j) When the meeting was properly called the purpose was made clear. This only set the date and time for a called meeting that was anticipated.
5. I know that we had at least one intern at this time, but as we have said previously, we did not have this requirement drawn to our attention and we failed to see it, but will see that it is included from now on.
6. This requirement also slipped our attention and all we know to do is to apologize to you and promise to see that this requirement is followed from now on.

Please tell us what is meant by your comment under ALL that our "Minutes do not appear to be copies of corrected minutes." We do not know how to respond when these are copies of the ACTUAL MINUTES THAT I mailed out & put in the files of Evangel Presbytery.

In another communication which was received there was an exception to the September 26, 1989 Minutes, Page 14: Item I-10. We can't see why you said there was no reason given as it is stated "Due to recent changes of his views which he believes are contrary to the Confession of Faith specifically dealing with charismatic gifts etc." This letter had previously been given to the committee on Ministers & Candidates and they had been in touch with Mr. Murphy and the church and he had joined a body there in Anniston which was not a body to which he could be dismissed to, and this was the request that he made and Presbytery granted it.

There was an exception given to the March 6, 1989 Called meeting to Item 5 concerning the appointment of a Commission to install. This commission was appointed at the May 1990 Stated Meeting: see page 11, F-5.

It was moved approved that this reply be adopted by Evangel Presbytery this 14th day of May, 1991.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Evangel Presbytery wishes to respond to the exceptions of the 19th GA to our minutes as follows:

The following action concerning the Minutes of Evangel Presbytery was taken at the Stated Meeting held on **September 24th, 1991**:

"We note the requirement in the *BCO*, apologize for being in error, and promise to conform to the requirement in the future."

This is concerning the January 30, 1990 Minutes, p. 8, 2-D. This motion was adopted by Evangel Presbytery at the Sixty-Third Stated Meeting, September 24, 1991.

Adopted

10. That the Minutes of **Grace Presbytery**:
 - a. Be approved without exception for: **August 11, 1990; October 9, 1990; January 8, 1991; May 14, 1991; August 10, 1991; October 8, 1991; December 6, 1991; January 14, 1991.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
May 8, 1990.
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted
11. That the Minutes of **Great Lakes Presbytery**:
Were not presented due to the very serious illness of their stated clerk.

Adopted
12. That the Minutes of **Gulf Coast Presbytery**:
 - a. Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
January 8, 1991; February 9, 1991; May 14, 1991; August 13, 1991; October 8, 1991; February 8, 1992; March 10, 1992.
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted
13. That the Minutes of **Heartland Presbytery**:
 - a. Be approved without exception for: **April 27, 1991.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
August 16-17, 1991.
November 8-9, 1991:
Page 210, 91-154: Presbytery failed to record in its minutes its reasons why it considers this work to be a valid Christian ministry when the source of the call came from a source other than a church in the PCA *BCO* § 20-1.
March 20-21, 1992:
Page 233, 92-33: The minutes fail to record whether Presbytery ascertained congregational concurrence with a teaching elder's request for dissolution of the pastoral relationship *BCO* § 23-1.
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

JOURNAL

- d. **No further response was required to the previous exceptions of the 17th, 18th and 19th General Assemblies due to action by the Assembly's Committee on Constitutional Business.** (See Appendix A, Attachment 1, V, item 1, p. 297).

- e. **Response to 19th GA Citations:**

Heartland Presbytery apologizes for any and all actions which contributed to a perceived reluctance to comply with General Assembly decisions relating to presbytery records.

Further, Heartland Presbytery acknowledges and regrets the omission of addenda from the body of its 1989, 1990, 1991 minutes reviewed by the Review Committee, and assures General Assembly that all pertinent and necessary documents are in fact attached to the original minutes.

Finally, Heartland Presbytery has instructed its stated clerk to review the process of recording the minutes to prevent the reoccurrence of these types of situations cited.

This response was passed by presbytery action #92-12 on 3/20/1992.

Adopted

14. That the Minutes of Heritage Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception for: **May 11, 1991; August 24, 1991; September 14, 1991; November 9, 1991; January 21, 1992; February 8, 1992.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: **None.**
- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**
STATED CLERK'S NOTE: Heritage Presbytery did submit a response to exceptions which is included here.
- e. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

At the last General Assembly there were several objections "Objections of Substance" to our actions last year. These are major exception. There are two aspects that demand our response:

1. Objections of our approving two men holding Sabbath exceptions. The General Assembly has stated that these exceptions to our standards "*compromise a fundamental of our system of doctrine, WCF 21-8, LC 115-120, SC 57-62, BCO 48-1-7.*" This whole issue has been referred to the Care committee for response, through Administration. [We are also cited on one candidate for neglect of exam in original languages & academic qualification, also referred to care.]
2. There are some "exceptions of form" to the way items are recorded. These will be dealt with later.

However, GA has required us to respond at this meeting concerning why we did not respond to last year's exceptions. Exactly what the Review Committee is referring to is unclear. No exceptions from last year were provided to us by the Stated Clerk's office. Furthermore, last year there were no exceptions taken to our minutes. The only neglect cited was failure to provide a Presbytery Directory to GA. Since we were a new Presbytery, there was no directory. Our first directory was completed in 7/90. Besides, this is not an exception of substance. Therefore, I would move the following response to the citation by GA for this meeting:

"Moved, that with all due respect to the Assembly, we believe there is an error in including Heritage Presbytery in the list of those who failed to respond to exceptions to minutes. According to *Minutes* of 18th GA, only one set of minutes was examined (2/10/90) and these minutes were "Approved without exceptions". Therefore, Heritage Presbytery did not respond to exceptions because there were none to respond to.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RESPONSE CONCERNING EXCEPTION OF SUBSTANCE REGARDING THE SABBATH:

1. **Concerning Freedom of Interpretation M/C** that it is the opinion of Heritage Presbytery that some degree of freedom must be granted to the individual conscience when it comes to determining: (a) Precisely how "an holy resting all the day" is to be understood. (b) What are "worldly employments and recreations." (c) What precise meaning is to be attached to spending "the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship." (d) How "works of necessity and mercy" are to be defined. LC 117. M/S/C to amend by adding the following: This is no way meant to be construed as a rejection of or softening our commitment to scripture or the Westminster Standards or Biblical Presbyterianism.
2. **Concerning TE Van Gilst M/C** that because TE Van Gilst holds to the view concerning the keeping of the Christian Sabbath is Scriptural, and binding upon the church today, and only questions the meaning of some of the wording of the Westminster Standards, therefore we hold that his views do not constitute real exceptions. We commend Mr. Van Gilst for his careful consideration of the confessional language, and his candor in making known "possible exceptions."
3. **Concerning TE Perkins.** Mr. Perkins clarified his position to the Care Committee on the fourth commandment in the following three areas: (a) He believes that the fourth commandment is morally binding for the church. (b) When asked "Do we have a Christian Sabbath?", the minutes record a negative answer. By way of clarification, Mr. Perkins said he understood the question to have reference to Saturday as the Sabbath, and not to the continuing and morally binding principle of one day in seven to be set aside as holy unto the Lord. (c) The minutes record: "He (Mr. Perkins) believes that it is permissible for a Christian to work on the Lord's day." By way of clarification, Mr. Perkins' statement had reference to works of mercy and necessity. Mr. Perkins believes that a Christian ought to avoid work on the Lord's day. This answers the apparent contradiction in the Minutes, and satisfied the committee. M/C to adopt this as the answer of the Presbytery.

Adopted

15. That the Minutes of Illiana Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception for: **April 13, 1991; October 12, 1991; November 2, 1991.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

January 10-11, 1992:

Page 295, ¶ 3b: There is no evidence from Calvary Presbytery that they had previously approved this internship (BCO § 19-7).

There is no record that Illiana Presbytery approved the exception by the required 3/4 vote (BCO § 19-16).

Page 295, ¶ 6: Both the *Westminster Confession* (§ 29, ¶ 4) and the *Directory for Worship* (§ 47-9) teach that the Lord's Supper is an element of public, as over against private worship. While any teaching elder may preside, unless other elders and individuals are present this practice constitutes private communion and is contrary to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in America.

General:

There is no directory, roll or list of candidates and licentiates provided (RAO §14-10, h). This is a substantial exception in as much as it has been a problem for three years (RAO §14-9, c. 2).

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly not be approved as satisfactory.

- d. **The response is not satisfactory and not approved in light of BCO § 15-2, MI4GA, Appendix I, 37, p. 346 and MI6GA, p. 164, Response to Constitutional Inquiry. Use of commissions is not authorized for examinations irrespective of the makeup of the commission.**
- e. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

EXCEPTION: p. 264, p. 1 - Presbytery divided itself into 3 parts to examine two ordinands and one licentiate. This is contrary to BCO 15-2 and BCO 21-4.

RESPONSE: Illiana Presbytery submits that commissions of Presbytery did carry out the ordinations of TE Freeman and TE Leuzinger and that a commission of Presbytery will carry out the ordination of Mr. McDonald at the appropriate time following his ordination examination. (McDonald's examination was conducted and sustained by Illiana on October 12, 1991.)

However, Illiana Presbytery respectfully submits that it did not violate the intent of BCO 15-2 or BCO 21-4, in dividing itself, as noted in General Assembly's exception, for purposes of examination of the two ordinands and one licentiate on two grounds.

First, BCO 13-4 and Illiana's standing rules require a minimum of three TEs and three REs to constitute "a quorum competent to proceed to business. Each of the three examining commissions at the October 13, 1990, meeting exceeded this minimum requirement.

And secondly, the reassembled Presbytery had opportunity to further examine each ordinand and the licentiate. Although not explicitly stated, this further questioning is indicated when it is stated, "as the area of experiential religion had not been covered (by the examining commission) the Presbytery examined Mr. Leuzinger in this area."

Adopted

- 16. That the Minutes of James River Presbytery:
 - a. Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
April 13, 1991; July 13, 1991; October 12, 1991.

General:

There is no mention of an annual report of candidates for the ministry under the presbytery's care. (BCO § 18-6) (This presbytery has been cited for this previously.)

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **The Committee recommends approval of Presbytery's response to the General Assembly, but notes that the exception of substance in item b. above has been cited by the 18th and 19th General Assemblies.**

Adopted

- 17. That the Minutes of Korean Central Presbytery:
 - a. The following minutes have been received: **March 27, 1990; October 15, 1990; April 16, 1991; October 8, 1991.**
 - b. See Recommendation 1 under IV below.

Adopted

- 18. That the Minutes of Korean Eastern Presbytery:
 - a. The following minutes have been received: **July 6, 1987; September 21, 1987; November 23, 1987; April 4, 1988; November 28, 1988; March 27, 1989; September 18, 1989; November 27, 1989; April 2-3, 1990;**

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

September 17, 1990; November 26-27, 1990; April 1, 1991; September 16, 1991; November 25, 1991; April 20-21, 1991.

- b. See Recommendation 1 under IV below.

Adopted

19. That the Minutes of **Korean Southern Presbytery:**

- a. The following minutes have been received: **April 5, 1990; October 11, 1990; April 11, 1991; October 10, 1991.**

- b. See Recommendation 1 under IV below.

Adopted

20. That the Minutes of **Korean Southeastern Presbytery:**

- a. The following minutes have been received: **April 2, 1990; October 1, 1990; April 8, 1991; October 7, 1991.**

- b. See Recommendation 1 under IV below.

Adopted

21. That the Minutes of **Korean Southwestern Presbytery:**

- a. The following minutes have been received: **April 10, 1990; October 16, 1990; April 16, 1991; October 15, 1991; December 9, 1991.**

- b. See Recommendation 1 under IV below.

Adopted

22. That the Minutes of **Louisiana Presbytery:**

- a. Be approved without exception: **None.**

- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

January 2, 1991; April 2, 1991; July 2, 1991; October 2, 1991; November 7, 1991.

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

- d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

EXCEPTION: July 28, 1990, p. 5 -- BCO 15-1 requires approval of commissioner's report to become action of the court and be entered into minutes. No such approval is mentioned. Also no motion to dissolve commission.

RESPONSE: The Louisiana Presbytery acknowledges that we failed to record that these actions were taken. This was done by oversight of the Stated Clerk. Presbytery has taken steps to insure that in the future all our actions are accurately recorded in our minutes.

Adopted

23. That the Minutes of **Mid-America Presbytery:**

- a. Be approved without exception for: **October 11, 1991.**

- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

February 19, 1991; April 12, 1991; August 27, 1991; January 25, 1992.

April 10, 1992:

Reference 92.2.018 Presbytery cannot entrust an ordination examination to a commission. (BCO § 15-2, last sentence)

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly not be approved as satisfactory.

- d. **No response was received.**

Adopted

JOURNAL

24. That the Minutes of Mississippi Valley Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
June 4, 1991; October 15, 1991; February 18, 1992.
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**
- Adopted*
25. That the Minutes of Missouri Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
July 17, 1991; October 16, 1991; January 15, 1992.
April 17, 1991:
Page 77 There were no letters of recommendation for men taken under care from their sessions, nor was there any evidence that they had been members of the church for at least six months. (BCO § 18-2)
Page 77 There was no evidence that either candidate for licensure had produced a written sermon (BCO § 19-2).
- General:**
There were no reports from interns. (BCO § 19-12).
- That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
EXCEPTION: "That the Minutes of Missouri Presbytery: ... b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the Presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: April 20, 1990 1) First reading of Standing Rules change with no vote recorded. SR p. 2".
RESPONSE: A motion was adopted to respond to the Records Committee that the Minutes of April 20, 1990, be corrected to show that there were no negative or abstain votes in regard to the SR change; and that hereinafter the Clerk of Presbytery be very diligent in recording counted votes, and to count necessary votes even when the outcome is obvious.
- Adopted*
26. That the Minutes of New Jersey Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception for: **February 19, 1991.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
May 18, 1991; February 29, 1992.
September 28, 1991:
Page 217 No copy of a commission report is appended to or included in the minutes (BCO § 15-1).
November 23, 1991:
Page 234 Neither the commission's report nor its minutes were included either in the minutes of the presbytery or appended as per BCO § 15-1 and RAO § 14-10 f. 2.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

February 15, 1992.

Page 247 Neither the commission's report nor its minutes were included either in the minutes of the presbytery or appended as per *BCO* § 15-1 and *RAO* § 14-10 f. 2.

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

27. That the Minutes of **New River Presbytery**:

- a. Be approved without exception: **None.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

March 8-9, 1991; July 12-13, 1991; November 8-9, 1991.

December 7, 1991:

Page 2, 53-1-4 *ff.* The minutes of a session's executive session were read in open court, which is impermissible (*Robert's Rules*, section 9).

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

28. That the Minutes of **North Georgia Presbytery**:

- a. Be approved without exception for: **June 1, 1991; July 20, 1991; January 18, 1992; April 21, 1992.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

October 15, 1991:

Paragraph 4 There is no report of the commission in the minutes of the presbytery (*BCO* § 15-1).

Paragraph 4 There is no record that the commission was organized according to *BCO* § 15-2.

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

29. That the Minutes of **North Texas Presbytery**:

- a. Be approved without exception: **None.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

January 25-26, 1991; April 6, 1991; April 26-27, 1991; June 26-27, 1991; October 25-26, 1991; January 24-25, 1992.

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

EXCEPTION was taken to the June 15, 1989, Minutes, P.1: "Minutes stated they are not official until approved by next stated meeting. No record of approval at next stated meeting found."

RESPONSE: The Committee was inadvertently furnished with a front page that had not been edited and changed after being approved by the Presbytery at its next meeting.

JOURNAL

The approval of the minutes in question was not recorded at the next stated meeting. It is the Presbytery's normal procedure to always approve or edit prior minutes as part of the Stated Clerk's report. The Committee's exception resulted in my error in recording the approval.

Adopted

30. That the Minutes of Northeast Presbytery:
- a. Be approved without exception for: **December 7, 1991; January 10-11, 1992.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
September 10-11, 1991; February 22, 1991.
May 10-11, 1991:
 - Page 27, # 18 A commission to install must have at least two teaching elders and two ruling elders present. This commission had only one teaching elder (*BCO* § 15-2).
 - Page 27, # 18 There is no record of a sermon being preached as part of the ordination examination (*BCO* § 21-4).
 - Page 27, # 18 The commission appointed members to itself. This it cannot do; *BCO* § 15-1 states that a commission must be appointed by the court that constitutes it.
 - Page 36, # 22.2 There is no record of a sermon being preached as part of the trials for ordination, nor that the candidate met the educational requirements or the original languages requirements. (*BCO* § 21-4).
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
Recommend that Northeast Presbytery respond to the exceptions of substance taken by the 19th General Assembly as follows:
January 12-13, 1990:
EXCEPTION: Page 30, 33-D Failure to cite Session for admitting children to communion without profession of faith (*BCO* 6-2, -4, & 58-4).
RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception although it recognizes that the Minutes are ambiguous at this point.
Grounds:
 1. There was never any question about admitting children to communion without a profession of faith. The policy in question was, to quote the Minutes, "admitting children to communion without full membership."
 2. The point of issue here was admitting children under the age of 18 to communicant membership in the congregation without their becoming members of the corporation. The congregation is a corporation in the State of New York. The laws of the State of New York require that all members of a corporation be at least 18 years of age. Note that the Minutes expressly state that the action of Presbytery was to strike the recommended exception. Presbytery did not adopt the recommended exception as its own.
 3. At the May 1990 Stated Meeting Presbytery received a complaint against the action of not adopting the recommended exception from the Session of Christ Church. Presbytery appointed an Ad Interim Committee to Study and Report on the Complaint against Presbytery.
 4. At the September 1990 meeting the Committee reported and Presbytery adopted its recommendations:

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- (a) Recommend that the exception of the Northeast Presbytery taken to the minutes of Hope Church September 20, 1987 be declared erroneous, and be hereby rescinded.

Grounds: BCO 25-11: "While. . . in all matters ecclesiastical the action of such local congregation or church shall be in conformity with the provisions of this *Book of Church Order*, nevertheless in matters pertaining to the subject matters referred to in this Chapter 25 ("conveying title to property," et. al.). . . actions with the civil laws applicable to such laws local congregation or local church." Adopted

- (b) Recommend that Presbytery adopt the previous recommendation as the response to the complaint to the Session of Christ Church.
Adopted

[See Minutes September 14-15, 1990, page 17, item (11).]

September 14-15, 1990:

EXCEPTION: Page 25 (20.1) Ordination exam should not be in views, but in knowledge. Other than theology, no other areas examined (BCO 21-4 a-d).

RESPONSE: Presbytery agrees with the exception and will be more careful in the future. The candidate had been previously examined as *Pro Re Nata* meeting July 7, 1990 in areas except sacraments. The candidate was examined on his knowledge as well as his views. The Minutes were incorrect at this point.

GENERAL: No roll, directory, list of candidates or Standing Rules included.

RESPONSE: Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception on the following grounds:

1. Presbytery submitted a copy of its *Directory* and Standing Rules with its Minutes to the Assembly for its review. This *Directory* includes the complete roll and list of candidates. This was noted in the submittal letters NEP-90-16 dated April 25, 1991, and NEP-PJA-91-07 dated January 16, 1991. The Standing Rules may have not yet been submitted in calendar year 1991, but they have not been changed since January 1990.
2. RAO 14-10 Guidelines for Keeping Presbytery Minutes para. h. lists the items cited as items that should be included in the minutes once a year. Presbytery has met this guideline.

Adopted

31. That the Minutes of Northern California Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception for: **March 8, 1991; June 8, 1991; October 4-5, 1991.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: **None.**
- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

Following is the response approved by the Northern California Presbytery at their meeting of October 5, 1991, to the Exceptions of Substance taken to our March 2-3, 1990, and October 5-6, 1990, Minutes which are as follows:

GENERAL: No Directory, Roll or Standing Rules included during year.

RESPONSE: "The Directory of the Northern California Presbytery dated September 1990 was sent to Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk of General Assembly, by letter dated 9/13/90 and the January 1991 Directory was sent to Paul Gilchrist by letter dated February 16, 1991. These directories included all directory and roll information required by RAO 14-10-h. In the future they will be attached directly to the Presbytery Minutes. Directory dated October 1991 is attached for the information of the GA Presbytery Records Committee.

"The Presbytery Standing Rules were not forwarded due to an oversight, as no changes have been made to them since they were adopted. In the future a copy of our Standing Rules will be sent each year as required by the RAO even if they have not been changed during the year. Attached is a copy of our By-laws which are our Standing Rules."

JOURNAL

It is considered that the above action should close out this item.

Adopted

32. That the Minutes of Northern Illinois Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception for: **July 28, 1990; January 26, 1991; July 27, 1991.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
**April 26-27, 1991; January 25, 1992.
November 1-2, 1991:**
Page 91-107 There is no record of a sermon being preached as part of the trials for ordination, nor that the candidate met original languages requirements (*BCO* § 21-4).
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**
- Adopted*
33. That the Minutes of Pacific Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception for: **July 27-28, 1990; December 7, 1990; April 26-27, 1991; July 26-27, 1991; October 18-19, 1991.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
January 24-25, 1992.
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - No further response was required to the previous exceptions of the 14th General Assembly due to action by the Assembly's Committee on Constitutional Business. (See Appendix A, Attachment 1, item V, 3, p. 298)**
 - Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
 - Move that the presbytery correct the minutes of April 25-26, 1986, page 3, #16., a) by inserting the words, "and a theological thesis and exegetical paper", after the work "languages" in line 4.
 - Move that the Presbytery respond to the exception in the Sept. 26-27, 1986, Minutes, Page 4, #12, B, (5) (failure to follow the 2 month filing time for letter for man coming under care) by noting with regret the failure to fully comply with *BCO* 18-2, and by resolving to be more circumspect regarding this provision.
 - Move that the Presbytery respond to the exception in the September 26-27, 1986, Minutes, Page 4, #12, B, (6) (failure to follow the 2 month filing time for letter for man coming under care) by noting with regret the failure to fully comply with *BCO* 18-2, and by resolving to be more circumspect regarding this provision in the future.
 - Move that the Presbytery respond to the exception in the September 26-27, 1986, Minutes, Page 5, #12, B, (7) by amending the Minutes of September 26-27, 1986, Page 5, #12, B, (7), inserting the sentence, "Mr. Watanabe presented the academic degrees necessary for ordination and was examined in the original languages of Scripture, along with presenting an acceptable theological thesis and exegetical paper required for ordination trials." This sentence to be inserted in line 3 after the sentence ending, "(see Appendix C)."
- Adopted*
34. That the Minutes of Pacific Northwest Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception for: **March 10, 1991; August 22, 1991; October 4-5, 1991.**

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

January 11, 1991:

Page 8, 4a. & b. There is no record of the congregation's concurrence with the proposed dissolution of pastoral relationships (*BCO* § 23-1).

April 26-27, 1991:

Page 19, item 2 There is no record that a teaching elder called to a non PCA work was granted "full freedom to maintain and teach the doctrine of our church." Presbytery must have assurance of this (*BCO* § 8-7).

Page 24, item 10 There is no record of that the candidate for ordination submitted the required theological and exegetical papers, or that the same were approved. Also there is no record of the required sermon being preached. (*BCO* § 21-4).

Page 25, item 1 There is no record of the congregation's concurrence with the proposed dissolution of pastoral relationships (*BCO* § 23-1).

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

EXCEPTION: The Committee on Review of Presbytery Records of the 19th General Assembly took exception to the minutes of the Presbytery of the Pacific Northwest (April 27-28, 1990, p. 19, #2) in the matter of its having erected a Commission to exam for licensure.

RESPONSE: At the meeting of the Presbytery of the Pacific Northwest, October 4, 1991, the following response was adopted:

Recommendation: that Presbytery adopt the following response for submission to the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records of the 20th GA. "The Presbytery of the Pacific Northwest concurs with the exception taken to its minutes (April 27-29, 1990, page 19, number 2) but finds that the progress of events has made it impossible to correct its action [Mr. Cassis having now been ordained as teaching elder and being actively engaged in the ministry]. The Presbytery respectfully promises more care to ensure compliance with the *BCO* in such matters in the future."

Adopted

35. That the Minutes of **Palmetto** Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception for: **April 25, 1991; July 26, 1991; September 10, 1991; October 24, 1991.**

- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

January 24, 1991.

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

In response to #35 on page 109: (1) *BCO* 19-12 No record of progress of interns included in the minutes. (2) *BCO* 15-1 No record of commissions or actions approving those reports appear.

RESPONSE: We note your findings. We have not done this in the past..... However we will begin doing this in our minutes.

Adopted

36. That the Minutes of **Philadelphia** Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception: **None.**

- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

JOURNAL

November 9, 1991.

May 11, 1991:

Page 1, ¶ 7 There are no minutes of the commission to ordain in the appendix (*BCO* § 21-7; § 15-2)

Page 2, ¶ 13-D There is no record of the examination of a teaching elder as per *BCO* § 13-6. He was not on the roll at the time of the MNA report.

September 14, 1991:

Page 3 ¶ 17-E The minutes do not reflect congregational assent to the dissolution of pastoral relations (*BCO* § 23-1)

January 11, 1992:

Page 6 ¶ 18 The minutes do not identify areas of the examination as required by *BCO* § 21-4.

Page 6 ¶ 16 The minutes do not reflect either presbytery or the committee as hearing or approving the licensure sermon (*BCO* § 19-2).

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **No further response was required to the previous exceptions of the 17th, 18th and 19th General Assemblies due to action by the Assembly's Committee on Constitutional Business. (See Appendix A, Attachment 1, item V, 2, p. 297.)**
- e. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
 1. 13 May 1989 -- exception accepted - church did meet and agreed to ask the presbytery to dissolve the pastoral relationship.
 2. 9 September 1989 - exception accepted - Mr. White did fulfill the educational requirements mentioned in *BCO* 21-4.
 3. 13 January 1990 - exception accepted - Mr. White is no longer a member of this presbytery (now with Northeast) so we do not have record of his date of ordination. GA Clerk may.
 4. Exceptions taken by 17th General Assembly that were not approved:
 - a. 14 May 1988 - exception accepted and corrected.
 - b. 10 September 1988 - exceptions accepted - practice has been changed and each portion of exam is mentioned in the minutes.
 - c. 12 November 1988 - exception accepted - Mr. Wrigley was ordained and commissioned to the chaplaincy on 30 October 1988.
 - d. 11 March 1988 - exception accepted - these requirements were met and recording practice has been changed to reflect his.

Adopted

37. That the Minutes of Potomac Presbytery:
 - a. Be approved without exception for: **September 21, 1991; November 12, 1991.**

- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:

February 1, 1991:

There is no report from interns (*BCO* § 19-12).

May 14, 1991:

There is no report from interns (*BCO* § 19-12).

General:

There are no reports given from candidates under care (*BCO* § 18-6).

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

d. **Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

EXCEPTION: (1) With regard to the Minutes of May 8, 1990, an exception of substance is alleged: "Section 19f No record that sermon preached or approved. No record of completed internship. No record of theological and exegetical papers being approved. *BCO* 21-4." (2) With regard to the Minutes of November 13, 1990, an exception of substance is alleged: "Section 17 c and d No record of theological and exegetical papers. No record of internship. No record of completed education requirements for two of the ordinands. *BCO* 21-4." (3) However, with regard to the Minutes of September 14-15, an exception of form is alleged: "Section 28 h No record of sermon, no record of theological and exegetical papers, no record of completion of education requirements. No record of completion of internship requirements. (Language that a candidate has met all the requirements of the *BCO* is not sufficient.)"

RESPONSE:

1. We are confused by the Assembly's communication. Are we to understand the citations, "no record of sermon," "no record of theological and exegetical papers," "no record of internship," and "no record of completed education requirements" to be exceptions of substance or form?
2. If exceptions of form, these are defined in the RAO as "[v]iolations of the Assembly's Guidelines for Keeping Presbytery Minutes, rule of order, etc...These exceptions shall be sent to the stated clerks of presbyteries who do not have to respond in writing to the Assembly...." (RAO 14-9.2) Thus, according to the rules in this case, no response is required of us. Nevertheless, we respond by confessing that we cannot see what rule from the Guidelines we are violating in our current practice, and would appreciate instruction from the Assembly on this matter. The parenthetical comment is of interest, but where in the Guidelines is it stated or implied that "Language that a candidate has met all of the requirements of the *BCO* is not sufficient"?
3. If exceptions of substance, these are defined in the RAO as "[a]pparent violations of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America, actions out of accord with the deliverances of the General Assembly, matters of impropriety and important delinquencies and significant violations of the RAO..." (RAO 14-9.3.) In this case, we are required to "take note in [our] Minutes of exceptions taken by the Assembly" (which hereby we so do), and adopt either corrections, explanations, or respectful disagreements (which must include presbytery's grounds for so doing) (RAO 19-9.f.). Thus, if we are to understand "no record of sermon," "no record of theological and exegetical papers," "no record of internship," and "no record of completed education requirements" as exceptions of substance, Potomac Presbytery respectfully disagrees with the exception, offering its grounds as follows:
 - a. RAO 14-10 (Guidelines for Keeping Presbytery Minutes) states that "d. The contents of the Minutes should include the following items.... 3. The Minutes should record the actions of the Presbytery, including all motions adopted and business transacted . . . Each main motion should normally be recorded in a separate paragraph. . ." This section does not stipulate what the actions of Presbytery should be, only that the actions be recorded. This section does not stipulate how main motions should be framed, only that they normally should be recorded separately.
 - b. It is the practice of Potomac Presbytery, in the ordination of its candidates for the office of Teaching Elder, to record its actions with regard to the requirements of the *Book of Church Order* by one main motion to the effect that "It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ has met all the requirements of the *Book of Church Order*." This is in lieu of a separate motion for each stipulation of 21-4. We can see no requirement in the "Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America, . . . the deliverances of the General Assembly, [or] ... the RAO ..." (RAO 14-9.3) violated by this procedure. Consider the alternative. A main motion for each provision of 21-4 would appear as below:

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ presented an acceptable diploma of Bachelor or Master from some approved college . . ."

JOURNAL

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ presented satisfactory testimonials as to the completion and approvals of his internship in the practice of the ministry."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ has met the requirements of the Assembly's approved curriculum."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was asked concerning and was found to have had no unacceptable change in his previous views concerning any points in the *Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Book of Church Order* of the Presbyterian Church in America."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his acquaintance with experiential religion, especially his personal character and family management (based on the qualifications set out in 1 Timothy 3:1-7, and Titus 1:6-9)."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his knowledge of Bible content."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his knowledge of Theology."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his knowledge of the Sacraments."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his knowledge of Church History."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his knowledge of The history of the Presbyterian Church in America."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ was acceptably examined concerning his knowledge of the principles and rules of Government and Discipline of the Church."

"It was M/S/A that Presbytery accept a Seminary degree which includes study in the original languages in lieu of an oral examination in the original languages."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ has acceptably prepared a thesis on some theological topic assigned by Presbytery."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ has acceptably prepared an exegesis on an assigned portion of Scripture, requiring the use of the original language or languages."

"It was M/S/A that Mr. ____ has acceptably preached a sermon before the Presbytery."

Potomac Presbytery finds the prospect of such a record in the case of each candidate (and a correspondingly lengthy record in the cases of the requirements for licensure and internship) to be unreasonable. Further, please note that where the *Book* does in fact require a specific record of the Presbytery's actions, it plainly states the requirement, e.g., "Whenever a Presbytery shall omit any of these educational requirements, it shall always make a record of the reasons for such omission and the parts omitted," and "Whenever a Presbytery shall omit any of these parts, it shall always make a record of the reasons for such omissions and of the trial parts omitted." Potomac Presbytery does find it useful to include in its Minutes a specific main motion when an action adopts an alternative provided for by the *Book* (e.g., "It was M/S/A that Presbytery accept a Seminary degree which includes study in the original languages in lieu of an oral examination in the original languages.") and where it is helpful to the Presbytery to distinguish among its acts fulfilling *BCO* requirements where there is potential for differences of opinion among the Presbyters to arise (e.g., the candidate's oral examination in the various subject areas). But we can find no rule the violation of which would constitute an "exception of substance" were even these procedures not adopted.

- c. Thus with regard to the specifics of the alleged exceptions of substance, Presbytery answers that in the Minutes of May 8, 1990, Section 19f, the record of

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

the sermon preached and approved and the record of theological and exegetical papers being approved, is found in the record, "It was M/S/A that Mr. Dayhoff has met all the requirements of the *Book of Church Order*" (*Minutes of Second Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery*, 19.f; see also 12.); the record of Presbytery's action approving the completed internship of Mr. Dayhoff appears as a motion recorded in the report of the Presbytery's Committee on Christian Education (*Minutes of First Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery*, 9.1).

Further, Presbytery answers that in the Minutes of November 13, 1990, the record of approval of the theological and exegetical papers and the record of completed education requirements for two of the ordinands, is found in the record, "It was moved that, having examined Messrs. Coffin, Showers and Barber according to the requirements of the *BCO*, and reporting the successful trials for ordination as stipulated by the *BCO*, they be ordained as ministers of the Gospel and be received as members of this Presbytery" (*Minutes of Fourth Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery*, 17.b. Emphasis added.). Note that the record does show a specific main motion in the case of education requirements for one of the ordinands (*Minutes of Fourth Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery*, 17.c) because the *BCO* specifically requires such a record (21-4, 1); the record of approved internship for Mr. Coffin and Mr. Barber is found in the report of the Presbytery's Committee on Christian Education (*Minutes of Fourth Stated Meeting of Potomac Presbytery*, 15.); with regard to the internship of Mr. Showers, the record of Presbytery's action noting that Mr. Showers was exempted from the requirement by the "grandfather clause" (*M9GA*, 1981, p. 142; *M11GA*, 1983, p. 132) was inadvertently dropped from the record, and is herein noted and corrected.

Adopted

38. That the Minutes of Rocky Mountain Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
September 26-27, 1991; October 19, 1991; December 14, 1991.
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

39. That the Minutes of Siouxlands Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
April 23-24, 1991.
September 26-27, 1991:
Page # 21 The minutes do not indicate which denomination or presbytery this teaching elder came from, nor do they indicate that he was examined on Christian experience (*BCO* § 13-6).
Page # 26 There is no indication that this teaching elder accepted the call, signed the presbytery roll, or the ministerial obligation; there is no information regarding the commission to install (*BCO* § 13-6 & 7).
January 23-24, 1992:
Page # 22. A ruling elder is listed as a stated supply but not listed in the directory as a licentiate (*BCO* § 22-5,6; *BCO* § 19-1).

JOURNAL

General:

The minutes are in such an abbreviated form that it is difficult to determine the actions reported; it would be of great help to be more detailed, not only for the Committee, but for historical purposes (RAO § 14-10 d. 3.).

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly not be approved as satisfactory.
- d. That Siouxlands Presbytery be directed to respond in writing to the exceptions to their minutes cited by the 17th, 18th and 19th General Assemblies, or failing to do this, they be directed to respond by representative to the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records the first day of the 21st General Assembly to show what they have done or failed to do in this matter (BCO § 40-5).

Adopted

40. That the Minutes of South Coast Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception: **None.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
April 26-27, 1991; June 29, 1991; September 20-21, 1991.

General:

No minutes record the annual reports from candidates or ministers laboring out of bounds as required by BCO § 18-6; § 8-7.

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

41. That the Minutes of South Texas Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception: **None.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
June 29, 1991; July 26-27, 1991; October 25-26, 1991; June 24-25, 1992; March 7, 1992.
- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

42. That the Minutes of Southeast Alabama Presbytery:

- a. Be approved without exception for: **January 28, 1992.**
- b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
April 23, 1991; July 16, 1991.
October 22, 1991:

Pages 91-6-15 and 91-6-25 The minutes of a Called meeting for **September 23, 1991** are referred to but were not submitted to the General Assembly for review (BCO § 13-10 and RAO § 14-10)

- c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

43. That the Minutes of Southern Florida Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception for: **April 24, 1990; April 16, 1991; July 16, 1991.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
October 15, 1991; January 21, 1992.
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
Please accept our explanation to the exceptions of substance as follows:
EXCEPTION OF SUBSTANCE:
 - April 1990 - Text of complaints omitted.
RESPONSE: Cannot identify this exception by the information in the Committee's report. Page numbers cited as reference are incorrect. We need more accurate information.
 - October 16, 1990 - BCO 19-1 states that a minister from another denomination who is a stated supply must be examined for licensure. His examination did not include Bible content and BCO.
RESPONSE: We are sorry for this oversight and will follow this requirement in the future. The man in question is no longer serving as stated supply for that church and is not involved in any work in the Presbytery of Southern Florida.
- Adopted*
44. That the Minutes of Southwest Presbytery:
- Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
**September 26, 1991; September 26-27, 1991.
March 25-26, 1991:**
Page 91-24, Section 20 h,i They appointed a commission to serve as a session of a church without evidence in the minutes of there being a request from the church that they do so (BCO § 16-2).
Page 91-24, Section 20 h,i There is no provision for a session *pro-tempore* in the PCA BCO § 11-4; see M19GA, Exhibit B, IV, 4, p. 492.
General:
There is no annual report of candidates under care (BCO § 18-6).
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory with the following understood:
Concerning response # 1: It is approved with the advice that Presbytery clarify the language of S.R. 1.050 a. to be more precise in its protection of the right of the congregation to call their own pastor (BCO § 16-2)
Concerning response # 9: It is approved with the understanding that "more proper evidence of oversight" means that the annual report of candidates is required to be presented to presbytery (BCO § 18-6).
 - Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
April 26-27, 1990:
EXCEPTION (1): Page 6 #17-4 "Not in accord with BCO 20 to require a congregation to consult with Presbytery committee before calling a pastor. Preliminary principle #6, BCO 3-1, 11-3, and 13-9."

JOURNAL

RESPONSE: This is an addition to our Standing Rules 1.050 a) & b). (see p. 7 of Standing Rules). Having reviewed the stated references, we disagree that they are pertinent to the subject of the Minutes. Granted that local autonomy must be, and is respected, but Presbytery's role is definite. Reference 21-1 BCO refers to candidates, licentiates, ordained ministers of the PCA or any other denomination "shall not ordinarily move onto the field to which he has been called until examined and received by Presbytery." Our Standing Rules are to prevent this sort of thing from happening. It has been our experience to find that calls and moves are so far along before they come to the attention of Presbytery's committees, sometimes men are already on the field before the committee knows. The Standing Rules 1.050 a) and b) provide the committee with the necessary guidelines to assist the churches in a timely manner. These rules are not intended to interfere with the prosecution of a call, but merely to guide churches and ministers in timely execution of the call. We do not believe that these rules are out of accord with BCO 20 and other references cited. Even your own quoted reference, 20-10, indicates that a Presbytery may recommend to the church that, under certain circumstances, they should desist from prosecuting the call, or may decline to place the call in his hands. If Presbytery has that authority, then to assist a church in the initial call would not be out of order.

EXCEPTION (2) Page 6 #16c "No record of petition to be organized BCO 5-8-1." Note: This material was a part of the September 26-27, 1990 Minutes, and is cited in the next item, and answered in response there.

September 26-27, 1990

EXCEPTION (3) Page 7 #30 "No record of petition to be organized BCO 5-8-1."

RESPONSE: Both South Valley PCA and Desert Springs PCA are in this item. The material was in Committee and came before Presbytery for both churches. Copies of these records are included as Exhibit A and B** and Identified by your Exception statement.

EXCEPTION (4): Page 8 #35 BCO 31-1, 2; 16-1, 2 "Suspended elders without cause and took jurisdiction without consent of congregation."

RESPONSE: Acknowledged. We refer you to the January 31-February 1 Minutes (which you had in hand). See the Judicial Commission report page 5.i. 1) and 2) which action they took between Presbytery meetings, but which the subsequent Presbytery adopted as its own. This expresses the acknowledged error and the correcting action. Was our action not sufficient? If so, why cite us for a corrected action? If not, why were we not cited for inappropriate action in January?

January 31-February 1, 1991

EXCEPTION (5): Page 4 #10g.2, a,c,f, "No record of Commission keeping a record of their proceedings or of them (sic) submitting them to the court."

RESPONSE:

- (a) refers to MNA Committee as a Commission to work with Evergreen PCA Mission "to bring it to a particular church status." This Commission never functioned because the Mission retreated from this position. It was established and dissolved without action.
- (c) concerns organization of Desert Springs PCA and states that "a partial report of the Commission presented the minutes of January 19, 1991. The Commission continues." These minutes of this partial report are herewith included as Exhibit C** and identified by your exception statement.
- (f) concerns an Administrative Commission established to work with John Evans. Presbytery had misinformation, and shortly after learned, as the printed explanation in the minutes, states -- "Mr. Evans is not under jurisdiction of Southwest Presbytery but Korean Southwest." Since there was nothing for this Commission to do, they did not meet, they took no action, therefore, there was nothing to report. To clear the record Presbytery dissolved the Commission.

EXCEPTION (6): Page 5 "No record of Presbytery authorization to dismiss TE's to other Presbyteries. BCO 20-9.

RESPONSE: Reference is to enclosed Exhibit E** Standing Rules 1.0478 c) by which Presbytery Authorizes the officers and Churches Committee to act as a Commission "at the discretion of the Committee in order to dissolve pastoral relationship in cases when the Pastor and Congregation formally concur or, where no congregations are concerned, to dismiss other

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ministers, licentiates, or candidates. The committee Chairman shall inform the Stated Clerk of this action and the Clerk may then dismiss the minister."

EXCEPTION (7): Page 13 #20 a.c. "No complete record of dissolutions of pastoral relationships."

RESPONSE: Minutes of Officers and Churches Committee of January 31, 1991 are herewith included as Exhibit D** and identified by your stated exception.

GENERAL:

EXCEPTION (8): RAO 14.10H.5. "No up-to-date copy of Standing Rules of the Presbytery."

RESPONSE: Accepted. Herewith enclosed as Exhibit E**.

EXCEPTION (9): "No record of report of Candidates Under Care."

RESPONSE: If there were no Standing Rules, there was no Directory. This is submitted as Exhibit F** and has a Directory of Licentiates and Candidates. If your exception is to more than this we acknowledge the absence of such and will strive for more proper evidence of oversight.

This response submitted to (Old) Southwest Presbytery September 26, 1991, by the Stated Clerk for its consideration.

** [NOTE: not printed in General Assembly Minutes]

Adopted

45. That the Minutes of **Southwest Florida Presbytery**:
- Be approved without exception for: **April 12-13, 1991; July 9, 1991; October 11-12, 1991.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: **None.**
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

46. That the Minutes of **Susquehanna Valley Presbytery**:
- Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
May 18, 1991; November 16, 1991.
February 16, 1991:

Page 160 The President and members at large from the Women in the Church may be advisors of presbytery committees, but they may not be regular members (1 Timothy 2:11-12).

September 21, 1991:

Page 179 The appointment of a moderator for a session should include an indication of the request or consent of the session (BCO § 12-3).

- That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
- Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**

EXCEPTION: February 17, 1990 (1) Page 104, item 17 Did not list commission members or establish a quorum.

RESPONSE: The clerk reported that the commission to instal TE Joel Fiscus as Associate Pastor of Faggs Manor Presbyterian Church, appointed at the last meeting of Presbytery (but not reported in its minutes), was composed of TE C. Cummings, TE S. Beck, TE C. Miller, RE L. Brown, RE H. Davis, with C. Cummings as Convener, and the quorum set at two REs and two TEs.

Adopted

JOURNAL

47. That the Minutes of **Tennessee Valley Presbytery**:
- Be approved without exception for: **January 12, 1991; April 13, 1991.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
July 9, 1991; October 8, 1991.
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
EXCEPTIONS to 18th GA Minutes of 1990:
April 8, 1989 and July 11, 1989 - There were no licentiates examined for ordination at the April meeting. The internships of the licentiates examined for ordination at the July meeting had been approved at the April meeting.
October 10, 1989 - While both licentiate candidates preached before the Presbytery, the TVP failed to require for them written sermons. This will be corrected in the future.
Mr. Reed, an ordained Baptist minister at the time, was a licentiate candidate, and he was asked the "Questions for Licensure", *BCO* 19-3. The Stated Clerk understood *BCO* 13-6 to apply to ministers from other denominations received as ordained ministers of the PCA. If these questions (13-6) are to be asked of someone being examined for licensure, then out of ignorance the TVP failed to comply with the *BCO*.
- Adopted*
48. That the Minutes of **Warrior Presbytery**:
- Be approved without exception: **None.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
April 16, 1991; June 11, 1991; July 16, 1991; October 15, 1991; November 15, 1991; January 21, 1992.
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**
- Adopted*
49. That the Minutes of **Western Carolina Presbytery**:
- Be approved without exception for: **November 9, 1991.**
 - Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below:
**February 2, 1991; March 16, 1991; September 14, 1991.
July 20, 1991:**
Page 5, Item 3 There is no indication of congregational action on the dissolution of a pastoral relationship (*BCO* § 23-1).
 - That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - We recommend that the 20th General Assembly cite Western Carolina Presbytery for failing to submit responses to the exceptions taken by the 16th and 18th General Assemblies and direct them to respond at their next stated meeting.**
 - Response to 19th GA Exceptions:**
In response to citation by the 19th GA in reference to minutes reviewed by the 16th GA:
 - March 21, 1987; p. 5 - exceptions to session minutes not recorded in presbytery minutes.
RESPONSE: This is noted and will be corrected in future references.
 - November 14, 1987 - no records of nominations allowed from the floor and no motion to receive slate by acclamation.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RESPONSE: There was a call for nominations and the slate was approved - mistake in minutes will be corrected in the future.

In response to citation by the 19th GA in reference to minutes reviewed by the 18th GA:

1. January 14, 1989; p. 2 & 3 - No record that questions for ordination put to candidate.
RESPONSE: The questions for ordination were put to the candidate but failed to record. This will be corrected.
2. March 18, 1989; p. 4, #4 - No record for waiving Hebrew exam and 3/4 vote required.
3. p. 4 - No record that candidate completed internship.
4. p. 15, #5 - The record does not indicate that candidate was examined in Christian experience and inward call to preach.
RESPONSE: This man was examined under the "extra ordinary clause". He attended seminary, several years before, taking Greek and obtaining a degree. He served with Team Missions for a number of years. He was coming into the PCA and seeking to go with MTW. He was examined in Christian Experience and calling. There was a 3/4 vote. His "internship" was completed on the field.
5. p. 4, #2.4 & attachment #10 - commission cannot add new members to itself.
RESPONSE: The "chairman" of the commission was given authority through the Moderator to add a member. This will be corrected and noted for future reference.

Adopted

50. That the Minutes of Westminster Presbytery:
 - a. Be approved without exception for: **June 11, 1991; July 20, 1991; October 19, 1991; January 18, 1992; April 11, 1992.**
 - b. Be approved with exceptions of form reported to the presbytery and exceptions of substance stated below: **None.**
 - c. That their response to the exceptions of the 19th General Assembly be approved as satisfactory.
 - d. **No response from the 19th GA or previous Assemblies is required.**

Adopted

IV. General Recommendations and/or Information:

1. Concerning the Korean Language Presbyteries:

The Committee is happy to report that all five of the Korean Language Presbyteries have made a sincere effort to provide translations of all of their Minutes for the past year. The Committee recommends that the Assembly thank and commend these Presbyteries for their effort to comply with the *Book of Church Order*, and the *Rules for Assembly Operation*. They are to be encouraged to continue this good beginning.

There are a number of areas in which the Korean Language Presbyteries are not yet in full conformity with our *Book of Church Order*. No doubt this grows out of the fact that the Assembly has not provided a good translation of the *BCO* and of the *Rules of Assembly Operation*. It is our understanding that both have now been translated through the good labors of TE Daniel Kim of MNA staff, TE Do Won Park, TE Hosea Kim, TE Heewan Song, TE Byung Soo Choi, TE Paul Kim, and TE Dwight Linton. The Committee recommends that the General Assembly express its thanks to these men for their good work.

The Committee has chosen to categorize all exceptions to the Korean Language Presbytery minutes as exceptions of form or notations. This decision was viewed as the best vehicle for lovingly and helpfully dealing with errors that may have been rooted in the lack of a Korean translation of the *BCO* and *RAO*. The Committee commends to the General Assembly our specific recommendations regarding how the PCA can further assist our Korean brothers in Christ to document their kingdom work in conformity with PCA guidelines.

JOURNAL

To assist the Korean Language Presbyteries to make progress in these areas, the Committee recommends that the Assembly direct the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly to schedule an annual meeting of the Korean Language Presbytery clerks. The cost of this meeting is to be borne by the respective presbyteries. The Assembly further directs that TE Dan Kim of the MNA staff serve as a consultant to this meeting. He is also to be requested to continue to assist the Korean Presbytery Clerks in getting their minutes ready for the Assembly. The responsibility for the translation of the various Presbytery minutes remains with the Presbyteries. TE Dan Kim is encouraged to provide a brief dictionary of technical terms to be used for recording minutes. He is also encouraged to provide a sample set of minutes both in Korean and English in consultation with officers of the Committee on the Review of Presbytery Records. Dr. Kim is further asked to develop a training program to assist Korean Language Presbyteries properly to examine candidates.

To provide for better continuity of the record keeping, the Committee recommends that the Korean Language Presbyteries elect their clerks to terms of at least three to five years. The Korean Language Presbyteries should send representatives to the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records.

It is recommended that a Korean translation of this motion be provided the Korean Language Presbyteries.

2. That General Assembly again inform all presbyteries of the necessity that each presbytery participate in the Committee to Review Presbytery Records.
3. That General Assembly commend the following Presbyteries and their Stated Clerks for presenting Presbytery minutes to the 20th General Assembly containing no exceptions of substance or form: **Calvary, Central Carolina, Eastern Carolina, Heritage, Northern California, Southwest Florida, Westminster.**
4. That the General Assembly inform the stated clerks of presbyteries concerning the most common exceptions of substance and/or form contained in the presbytery minutes presented to the 20th General Assembly:
 - a) Failure to list ministers and churches on presbytery roll who have unexcused absences;
 - b) Failure to note the quorum of a commission;
 - c) Failure to note that a congregational meeting was held to concur with the request of the pastor to dissolve the pastoral relationship;
 - d) Failure to attach minutes of commissions (ordination, installation, organization, adjudication, etc.) and to approve such minutes;
 - e) Failure properly to record votes when more than a simple majority is required;
 - f) Dividing presbytery into parts in order to hear multiple ordination sermons;
 - g) Lack of annual reports of candidates and ministers laboring out of bounds, and of reports of interns at each stated meeting;
 - h) Failure to list exceptions to sessional records and responses to such exceptions;
 - i) Failure to attach rolls of ministers, churches, candidates, and licentiates, and an up to date copy of the standing rules;

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- j) Failure to include changes in terms of calls to ministers (financial amounts need not be included).
5. All presbyteries should be advised of the necessity of closely following the *Book of Church Order* in all judicial matters.
6. Concerning the Presbytery of Eastern Canada:
Whereas, the Presbytery of Eastern Canada has jurisdiction over a very broad geographical area, with widely scattered churches; and,
Whereas, the presbytery has recently had a number of serious setbacks and problems among the churches within its boundaries; and,
Whereas, the financial hardship is severe in many of these churches, which are small and struggling; and,
Whereas, these churches often feel isolated and forgotten by their sister churches in the United States;
Therefore, we respectfully recommend that the individual commissioners of the General Assembly, and the various churches that they represent, pray earnestly for their Canadian brothers, that God would prosper, protect and bless them in their fields of labor.

V. Miscellaneous Information:

The officers elected to serve next year are as follows:

Chairman: RE Donald D. Comer

Vice-chairman (Chairman Elect): RE Frederick R. Neikirk

Secretary: TE Larry C. Hoop

Roll of Committee on Review of Presbytery Records:

Presbytery

Ascension
Calvary
Central Florida
Central Georgia
Eastern Carolina
Grace
Great Lakes
Gulf Coast
Heartland
James River
Louisiana
Mid-America
Mississippi Valley
Missouri
New Jersey
New River
North Texas
Northern Illinois

Commissioner

RE Frederick Neikirk
TE Dan Smyth
TE Anthony Dallison
RE Donald D. Comer
TE David A. Bowen
RE Richard F. Mayfield
TE Robert G. Hamilton
TE James L. Cavanah, II
TE Larry C. Hoop
RE Eugene H. Friedline
TE Robert Benn Vincent, Sr.
TE John Owen Butler
TE John Reeves
TE James Gray
RE David H. Miner
RE Virgil B. Roberts
RE T. John Mulkey
RE Robert R. Rathburn

JOURNAL

Pacific	TE Donald W. Aven
Palmetto	TE James M. Hope
Philadelphia	TE Thomas R. Patete
Potomac	TE H. J. Ferguson
Rocky Mountain	TE Richard B. Fite
Southern Florida	TE Franklin Knowles
Tennessee Valley	RE Donald V. Goodin
Western Carolina	TE Morton H. Smith

The following reported but were not able to attend:

Covenant	RE Bob Carson
Evangel	TE Hubert Stewart
Heritage	TE Bruce Howes
Northeast	RE Jack Merry
Pacific Northwest	TE John Hoogstrate
South Texas	RE Irvin May, Jr.
Southeast Alabama	TE Jack Hoff
Southwest Florida	RE Franklyn Ward
Southwest	RE Jack Quigley
Warrior	RE Charles Davis
Westminster	RE Larry Crigger

The following were not represented:

Central Carolina	Korean Southwest
Eastern Canada	North Georgia
Illiana	Northern California
Korean Central	Siouxlands
Korean Eastern	South Coast
Korean Southeastern	Susquehanna Valley
Korean Southern	

The report was approved as a whole.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ RE Donald D. Comer, Chairman
/s/ TE Robert Benn Vincent, Sr., Secretary

TE Robert Hamilton led in prayer for the Presbytery of Eastern Canada as had been ordered by action on #IV-6.

Moderator Benson ruled that the action in removing the word "not" from #37.c was to be understood as applying to any other similar citations of minutes of other presbyteries for failure to record all the individual portions of examinations.

The report was received as a whole.

20-72 Protest

The following protest from TE Jerry Crock was received and ordered spread upon the minutes.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Whereas, the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1789, did amend the original version of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, chapters 23 and 35; and

Whereas, these changes reflect an inclination toward religious pluralism in the United States of America; and

Whereas, the "Preliminary Principles" of the *Book of Church Order* of the Presbyterian Church in America, in section II, paragraph 1, reflect this same inclination toward religious pluralism; and

Whereas, the Lord Jesus Christ said of Himself, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me," thus precluding the validity of all systems of belief, or religions, which are not explicitly Christian; and

Whereas, "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other Name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved;" and

Whereas, the Founding Fathers of the Country clearly and firmly believed that the only true religion is Christianity, as seen, for example, in *The Code Of 1648, The Laws and Liberties of the Massachusetts Bay Colony*; and

Whereas, the denial of Overture 31 implies that the Presbyterian Church in America lends credibility to "other" religions which are non-Christian or anti-Christian;

Therefore, the undersigned do solemnly and confidently protest the action of the 20th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America concerning Overture 31.

Adding their names to the protest were TE Carl G. Russell; TE Jim Bordwine; RE Mack Carlton; TE Larry Ball; TE Ken Gentry; RE Neil G. Smith; TE T. Mark Duncan; RE Rick Twinbo; TE K. W. Pet Hurst; TE Dennis P. Slack; RE Joe L. Reynolds; RE Paul Slish; RE Mark Hecht; TE Brent Bradley; TE Jeffrey M. Black; TE Frank J. Smith; TE James T. Lester, Jr.; TE Ross Lindley.

20-73 Committee on Thanks

TE Henry Bishop, chairman, led in prayer and presented the Committee's report which was received.

"It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name O Thou most High."

Psalm 92:1

On behalf of the commissioners to the 20th General Assembly we give thanks to our Sovereign God for the challenges of this week's church business, the refreshment of worship and the enjoyment of loving fellowship with our Lord Jesus Christ and one another.

We sing praises to God for gathering us together in such a beautiful place as the Roanoke Valley and express appreciation to our brethren in New River Presbytery for hosting us so well, for long hours, hard work and great hospitality.

Finally, though many should be acknowledged, we think in particular of our staff members, Moderator, recording clerks, floor clerks and the "behind the scenes" servants, using God's own Word to express our thanks,

"We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers, remembering without ceasing your work of faith, labor of love,

JOURNAL

and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ in the sight of our God and Father..."

1 Thes. 1:2-3

Respectfully submitted,
TE Henry Bishop
RE Daniel Domin
RE Ben Rook

20-74 Minutes

On motion the Assembly received the minutes of Thursday morning's session and agreed to submit any corrections to the recording clerks. Further, on motion the Assembly voted to allow the minutes of the Thursday afternoon session to be approved by the stated clerk and other commissioners from the Atlanta area.

20-75 Committee on Constitutional Business

TE Rod Mays presented the Committee's answer to the inquiry from TE Grover E. Gunn, which was received and ordered spread upon the minutes as follows:

"Does a member of presbytery have a constitutional right to complain that presbytery has received a protest containing allegedly intemperate or slanderous language?"

Response:

Yes, *BCO 43-1* states that a complaint is a written representation made against some act or decision of a court of the church. The decision to receive a protest is a decision or action of a court and, therefore, may be complained against. However, *BCO 45-5* states that a protest must be couched in temperate language and be respectful to the court.

Therefore, although the recording of the protest itself is to end the matter, if a presbyter is convinced that the protest was not couched in temperate language or respectful to the court, he may complain against the action of the court in receiving it. Here the matter that is complained against is new (i.e. intemperate language or disrespect) and is not a continuation of the matter about which the protest was submitted.

Minority Report:

RE Granville Dutton and TE Craig D. Childs, Sr. presented the following minority report.

A member of presbytery does not have the right to complain against his presbytery for receiving a protest containing allegedly intemperate or slanderous language (*BCO 45-5*).

RATIONALE:

1. *BCO 45*, which deals specifically with dissents, protests, and objections, is provided in order to allow a minority the privilege to express their dissent, protest, or objection to an action of their court.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. It is a general principle of interpretation that the specific governs the general. In 45-5, the *BCO* specifically determines that after the court records the dissent, protest, or objection, "here the matter shall end". We understand this to be a specific directive that the entire matter including the dissent, protest, or objection is to end. We believe it was the intent of the *BCO* to end the matter of protest, dissent, or objection without initiating a new judicial action further deterring us from pursuing the Great Commission.

20-76 Dissents

TE Frank J. Smith presented the following two dissents which were on motion received.

1. I respectfully dissent from the reasoning adopted in Judicial Case 91-2 with regard to the prerogative of a presbytery not to dissolve a pastoral relationship when so requested by a congregation. *BCO 23-1* does allow a wide discretionary power to the higher court not to honor such a request, and the Standing Judicial Commission clearly erred in writing otherwise. Furthermore, if this position were followed consistently, it would bind a presbytery to dissolve a pastoral relationship even on a close (e.g. 51%) majority vote, even if such a vote were brought about because of an ungodly reaction against sound preaching, and even if such a vote were in a congregational meeting called and held when many members of the church were not able to attend. This ruling will significantly undercut the power of presbytery to enforce orthodoxy and to protect the pulpit. In addition, not only did this position contradict a prior position of the Presbyterian Church in America, but it came as *obiter dicta*.
2. I respectfully dissent from the judgment of the General Assembly in Judicial Case 92-3. It is clear that advice given by a court is an action taken by that body, which is a complainable matter. Further, it is perspicuous that, although the matter complained against was originally a non-judicial reference, a complaint lodged with a court is not non-judicial and therefore cannot *ipso facto* be refused by the Standing Judicial Commission.

20-77 Excuses from Part of the Assembly

The following commissioners requested excuse from attendance at portions of the Assembly:

Presbytery	Commissioner
Calvary	TE John Hall RE David Woodard
Central Florida	RE Richard Hommes
Central Georgia	TE John Oliver TE Randy Q. Smith
Evangel	TE Paul Alexander
Grace	TE Norman A. Bagby, Jr.
Gulf Coast	TE Charles De Bardeleben TE Donald Dunkerley
James River	TE Joseph Mullen
Louisiana	TE Paul Lipe
Mississippi Valley	TE B. I. Anderson

JOURNAL

North Georgia	TE Oliver J. Claassen
North Texas	TE David F. Roberts
Palmetto	TE Carl Kalberkamp
	TE Joseph Novenson
	TE Arthur E. Scott
	RE Brian Skelly
Philadelphia	TE Paul L. Karlberg
	TE Robert H. Swanyne
Potomac	TE Christopher O'Brien
	TE O. Palmer Robertson
	RE Wy Plummer
South Florida	TE Douglas Culver
	TE Drennon Blair
Southeast Alabama	TE William Mason
Southwest Florida	TE Bruce Fiol
Tennessee Valley	RE Roger D. Ingvalson
	RE Bob Payne
	TE Michael Smith
Western Carolina	TE Ed Graham
	RE Bill Vander Hoven
Westminster	RE Sam Lindley

20-78 Adjournment

The Assembly adjourned at 3:40 p.m. after the singing of Psalm 100 and the benediction pronounced by Moderator Benson.

APPENDICES

The Appendices include the Reports of the Permanent Committees as originally submitted to the General Assembly, except where the text may have been amended by the Assembly. The recommendations in this section are those originally submitted by the Permanent Committees and may not have been adopted by the Assembly. See the reports of the committee of Commissioners for each of the respective committees to find the recommendations as they were adopted by the Assembly.

The budgets as approved by the Assembly are found in Appendix C, p. 316 ff.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE STATED CLERK TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA June 15-19, 1992

*Blessed is the man You choose,
And cause to approach You,
That he may dwell in Your courts.
We shall be satisfied with the goodness of Your house,
Of Your holy temple.
You crown the year with Your goodness,
And Your paths drip with abundance.
Psalm 65:4, 11*

One cannot help but praise God for His goodness and grace and mercies both to us individually and to us as a church. The Lord in His grace and mercy has taken us through difficult times and has also graciously and wonderfully showered upon us His abundant blessings, for this we are so grateful.

I. PUBLICATIONS

As usual during the past year we have published several items in connection with the work of the Stated Clerk of General Assembly. First of all the *Minutes of the 19th General Assembly* were done in a timely fashion. For the first time in the history of the PCA we have had to put out the *Minutes of the General Assembly* in two volumes. The massive amount of reports forced us to go this route.

The *Directory of Churches* (sometimes known as the "Blue Book") was distributed at the end of January. By doing this we were able to get an updated list of our churches to our people in early fashion leaving us freer to publish the *1992 Yearbook* later. The *1992 Yearbook* should be available by the time of the General Assembly itself through the Christian Education and Publication Bookstore. Once again, we had to put this into two volumes because of the tremendous amount of material that is reported in the *Yearbook*.

The *Commissioners' Handbook* for the 20th General Assembly has gone out to all registered commissioners. This year we are expecting something like 1300 commissioners at the 20th General Assembly in Roanoke. Once again, the massive amount of work, especially two reports makes this a very lengthy report; first, the report of the Standing Judicial Commission and second, the report of the Ad Interim Report on Divorce and Remarriage.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

For several years we have wanted to bring the *PCA Digest* up to date but have been so short-handed in our office that we have not been able to do it. This year, Dr. Morton H. Smith has graciously consented to try to bring this document up to date. We do want to republish the *Digest* in such a way as to make it a useful tool for the church. I am hoping that it will be available for committees of commissioners at the 20th General Assembly.

II. *BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER AMENDMENTS*

There were six *Book of Church Order* amendments sent down to presbyteries by the 19th General Assembly for advice and consent. These are listed starting on page 251 of the *Commissioners' Handbook*. At the General Assembly, I expect to report whether all of the amendments were approved by the Presbyteries or not. One of them seems to be in doubt.

III. STATISTICS

A five-year summary of PCA statistics is attached (Table 1, see page 274). For 1991, we are reporting 1,044 with 169 missions. The number of churches is down, although the total is up from a year ago to 1,213 compared to 1986, five years ago, when we had 1,023 churches and missions. The trend for these last five years suggests that we will have 1,625 churches and missions by the year 2000.

As for membership, our statistics show a total of 233,770, which includes ministers, communicant members, and non-communicants. The total communicant membership went from 186,064 to 191,935, for an increase of 3.16%. This also results in a five-year increase of 19.3%. With churches beginning to keep a more accurate count of the non-communicant membership, the total membership has increased in the last five years by 22.4%. The trend established in the last five years suggests that by the year 2000 we will have a total membership of 340,000 people.

There are some other figures that would be of interest to the General Assembly. Benevolent contributions for General Assembly and Presbytery causes were almost 15 million dollars. Yet total congregational benevolences for the year was \$50,929,600. Per capita giving for all causes during this past year was \$1,188, which is an increase over 1990.

We now have 2,198 ordained ministers in the PCA (see Table 2, page 275). Once again, I would remind people that besides those who are in pastoral ministries, (associate pastors, etc.) there are a large number of foreign missionaries, chaplains, professors, and administrators. This reflects a very healthy influence in various areas of life and in various ministries that God has given to us.

Unfortunately, the statistics still continue to be somewhat soft as long as there are churches for whom we have not received recent statistics. Table 3 (page 276) lists these churches. I would encourage pastors and elders to see to it that these statistics are made available so that we can get an accurate figure of what God is doing throughout our denomination.

APPENDICES

Table 4 (page 283) gives a summary analysis by Presbyteries of churches contributing to General Assembly causes. We are thankful that the number of churches contributing to one or more General Assembly causes has increased from 79% in 1990 to 82% this past reporting year. However, a closer look of the support by churches by committees or agencies leaves much room for growth and development.

Finally, the total compensation summaries for senior pastors or solo pastors in the PCA is given in Table 5, Part A, page 287. We have submitted only the third quartile, median average, and first quartile figures for the churches in all of the United States. Third quartile means that 25% of our pastors are compensated above this figure and 75% below this figure. Succeeding Parts, B through I, give the total compensation by size of churches. By definition, it would be unwise to publish the highest and lowest salary figures in each of those categories. These figures should be helpful to Sessions when establishing salary compensation figures for their pastors. The office of the Stated Clerk would be more than happy to assist the Sessions in obtaining more complete figures, not only by size of churches, but also by regions.

IV. NEW CHURCHES SINCE 19TH GA

Table 6 lists all the churches added to the PCA since June of 1991 (see 20-11, p. 46). These are the ones that have been reported to our office. We welcome all of these. Following the tradition long established we will give special recognition during the 20th GA of the commissioners representing these churches.

V. OTHER ASSEMBLY ASSIGNMENTS

The Stated Clerk has sought to be faithful to his Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. He has tried diligently to fulfill all the responsibilities of his office and regularly reports to the chairman of the Administrative Committee, under whose supervision he serves. The clerk has attended presbytery meetings, preached in churches, conducted seminars, responded to multitudinous questions on the *BCO* and other General Assembly documents, has conducted regional meetings of presbytery clerks, communicating fairly regularly with sessions and friends of the PCA. He has assisted various committees of the General Assembly as well as the Standing Judicial Commission in order to enable them to do their work on behalf of General Assembly.

The clerk is grateful for the hard-working staff without whose help it would be impossible to fulfill the duties of the office. Above all, he is grateful to the Lord Jesus Christ, the King and Head of the church, who wonderfully rules and overrules in the affairs of people. We humbly offer the work of our hands and minds to His glory, honor and praise.

Faithfully Submitted,
/s/ Paul R. Gilchrist
Stated Clerk of General Assembly

TABLE 1

**FIVE YEAR SUMMARY OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA STATISTICS**

	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Presbyteries	43	44	47	49	50
Churches	951	957	998	1,055	1,044
Missions	91	126	120	128	169
Ministers	1,809	1,978	1,971	2,096	2,198
Candidates	269	--	255	266	333
Licentiatees	166	--	185	161	159
Profession of Faith by Covenant Children	1,640	2,124	2,348	2,524	2,889
Profession of Faith by Adults	3,027	3,329	3,574	4,728	4,159
Communicants	165,525	170,344	172,519	183,968	189,737
Non-communicants	30,241	38,832	43,525 ⁽¹⁾	38,757	41,835
Total Membership (Comm, Non-comm, Ministers)	197,575	211,154	218,015	224,821	233,770
Family Units	69,645	78,857	83,415	89,616	93,537
Sunday School Enrollment	86,446	101,870	109,467	112,674	120,105
Adult Baptisms	1,251	1,614	1,686	1,834	2,494
Infant Baptisms	3,323	3,787	4,057	4,489	4,731
Total Contributions	148,701,489	191,094,807	183,315,615 ⁽²⁾	204,427,817	221,068,564
Per Capita Giving ⁽³⁾	898	1,122	1,093	1,141	1,188
Assembly Causes	7,748,092	9,432,052	11,000,553	11,436,347	12,502,118
Presbytery Causes	1,933,576	2,224,299	2,550,230	2,410,094	2,443,649
Congregation Benevolences	30,184,589	38,110,387	47,600,758	48,550,118	50,929,600
Total Benevolences	39,866,257	49,766,738	61,151,541	62,396,559	65,875,367
Per Capita Benevolences ⁽³⁾	241	304	365	348	354
Congregational Current Expenses	76,317,462	101,010,154	111,177,210	123,432,523	135,916,733
Congregational Building Expenditures	25,546,202	35,520,438	35,664,818	41,899,537	46,990,433
Total All Disbursements	141,729,921	186,297,330	207,993,569	227,728,619	248,782,533

(1) Included non-baptized covenant children; all other years include only baptized covenant children.

(2) Beginning in 1989, the statistics included a category for Earned Income, separate from Total Contributions.

(3) Presbytery and Assembly per capita giving was figured only for those congregations reporting financial statistics.

APPENDICES

TABLE 2

STATUS OF ORDAINED MINISTERS IN PCA BY POSITION
as of December 31, 1991

Pastor	690
Senior Pastor	175
Associate Pastor	103
Assistant Pastor	166
Evangelist	24
Organizing Pastor	139
Subtotal	1,297
Administration	43
Chaplain	87
Foreign Missionary	145
Campus Minister	16
Stated Supply	24
Professor	59
Teacher	8
Honorably Retired	176
Out-of-Bounds	178
Without Charge	165
TOTAL	2,198

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TABLE 3

CHURCHES NOT REPORTING 1991 STATISTICS

	Year for Which Statistics Were Last Received (* = No Statistics Available)
<i>Ascension</i>	
Chapel, Beaver, PA	1988
Church of the Savior, Williamsville, NY	1990
Covenant, Steubenville, OH	1990
Grace, Hudson, OH	1990
Redeemer, Pittsburgh, PA	1990
Rocky Springs, Harrisville, PA	1990
<i>Calvary</i>	
Grace Community, Greenville, SC	1990
Mountville, Mountville, SC	1984
<i>Central Carolina</i>	
Castanea, Stanley, NC	1988
Coulwood, Charlotte, NC	1988
Countryside, Cameron, NC	1989
Faith, Charlotte, NC	1988
Grace Covenant, Gastonia, NC (m)	1990
Sandhills, Southern Pines, NC (m)	*
Shearer, Mooresville, NC	1990
<i>Central Florida -- All Churches Reporting</i>	
<i>Central Georgia</i>	
First, Sandersville, GA	1990
Westminster, Valdosta, GA	1987
<i>Covenant</i>	
Bassett, Bassett, AR	1988
College Hill, Oxford, MS	*
Covenant, Greenville, MS	1989
Covenant Life, Slatillo, MS	1990
Faith, Aberdeen, MS	1985
First, Clarendon, AR	1990
Grace Evangelical, Memphis, TN (m)	*
Northside, Sherwood, AR	1985
Old Lebanon, Ackerman, MS	1990
Reformed, Pontotoc, MS	1990
Sardis, Sardis, MS	1990

APPENDICES

**Year for Which Statistics
Were Last Received
(* = No Statistics Available)**

Eastern Canada

First, Unionville, ONT 1989
Grace, Kitchener, ONT 1990

Eastern Carolina

Reformed Fellowship, Jacksonville, NC (m) *

Evangel

First, Jasper, AL 1990
Frontier, Birmingham, AL *
Grace Fellowship, Albertville, AL 1988
New City Church, Birmingham, AL (m) *
PC of the Hills, Birmingham, AL (m) *

Grace

Columbia, Columbia, MS 1990
Ellisville, Ellisville, MS 1988
First, Crystal Springs, MS 1990
First, Picayune, MS 1990
First, Taylorsville, MS 1990
McDonald, Collins, MS 1988
Oldenburg, Roxie, MS 1987
Petal, Petal, MS 1988
Prentiss, Prestiss, MS 1990
Sharon, Magee, MS 1989
Sleigo, Collins, MS 1984
Wesson, Wesson, MS 1989
Woodland, Hattiesburg, MS 1990

Great Lakes

Christ, Midland, MI (m) *
Grand Valley, Allendale, MI (m) *
Northwest, Dublin, OH (m) *

Gulf Coast

Fort Walton Beach Korean Community, Ft. Walton, FL (m) 1990
Panama City Korean, Panama City, FL (m) 1990
Westminster, Milton, FL 1990
Westminster, Tallahassee, FL 1989

Heartland -- All Churches Reporting

Heritage

Calvary Reformed, Media, PA 1990
Christ's Community, Salisbury, MD 1990
Evangelical, Elkton, MD 1989
Manor, New Castle, DE 1989

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**Year for Which Statistics
Were Last Received
(* = No Statistics Available)**

Illiana

First, West Frankfort, IL (m) 1986

James River

Eden Korean, Virginia Beach, VA (m) *

Grace Fellowship, Suffolk, VA (m) 1990

The Coventry Church, Yorktown, VA 1989

Korean Central

First Korean, Bridgeton, MO 1990

Han-Maum, Prospect Heights, IL (m) 1989

Korean, St. Louis, MO 1985

Madison, Madison, WI (m) *

Sung Am, Evanston, IL (m) *

Sungmin, Chicago, IL 1989

Korean Eastern

First Korean of N. Penn., Lansdale, PA (m) 1989

Hab Dong, Cheltenham, PA *

Korean, Edison, NJ (m) *

Nak Won, Willow Grove, PA (m) *

New Covenant, Hulmeville, PA (m) *

New Jersey Ephesus Church, Parsippany, NJ (m) *

State College Korean, State College, PA (m) *

Union Korean, Ayer, MA (m) *

Korean Southeastern

Ban Suk, Glen Burnie, MD (m) *

Calvary, Cockeysville, MD *

Comforter Korean, Alexandria, VA (m) 1990

Daleville, Daleville, AL (m) *

Dulles Korean, Fairfax, VA (m) 1990

Emmanuel, Timonium, MD 1990

Korean Orthodox, McLean, VA *

Korean Shinjung, Atlanta, GA 1989

Korean Zion, Baltimore, MD *

San Sang, Fairfax, VA (m) *

Washington Shin Il, Annandale, VA *

Wheat Grain, Columbus, GA (m) *

Korean Southern

Choong Hyun, Houston, TX (m) *

Hahn-Mee United, Oklahoma City, OK (m) *

Irving Korean, Irving, TX (m) *

Korean Church of A & M, College Station, TX 1990

Korean Young-Nak Church, Dallas, TX 1990

APPENDICES

**Year for Which Statistics
Were Last Received
(* = No Statistics Available)**

Korean Southwest

Asia, Los Angeles, CA (m)	*
Bethlehem Korean, Seattle, WA (m)	1988
Enshuah, S. Carson, CA (m)	*
Korean Disciple Making Church, La Puente, CA (m)	*
Korean Holy & Grace, Los Angeles, CA	*
Korean of Salinas, Salinas, CA (m)	*
Kwang Sung, Union City, CA (m)	*
Los Angeles Amen, Los Angeles, CA (m)	*
New Jerusalem Korean, S. Pasadena, CA (m)	*
Orange, Garden Grove, CA	1988
Rialto Korean, Rialto, CA	*
Torrance Glory, Torrance, CA (m)	*
Victory, Los Angeles, CA	1985
Yeolin Moon, Cerritos, CA (m)	*

Louisiana

Atchafalaya, Melville, LA	1981
DeRidder, DeRidder, LA	1986

Mid-America

Covenant, Fayetteville, AR	1989
First Reformed, Minco, OK	1987
Heritage, Edmond, OK	*
Immanuel Reformed, Springfield, MO	1990

Mississippi Valley

Bethesda, Edwards, MS	1990
Center Point, Prairie Point, MS	1987
Dekalb, Dekalb, MS	1989
Enondale, Porterville, MS	*
First, Philadelphia, MS	1989
Goodman, Goodman, MS	1987
McBride Memorial, Camden, MS	1990
Pleasant Springs, Preston, MS	1988
Rolling Fork, Mayersville, MS	1990
Scooba, Scooba, MS	1990
Smyrna, Kosciusko, MS	1977
Tchula, Tchula, MS	1990

Missouri

Redeemer Reformed, Columbia, MO	1988
---------------------------------	------

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**Year for Which Statistics
Were Last Received
(* = No Statistics Available)**

New Jersey

Comunidade Crista, South Orange, NJ	*
Covenant Bible Church, Cape May, NJ	1989
Evangelical, Williamstown, NJ	1990
Fellowship Chapel, Irvington, NJ (m)	1990
Locktown, Flemington, NJ	1990
Logos, Bridgewater, NJ (m)	1989

New River -- All Churches Reporting

North Georgia

Comerstone, Conyers, GA (m)	1990
New Covenant Fellowship, Atlanta, GA (m)	*
Perimeter East, Lilburn, GA	*
Rock of Ages, Decatur, GA (m)	1989

North Texas

Trinity, Plano, TX	1990
--------------------	------

Northeast

Covenant, Flushing, NY	1989
Covenant of Grace, Binghamton, NY (m)	1990
Jefferson, Jefferson, NH (m)	1988
New Life, Ithaca, NY (m)	1990
Nova Vida Fellowship, Allston, MA (m)	*
Redeemer, New York City, NY (m)	1990

Northern California

Oak Hills, Walnut Creek, CA (m)	1989
Sierra View, Fresno, CA	1990

Northern Illinois -- All Churches Reporting

Pacific

Church in the Canyon, Calabasas, CA	1989
Valley, Sepulveda, CA	1989
Valley Springs, Palmdale, CA (m)	*

Pacific Northwest

Covenant, Issaquah, WA	1990
Grace, Regina, SAS (m)	1990
North Ridge, Calgary, ALB	1990

APPENDICES

**Year for Which Statistics
Were Last Received
(* = No Statistics Available)**

Palmetto

Andrews, Andrews, SC	1988
Central, Kingstree, SC	1987
Faith, Cheraw, SC	1990
Grace Community, McClellanville, SC	1990
North Augusta, North Augusta, SC (m)	*

Philadelphia

Berith, Newtown Square, PA	1990
Bucks Central, Newtown, PA (m)	1990
Church of the Redeemer, Philadelphia, PA	1989
Hope, Solebury, PA	1989
Korean Saints, Warminster, PA	*
New Life, Philadelphia, PA	1990
Proclamation, Wayne, PA	*

Potomac

Winchester, Martinsburg, VA (m)	*
---------------------------------	---

Rocky Mountain

Cornerstone, Ft. Collins, CO	1990
Evergreen, Evergreen, CO (m)	1988

Siouxlands

Alexander, Underwood, ND	1990
Good Shepherd, Maple Grove, MN	1990

South Coast

Chaparral Hills, San Diego, CA	1990
Church on the Point, Dana Point, CA (m)	*
Trinity, Escondido, CA (m)	*

South Texas

Dios Con Nosotros, McAllen, TX (m)	*
Kingwood Forest, Kingstree, TX (m)	*
Spring Cypress, Spring, TX	1990

Southeast Alabama

Calabee, Shorter, AL	
Little Sandy Ridge, Ft. Deposit, AL	1990
New Harmony, Waverly, AL	1985
Woodland, Notasulga, AL	1990

Southern Florida *

El Redentor, Miami, FL	1990
PC of Ft. Pierce, Ft. Pierce, FL (m)	*
PC at Weston, Sunrise, FL (m)	*

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

**Year for Which Statistics
Were Last Received
(* = No Statistics Available)**

Southwest

Hope, Gilbert, AZ	1990
South Valley, Chandler, AZ (m)	1988
Westminster, Alamogordo, NM	1990

Southwest Florida

Auburn Road, Venice, FL	1988
First, North Port, FL	1990
Seminole, Tampa, FL	1990

Susquehanna Valley

Providence, York, PA	1990
----------------------	------

Tennessee Valley

Highland, Lafayette, GA (m)	*
New Covenant, Clarksville, TN (m)	*
Reformed, Lookout Mountain, GA	1990
West Hills, Harriman, TN	1990

Warrior

Akron, Akron, AL	1987
Catherine, Catherine, AL	*
Cedar Grove, Epes, AL	1988
Central, Emelle, AL	1987
Crescent Hill, Selma, AL	1990
Gainesville, Gainesville, AL	1973
Mt. Olivet, Gordo, AL	1979
Myrtlewood, Myrtlewood, AL	1981
Oxford, Cuba, AL	1977

Western Carolina

New Covenant, Hickory, NC	1990
Whiteside, Cashiers, NC	*

Westminster

Cash Hollow Chapel, Johnson City, TN (m)	1990
King Memorial, Bristol, VA	1986
Princeton, Johnson City, TN	1990
Valley Pike, Bristol, VA	1990

Total number of churches:	137
Total number of missions:	<u>70</u>
	207

TABLE 4

SUMMARY ANALYSIS BY PRESBYTERY OF CHURCHES CONTRIBUTING TO G.A. CAUSES

NOTE: This analysis is based on the 1991 Yearbook statistics.

	Total Number of Churches	Administration		Christian Education		Mission to North America		Mission to the World		Covenant College		Covenant Seminary		Ridge Haven		Other G.A. Causes		G.A. CONTR. SUMMARY	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Ascension Churches	38	23	61%	21	55%	24	63%	32	84%	22	58%	20	53%	5	13%	21	55%	34	89%
	Missions Total	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Calvary Churches	39	23	59%	21	54%	24	62%	32	82%	22	56%	20	51%	5	13%	21	54%	34	87%
	Missions Total	49	33	67%	30	61%	32	65%	36	73%	25	51%	25	51%	27	55%	27	55%	43
Central Churches	50	33	66%	30	60%	32	64%	36	72%	25	50%	25	50%	27	54%	27	54%	43	86%
	Missions Total	29	14	48%	10	34%	17	59%	17	59%	8	28%	9	31%	11	38%	19	66%	22
Carolina Churches	5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Missions Total	34	14	41%	10	29%	17	50%	17	50%	8	24%	9	26%	11	32%	19	56%	22
Central Florida Churches	22	13	59%	12	55%	11	50%	16	73%	9	41%	8	36%	6	27%	11	50%	17	77%
	Missions Total	5	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2
Central Georgia Churches	27	14	52%	13	48%	12	44%	18	67%	10	37%	9	33%	7	26%	12	44%	19	70%
	Missions Total	31	13	42%	13	42%	16	52%	18	58%	14	45%	13	42%	12	39%	19	61%	25
Covenant Churches	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Missions Total	34	13	38%	13	38%	17	50%	20	59%	14	41%	13	38%	12	35%	19	56%	27
Eastern Churches	38	22	58%	22	58%	23	61%	24	63%	14	37%	15	39%	11	29%	18	47%	29	76%
	Missions Total	39	22	56%	22	56%	23	59%	24	62%	14	36%	15	38%	11	28%	18	46%	29
Eastern Canada Churches	6	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%
	Missions Total	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
Eastern Carolina Churches	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%
	Missions Total	13	6	46%	6	46%	6	46%	8	62%	4	31%	4	31%	4	31%	8	62%	12
Evangel Churches	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Missions Total	15	6	40%	6	40%	6	40%	8	53%	4	27%	4	27%	4	27%	9	60%	13
Grace Churches	30	14	47%	11	37%	13	43%	16	53%	9	30%	10	33%	7	23%	17	57%	23	77%
	Missions Total	33	14	42%	11	33%	13	39%	16	48%	9	27%	10	30%	7	21%	17	52%	23
Great Lakes Churches	44	18	41%	19	43%	23	52%	25	57%	11	25%	8	18%	5	11%	25	57%	35	80%
	Missions Total	44	18	41%	19	43%	23	52%	25	57%	11	25%	8	18%	5	11%	25	57%	35
Gulf Coast Churches	16	11	69%	11	69%	9	56%	14	88%	10	63%	9	56%	7	44%	7	44%	14	88%
	Missions Total	10	2	20%	1	10%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	5	50%	6
Total Churches	26	13	50%	13	50%	10	38%	16	62%	11	42%	10	38%	8	31%	12	46%	20	77%
	Missions Total	22	11	50%	11	50%	16	73%	20	91%	10	45%	9	41%	7	32%	13	59%	20
Total	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Missions Total	24	11	46%	11	46%	16	67%	20	83%	10	42%	9	38%	7	29%	13	54%	20

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

	Total Number of Churches	Administration		Christian Education		Mission to North America		Mission to the World		Covenant College		Covenant Seminary		Ridge Haven		Other G.A. Causes		G.A. CONTR. SUMMARY		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Heartland	Churches	13	9	69%	7	54%	8	62%	11	85%	8	62%	8	62%	3	23%	7	54%	13	100%
	Missions	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	14	9	64%	7	50%	8	57%	11	79%	8	57%	8	57%	3	21%	7	50%	13	93%
Heritage	Churches	16	8	50%	11	69%	12	75%	11	69%	12	75%	12	75%	4	25%	10	63%	13	81%
	Missions	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	16	8	50%	11	69%	12	75%	11	69%	12	75%	12	75%	4	25%	10	63%	13	81%
Illiana	Churches	10	5	50%	4	40%	8	80%	9	90%	9	90%	7	70%	1	10%	6	60%	9	90%
	Missions	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
	Total	13	5	38%	4	31%	8	62%	10	77%	9	69%	7	54%	1	8%	6	46%	10	77%
James River	Churches	22	15	68%	13	59%	12	55%	16	73%	8	36%	8	36%	6	27%	10	45%	18	82%
	Missions	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
	Total	25	15	60%	13	52%	12	48%	17	68%	8	32%	8	32%	6	24%	11	44%	19	76%
Korean Central	Churches	5	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%
	Missions	4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	9	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	3	33%
Korean Eastern	Churches	4	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%
	Missions	9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
	Total	13	1	8%	1	8%	1	8%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%
Korean Southeast	Churches	13	3	23%	1	8%	3	23%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	4	31%
	Missions	13	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%
	Total	26	4	15%	1	4%	4	15%	4	15%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	2	8%	7	27%
Korean Southern	Churches	5	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%
	Missions	4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	9	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	2	22%
Korean Southwest	Churches	10	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	5	50%
	Missions	12	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	25%	3	25%
	Total	22	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	5	23%	8	36%
Louisiana	Churches	14	8	57%	7	50%	7	50%	10	71%	5	36%	6	43%	5	36%	8	57%	11	79%
	Missions	2	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
	Total	16	8	50%	7	44%	8	50%	12	75%	5	31%	6	38%	5	31%	8	50%	13	81%
Mid-America	Churches	7	3	43%	2	29%	3	43%	4	57%	3	43%	3	43%	1	14%	5	71%	6	86%
	Missions	3	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%
	Total	10	4	40%	3	30%	4	40%	5	50%	4	40%	4	40%	1	10%	6	60%	7	70%
Mississippi Valley	Churches	57	32	56%	31	54%	32	56%	33	58%	23	40%	24	42%	13	23%	29	51%	41	72%
	Missions	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	58	32	55%	31	53%	32	55%	33	57%	23	40%	24	41%	13	22%	29	50%	41	71%
Missouri	Churches	18	13	72%	11	61%	12	67%	16	89%	12	67%	15	83%	5	28%	8	44%	17	94%
	Missions	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	18	13	72%	11	61%	12	67%	16	89%	12	67%	15	83%	5	28%	8	44%	17	94%

APPENDICES

	Total Number of Churches	Admini- stration Number		Christian Education Number		Mission to North America Number		Mission to the World Number		Covenant College Number		Covenant Seminary Number		Ridge Haven Number		Other G.A. Causes Number		G.A. CONTR. SUMMARY	
		Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent	Contrib	Percent
New Jersey	17	10	59%	7	41%	8	47%	13	76%	7	41%	5	29%	4	24%	7	41%	15	88%
Churches	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%
Missions	20	10	50%	7	35%	8	40%	13	65%	7	35%	5	25%	4	20%	8	40%	16	80%
New River	15	10	67%	9	60%	9	60%	11	73%	5	33%	5	33%	4	27%	9	60%	14	93%
Churches	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	15	10	67%	9	60%	9	60%	11	73%	5	33%	5	33%	4	27%	9	60%	14	93%
North Georgia	29	19	66%	16	55%	17	59%	21	72%	15	52%	12	41%	11	38%	17	59%	25	86%
Churches	9	1	11%	2	22%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	33%	5	56%
Missions	38	20	53%	18	47%	20	53%	23	61%	15	39%	12	32%	11	29%	20	53%	30	79%
North Texas	16	9	56%	9	56%	9	56%	15	94%	10	63%	6	38%	4	25%	10	63%	16	100%
Churches	2	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%
Missions	18	10	56%	10	56%	10	56%	16	89%	11	61%	7	39%	5	28%	10	56%	17	94%
Northeast	14	8	57%	6	43%	9	64%	11	79%	5	36%	5	36%	1	7%	10	71%	12	86%
Churches	6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%
Missions	20	8	40%	6	30%	9	45%	12	60%	5	25%	5	25%	1	5%	11	55%	13	65%
Northern California	6	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	4	67%	2	33%	2	40%	2	40%	3	50%	4	67%
Churches	5	2	40%	2	40%	2	40%	2	40%	2	40%	2	40%	2	40%	2	40%	2	40%
Missions	11	3	27%	2	18%	4	36%	6	55%	4	36%	2	18%	2	18%	4	36%	6	55%
Northern Illinois	16	8	50%	6	38%	7	44%	11	69%	6	38%	7	44%	1	6%	9	56%	12	75%
Churches	3	1	33%	1	33%	2	67%	2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%
Missions	19	9	47%	7	37%	9	47%	11	58%	7	37%	7	37%	1	5%	9	47%	14	74%
Pacific	9	3	33%	3	33%	3	33%	6	67%	3	33%	3	33%	0	0%	3	33%	6	67%
Churches	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	11	3	27%	3	27%	3	27%	6	55%	3	27%	3	27%	0	0%	3	27%	6	55%
Pacific Northwest	16	11	69%	10	63%	9	56%	11	69%	10	63%	9	56%	2	13%	8	50%	15	94%
Churches	6	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%
Missions	22	12	55%	11	50%	11	50%	12	55%	11	50%	10	45%	3	14%	10	45%	17	77%
Palmetto	43	22	51%	23	53%	25	58%	36	84%	21	49%	20	47%	25	58%	30	70%	39	91%
Churches	3	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%
Missions	46	23	50%	24	52%	26	57%	37	80%	22	48%	21	46%	26	57%	30	65%	40	87%
Philadelph	22	12	55%	11	50%	10	45%	15	68%	10	45%	9	41%	3	14%	9	41%	18	82%
Churches	3	2	67%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%
Missions	25	14	56%	12	48%	11	44%	15	60%	11	44%	10	40%	3	12%	9	36%	20	80%
Potomac	42	30	71%	24	57%	30	71%	29	69%	26	62%	25	60%	12	29%	17	40%	38	90%
Churches	10	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%
Missions	52	31	60%	25	48%	31	60%	29	56%	26	50%	25	48%	12	23%	18	35%	39	75%
Rocky Mountain	8	4	50%	4	50%	3	38%	7	88%	5	63%	4	50%	0	0%	4	50%	8	100%
Churches	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	11	4	36%	4	36%	3	27%	7	64%	5	45%	4	36%	0	0%	4	36%	8	73%

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

	Total Number of Churches	Administration		Christian Education		Mission to North America		Mission to the World		Covenant College		Covenant Seminary		Ridge Haven		Other G.A. Causes		G.A. CONTR. SUMMARY		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Stoutlands	10	60%	7	70%	7	70%	7	70%	7	70%	5	50%	7	70%	1	10%	8	80%	10	100%
Churches	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	10	60%	7	70%	7	70%	7	70%	7	70%	5	50%	7	70%	1	10%	8	80%	10	100%
South Coast	8	36%	2	25%	2	25%	2	25%	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	88%
Churches	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
Missions	11	27%	2	18%	2	18%	2	18%	7	64%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	73%
South Texas	16	44%	6	38%	10	63%	10	63%	13	81%	5	31%	4	25%	2	13%	6	38%	13	81%
Churches	4	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
Missions	20	40%	7	35%	11	55%	11	55%	14	70%	5	25%	4	20%	2	10%	6	30%	14	70%
Southeast Alabama	35	54%	16	46%	21	60%	21	60%	26	74%	12	34%	7	20%	9	26%	18	51%	27	77%
Churches	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Missions	37	51%	16	43%	21	57%	21	57%	28	76%	12	32%	7	19%	9	24%	18	49%	29	78%
Southern Florida	28	43%	10	36%	16	57%	16	57%	19	68%	11	39%	10	36%	4	14%	15	54%	23	82%
Churches	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
Missions	32	38%	10	31%	16	50%	16	50%	20	63%	11	34%	10	31%	4	13%	15	47%	24	75%
Southwest	13	4	31%	4	31%	4	31%	11	85%	5	38%	4	31%	4	31%	1	8%	9	69%	
Churches	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	14	29%	4	29%	4	29%	4	29%	11	79%	5	36%	4	29%	1	7%	9	64%	11	79%
Southwest Florida	19	84%	14	74%	14	74%	14	74%	15	79%	13	68%	12	63%	8	42%	10	53%	17	89%
Churches	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%
Missions	23	70%	14	61%	14	61%	14	61%	15	65%	13	57%	12	52%	8	35%	11	48%	18	78%
Susque. Valley	12	8	67%	6	50%	7	58%	6	50%	8	67%	7	58%	1	8%	9	75%	11	92%	
Churches	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Missions	14	57%	7	50%	7	50%	7	50%	12	86%	8	57%	7	50%	1	7%	9	64%	13	93%
Tennessee Valley	36	19	53%	17	47%	21	58%	22	61%	21	58%	17	47%	9	25%	20	56%	29	81%	
Churches	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	38	50%	17	45%	21	55%	21	55%	22	58%	21	55%	17	45%	9	24%	20	53%	29	76%
Warrior	29	10	34%	8	28%	10	34%	14	48%	7	24%	6	21%	4	14%	14	48%	18	62%	
Churches	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	29	34%	8	28%	10	34%	10	34%	14	48%	7	24%	6	21%	4	14%	14	48%	18	62%
Western Carolina	26	14	54%	14	54%	14	54%	18	69%	12	46%	12	46%	11	42%	14	54%	21	81%	
Churches	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Missions	26	54%	14	54%	14	54%	14	54%	18	69%	12	46%	12	46%	11	42%	14	54%	21	81%
Westminster	27	16	59%	16	59%	13	48%	24	89%	6	22%	5	19%	6	22%	12	44%	25	93%	
Churches	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%
Missions	30	53%	16	53%	13	43%	25	83%	6	20%	5	17%	5	17%	6	20%	13	43%	26	87%
ALL PRESBYTERIES	1044	556	53%	502	48%	573	55%	719	69%	449	43%	416	40%	263	25%	547	52%	854	82%	
Churches	169	16	9%	16	9%	21	12%	28	17%	11	7%	10	6%	7	4%	23	14%	50	30%	
Missions	1213	572	47%	518	43%	594	49%	747	62%	460	38%	428	35%	270	22%	570	47%	904	75%	

APPENDICES

TABLE 5

SOLO/SENIOR PASTOR COMPENSATION
1991
U.S.A. CHURCHES

Part A: ALL SIZE CHURCHES				
Quartile	Salary ¹	Housing	Benefits ²	Total Comp.
3RD	25,248	12,240	14,471	51,959
MEDIAN	26,252	8,000	8,712	42,964
1ST	13,608	13,000	9,464	36,072

Part B: Churches of 0-100 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	17,200	20,400	6,000	43,600
MEDIAN	21,566	10,750	5,539	37,855
1ST	17,966	6,060	6,974	31,000

Part C: Churches of 101-200 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	22,792	14,735	10,728	48,255
MEDIAN	21,724	10,943	8,770	41,437
1ST	18,950	6,860	10,794	36,604

¹ Salary includes cash salary and social security allowance.

² Benefits include medical insurance, disability/life insurance, employer's retirement insurance, and car allowance (for private use).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Part D: Churches of 201-300 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	25,413	15,370	12,594	53,377
MEDIAN	24,831	9,332	13,044	47,207
1ST	18,521	10,990	10,226	39,737

Part E: Churches of 301-400 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	32,922	13,169	13,181	59,272
MEDIAN	33,720	5,500	14,468	53,688
1ST	47,500	0	912	48,412

Part F: Churches of 401-500 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	32,591	16,600	12,414	61,605
MEDIAN	32,596	10,750	8,271	51,617
1ST	26,800	7,300	13,650	47,750

Part G: Churches of 501-750 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	56,000	9,000	0	65,000
MEDIAN	26,718	16,500	16,357	59,575
1ST	50,688	0	5,608	56,296

APPENDICES

Part H: Churches of 751-1000 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	49,698	16,750	12,368	78,816
MEDIAN	37,494	25,180	9,402	72,076
1ST	33,450	18,100	10,600	62,150

Part I: Churches of over 1000 Members				
Quartile	Salary	Housing	Benefits	Total Comp.
3RD	55,024	28,000	16,454	99,478
MEDIAN	39,140	21,800	21,454	82,394
1ST	34,815	26,575	12,056	73,446

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 1

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS TO THE 20TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

I. INTRODUCTION

Your Committee on Constitutional Business met only one time subsequent to the 19th General Assembly. This meeting was held April 30 and May 1, 1992 in Atlanta, Georgia. The committee was able to complete all of its assignments at that meeting. All of the members of the committee were present.

II. NON-JUDICIAL REFERENCES

Reference 1 *From Palmetto Presbytery*: "May a ruling elder administer the sacraments?"

Response: The Committee's advice to the Palmetto Presbytery in response to their question: "May a presbytery properly grant the right to administer the sacraments to a ruling elder from a particular church, whose exam has been sustained as satisfactory, by virtue of the ruling elder's previous ordination to the Gospel ministry within another denomination, prior to his association with and membership in the PCA?"

We advise the presbytery the answer is "no".

Rationale:

1. To do so would be contrary to the Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF 27-4).
2. To do so would be contrary to the BCO. BCO 58-4 refers to the "minister" in the administration of the Lord's Supper. (BCO 8-5)
3. The particular person involved appears to qualify for ordination as a Teaching Elder, and we would recommend that this be done.

Minority Report:

We advise Palmetto Presbytery that, no, a presbytery may not grant "the right to administer the sacraments to a ruling elder from a particular church, whose exam has been sustained as satisfactory, by virtue of the ruling elder's previous ordination to the Gospel ministry within another denomination, prior to his association with and membership in the PCA."

Granting such a right would be contrary to:

1. WCF 27-4; "There be only two sacraments . . . neither of which may be dispensed by any but a minister of the Word, lawfully ordained" and
2. BCO 58-4; which refers only to the "minister" (or teaching elder) in speaking of the one who is to administer the Lord's Supper. This precludes a ruling elder, however otherwise well-qualified, from administering the sacraments.

Further, previous ordination to the gospel ministry, when the man in question has neither been deposed nor divested, makes it possible for a presbytery to examine and receive him as a teaching elder. However, the joining of a local church and election to the office of ruling elder in that church is, under our *Book of Church Order*, a tacit demitting of the office of teaching elder. In this case, it is necessary for the man to undergo the process of ordination to the office of teaching elder *de novo*.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ RE David C. Lachman

APPENDICES

Reference 2: From Heritage Presbytery: "May a session limit eldership to those who practice total abstinence from beverage use of alcohol?"

Background:

Complaint against the actions of Heritage Presbytery taken on September 14, 1991

Two complaints were filed with Heritage Presbytery contending that the action of 9/14/91 was out of accord with Scripture and our constitution. One was filed by TE C. Michael Chastain dated October 2, 1991, and the other by RE Richard E. Olson and TE S. Edd Cathey, dated October 14, 1991. The Presbytery did not sustain either complaint, but the Presbytery minutes indicate that both parties stated their intentions to appeal the case to the General Assembly. However, no written appeal or complaint was forwarded to the General Assembly within the 30 days time limit. *BCO* 42-4 and 43-3.

We advise the complainants and Heritage Presbytery that:

1. In the submission of complaints, care must be exercised to work within the time limits set forth in *BCO*.
2. A non-judicial reference for advice on this matter could be considered by the CCB if requested by a court (*BCO* 41-1) since there is no time limit on such requests.
3. Should a candidate be denied office because he did not agree with the recommendations adopted by Heritage Presbytery, that would be a basis for a Judicial Complaint.

Minority Report:

The undersigned respectfully submit a minority report with respect to the "request for advice: from the Heritage Presbytery. It is the opinion of the undersigned that the "request for advice" from Heritage Presbytery was not properly before the Committee for the following reasons:

1. It is our opinion that the Standing Judicial Commission erred in not considering the complaint from members of the Presbytery on the ground that the complaint is an appeal from a non-judicial reference. *BCO* 43-1 states "a complaint is a written representation made against some act or decision of a court of the church." The complainants filed a complaint against the decision of the Presbytery with respect to the two questions submitted by way of reference from a session with respect to the issue of total abstinence from alcoholic beverages.
2. It is our opinion that the Standing Judicial Commission erred in giving advice to the complainants to make a reference to the Committee on Constitutional Business. A reference is to be made by a lower court to a higher court. (*BCO* 41-1)
3. It is our opinion that there was no clear reference for advice from the Heritage Presbytery submitted to the Committee on Constitutional Business.

/s/ Roland S. Barnes

/s/ Craig D. Childs, Sr.

/s/ Richard Springer

III. ADVICE TO STATED CLERK OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Item 1. *Clarification of BCO 38-3* as requested by Review of Presbytery Records Committee, June 19, 1992: "It needs to be made clear in *BCO* 38-3 whether a man automatically loses ordination when he renounces the authority of the church or whether presbytery must take an action to do so, if it sees fit. Especially is this

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

confusing in cases where the church he joins is not heretical, but presbytery intends to take away his authority to exercise his office."

Response: The Committee on Constitutional Business advises the stated clerk, as follows:

According to *BCO* 13-9, the Presbytery has full authority to judge ministers and may divest a minister from office whose name is erased.

The language of *BCO* 38-3 does not envision the loss of ordination when an officer in good standing joins "some other evangelical church," even if charges are pending against him. If, in the court's judgment, "the denomination be heretical," the court is to withdraw all authority to exercise his office. The *BCO* permits a court the freedom of action to withdraw authority to exercise his office from one who joins another church as a member rather than as an officer.

Item 2: Overture from 3rd RPC, Philadelphia

Background:

1. The session of the 3rd Reformed Presbyterian Church of America requested advice from the Philadelphia Presbytery as to who is/is not invited to participate in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper per *BCO* 58-4. Reference letter 3rd Reformed Presbyterian Church of America to Philadelphia Presbytery, 3/16/92.
2. Response from Philadelphia Presbytery was that the session must use *BCO* 58-4 as stated. Reference letter Philadelphia Presbytery to 3rd Reformed Presbyterian Church of America 3/16/92.
3. Effect: 3rd Reformed Presbyterian Church of America session wrote an overture to GA via the office of Stated Clerk (Gilchrist). See letter 4/15/92.
4. Presbytery did not accept or reject or take action as required on the overture. The overture is required to meet the time frame for RAO 10-10. *BCO* 13-11 allows for the calling of a meeting for any emergency other than the stated meetings. If the 3rd Reformed Presbyterian Church of America could not gather support for a special called meeting, then the will of the Presbytery body has spoken.

Advice: That the overture from 3rd RPC be submitted to the 21st GA by the presbytery. If rejected by presbytery then the session may submit the overture to GA per RAO 10-10.

Rationale: The rules of Assembly operation require the acceptance or rejection of the overture by Presbytery and it must be presented to General Assembly 60 days prior to meeting. See RAO 10-10. According to the letter of 4/15/92, 3rd Reformed PCA thought it could not meet the conditions of RAO 10-10 concerning time frame, due to the date of Presbytery's stated meeting.

APPENDICES

IV. OVERTURES TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. Overture 1 From Southern Florida Presbytery
"Amend *BCO* 20-1 to Clarify Calls"

The overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures with the following editorial changes: Strike the word "any" and add an "s" to "amendment".

2. Overture 5 From Potomac Presbytery
"Amend *BCO* 15-4 to Limit Membership on *SJC*"

The overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissions on Bills and Overtures.

3. Overture 6 From Covenant Presbytery
"Amend *BCO* 14-1 by inserting *RAO* 13-1."

The overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures with one editorial notation: on the last line change the word "report" to "come".

4. Overture 7 From Northeast Presbytery
"Amend *BCO* 43-2 and 43-3"

The overture was found not to be in order as it has the effect of negating 43-1 by disjoining the action or decision complained against, effectively making the filing of a complaint contingent on a further action of presbytery. In addition, as minutes are not ordinarily approved until the next meeting, it conflicts with the provisions of the third sentence of 43-2, which instructs the court to consider the complaint at or before its next meeting, thereby preventing timely consideration of a complaint.

5. Overture 11 From Western Carolina Presbytery
"Amend *BCO* 13-1 and 14-2 to Permit All Ruling Elders to Serve at Presbytery and General Assembly."

The overture was found to be in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures, with the notation that the implication of the addition is that, as with teaching elders, ruling elders not currently serving on the session ("without charge"), but otherwise in good standing, would be included.

6. Overture 15 From Southern Florida Presbytery
"Amend *BCO* 32-2 and 32-3 to Clarify"

The overture was found not to be in order in that, by making citation of all parties and witnesses depend on mutual agreement between the parties, it allows the possibility of indefinite delay of the process by the accused, thereby enabling him to subvert the entire process of discipline envisioned by the *BCO*. In addition, it would be noted that the proposed amendment uses language more ambiguous than that which it replaces: "timely", "appropriate language", "enter a plea", and "rights".

7. Overture 16 From New River Presbytery
"Amend *BCO* 43-3 to Clarify it, if Current Amendment is Adopted."

The overture was found to be in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

8. Overture 23 From New River Presbytery

"Amend *BCO* 16-3 to Require Grounds for not Approving Ordination Exam."

The overture was found not to be in order in that it does not specify if it has in view each court (the session and presbytery) and every office (teaching elder, ruling elder, deacon) and in that it employs language inappropriate to a chapter defining vocation as a doctrine; such specifications would be appropriately placed in chapters 21 and/or 24.

The 19th General Assembly referred the following overtures to the Committee for advise on the constitutionality of the proposed amendments to the 20th General Assembly.

9. Overture 29 from Evangel Presbytery: "Restatement of *BCO* 38-2."

The overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures.

NOTE: *This was Overture 1 at 19th GA and referred to CCB and deferred to the 20th GA*

10. Overture 30 from New River Presbytery: "Amend *BCO* 15-4 to permit General Assembly to Adjudicate."

The overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures.

NOTE: *This was Overture 5 at 19th GA and referred to CCB and deferred to the 20th GA*

11. Overture 31 from Westminster Presbytery: "Amend *BCO* Preface II, to avoid Pluralistic Interpretation."

The overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures subject to the following notations -- change "provide" to "provides" and replace the ellipsis with a period.

NOTE: *This was Overture 10 at 19th GA and referred to CCB and deferred to the 20th GA*

12. Overture 32 from Ascension Presbytery: "Amend *BCO* 34-1 so Neighboring Presbytery may adjudicate case."

The overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures subject to the following notations - delete "be changed" and insert a comma between "scandal" and "the General Assembly", and italicize "de novo".

NOTE: *This was Overture 12 at 19th GA and referred to CCB and deferred to the 20th GA.*

13. Overture 33 from New River Presbytery: "Amend 24-5 to Permit Session to Ordain Elders and Deacons."

This overture was found in order and referred to the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures.

NOTE: *This was Overture 22 at 19th GA and referred to CCB and deferred to the 20th GA*

APPENDICES

14. Overture 34 from New River Presbytery: "Amend *BCO* 15-4 So as to limit membership on *SJC*."

The proposed amendment to *BCO* 14-1(12) found not to be in order.

NOTE: *This was Overture 27 at 19th GA and referred to CCB and deferred to the 20th GA*

Rationale:

The original proposed amendment from New River Presbytery involved *BCO* 15-4. The Bills & Overtures Committee of Commissioners changed the proposed amendment to address *BCO* 14-1(12); however, the substance of the amendment was radically changed by this action. The original amendment of *BCO* 15-4 dealt with the issue of an elder serving concurrently on the *GA SJC* and a *GA Permanent Committee*. The B&O Committee of Commissioners amendment to *BCO* 14-1(12) does not deal with the issue of concurrent service at all; rather, it introduces a new issue of one's eligibility to re-election to the Standing Judicial Commission without a year off. This issue does not inherently grow out of the New River *BCO* 15-4 amendment. The *BCO* 14-1(12) amendment actually introduces "new business" Since the introduction of new business is not within the authority of the B&O Committee of Commissioners (*RAO* 13-5(d)). The proposed amendment to *BCO* 14-1(12) is not properly before the General Assembly and therefore out of order.

The proposed amendment to *RAO* 4-6 is not in order. Rationale: Without the original New River proposed amendment to *BCO* 15-4 which was intended to prevent concurrent service on the Standing Judicial Commission and a permanent committee, the *BCO* presently permits such concurrent service. The proposed *RAO* 4-6 amendment then would create an inconsistency between the *BCO* and the *RAO*.

15. Personal Resolution from TE Grover E. Gunn: "Amend *BCO* 14-1 by inserting *RAO* 13-1." NOTE: This is the same as Overture 6 (see item IV, 3).

This resolution is answered by reference to Overture 6 from Covenant Presbytery.

16. **OVERTURE 35 From Delmarva Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
"Amend *BCO* 37-4 to Apply to Presbyteries as Well as Sessions"

Whereas, *BCO* 37 is clearly intended to cover the cases of teaching elders as well as regular church members, and

Whereas, *BCO* 37 contains several references which are inconsistent with this intention,

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the General Assembly of the PCA amend *BCO* 37 in the following ways:

1. In section 37-4, add "(or presbytery)" after "the session" on line 3, line 6 and line 25.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. In section 37-4 add "(or moderator)" after "the minister" on line 7 and line 19.

Adopted at the February 11, 1989 meeting of Delmarva Presbytery.

Attested by: /s/ Bruce B. Howes

Stated Clerk

NOTE: The above overture was submitted by Delmarva Presbytery to the 17th GA and numbered Overture 19 (*M17GA*, p. 166). It was referred to Committee on Constitutional Business "to draft amendments to *BCO 37* to clarify jurisdiction in the process of restoring an excommunicated and deposed teaching elder.

Grounds:

The proposed amendments do not fully deal with the question of what jurisdiction does a presbytery have (over against a session's jurisdiction - see *BCO 6-2, 4; 11-4; and 12-5*) for the restoring of an excommunicated teaching elder (see *BCO 13-9; 34-4; 36-7; and 37-7*).

CCB proposes that *BCO 37-4* be amended by adding a new second paragraph and renumbering the remaining paragraphs as follows:

"Prior to the readmittance of an excommunicated teaching elder, the session shall obtain information and advice from the court imposing such censure in order to assist the session in determining that the excommunicated person desiring to be readmitted to the communion of the church is so affected with his state as to be brought to repentance."

The following minority report was received:

The committee's report, while a substantial improvement in the CCB's previous recommendations of a new *BCO 37-5* (see *M19GA*, p. 230), nevertheless falls considerably short of fulfilling the GA's instruction that it "draft amendments to *BCO 37* to clarify jurisdiction in the process of restoring an excommunicated and deposed teaching elder."

1. It implies that such jurisdiction belongs to the session, but, though it instructs the session to "obtain information and advice from the court," does not explicitly give the session, as opposed to the presbytery, power to proceed with restoration.
2. It fails to take into consideration what relationship, if any, an excommunicated teaching elder sustains to the presbytery which deposed him, and fails to take into account the implications of *BCO 34-8, 37-5 and 37-7*.

It is recommended that the matter again be referred to the CCB with instruction that it take particular care to clarify the matter of jurisdiction both in the particular place in question (*37-4*) and in respect to other relevant sections of the *BCO*.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ RE David C. Lachman

The Stated Clerk of the General Assembly is to notify the Committee of Commissioners on Bills and Overtures and any other Committees of Commissioners necessary that if any changes are made in the wording and/or substance of overtures to amend the constitution, the overtures will have to be sent back to the Committee on Constitutional Business for review. (RAO 7-2).

APPENDICES

V. GENERAL ASSEMBLY ASSIGNMENTS

The 19th General Assembly referred three items of business from the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records to the Committee on Constitutional Business, namely, that the 20th GA not seat commissioners from Heartland, Pacific, and Philadelphia presbyteries until "the Committee on Constitutional Business certifies to the stated clerk that compliance to repeated citations is met."

Item 1 Heartland Presbytery:

It is the understanding of the CCB that the ambiguous response of the Heartland Presbytery indicates that they will completely comply with the citations of General Assembly; and that all Presbytery minutes submitted, beginning at the 20th GA, will include addenda and/or attachments. Therefore, the CCB certifies that Heartland Presbytery has complied with the citations of General Assembly.

The response of Heartland Presbytery is as follows:

March 20, 1992

Heartland Presbytery apologizes for any and all actions which contributed to a perceived reluctance to comply with General Assembly decisions relating to presbytery records.

Further, Heartland Presbytery acknowledges and regrets the omission of addenda from the body of its 1989, 1990, 1991 minutes reviewed by the Review Committee, and assures General Assembly that all pertinent and necessary documents are in fact attached to the original minutes.

Finally, Heartland Presbytery has instructed its stated clerk to review the process of recording the minutes to prevent the reoccurrence of these types of situations cited.

This response was passed by presbytery action #92-12 on 3/20/92.

Item 2 Philadelphia Presbytery

The CCB certifies that the response of the Philadelphia Presbytery is in compliance with the citations of General Assembly.

The response of Philadelphia Presbytery is as follows:

12 August 1991

Item #4 on page 126 of the committee report, it states that the Philadelphia Presbytery did not submit responses to the exceptions taken by the 18th GA. This is just not true. Enclosed please find a report which was sent to the committee on 30 April 1991. The committee should be more careful with its mail!

Responses to Exceptions Cited By
Committee on Review of Presbytery Records
of the 18th General Assembly From the Philadelphia Presbytery

30 April 1991

- I. 13 May 1989 - exception accepted - church did meet and agreed to ask the presbytery to dissolve the pastoral relationship.
- II. 9 September 1989 - exception accepted - Mr. White did fulfill the educational requirements mentioned in *BCO* 21-4.
- III. 13 January 1990 - exception accepted - Mr. White is no longer a member of this presbytery (now with Northeast) so we do not have record of his date of ordination. GA Clerk may.
- IV. Exceptions Taken by 17th General Assembly that were not approved
 - A. 14 May 1988 - exception accepted and corrected
 - B. 10 September 1988 - exceptions accepted - practice has been changed and each portion of exam is mentioned in the minutes
 - C. 12 November 1988 - exception accepted - Mr. Wrigley was ordained and commissioned to the chaplaincy on 30 October 1988
 - D. 11 March 1988 - exception accepted - these requirements were met and recording practice has been changed to reflect this.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Item 3 Pacific Presbytery

The CCB certifies that the response of the Pacific Presbytery is in compliance with the citations of General Assembly.

The response of Pacific Presbytery is as follows:

10-21-91

At this past meeting (October 18, 19) we also considered the GA Committee on Review of Presbytery Records report and took the following actions (which are included in the Minutes but will not reach your office until after our January meeting):

1. Move that the Presbytery correct the minutes of April 25-26, 1986, page 3, #16., a) by inserting the words, "and a theological thesis and exegetical paper", after the word "languages" in line 4.
2. Move that the Presbytery respond to the exception in the September 26-27, 1986, Minutes, page 4, #12 B, (5) (failure to follow the 2 month filing time for letter for man coming under care) by noting with regret the failure to fully comply with BCO 18-2, and by resolving to be more circumspect regarding this provision in the future.
3. Move that the Presbytery respond to the exception in the September 26-27, 1986 Minutes, Page 4, #12, B, (6) (failure to follow the 2 month filing time for letter for man coming under care) by noting with regret the failure to fully comply with BCO 18-2, and by resolving to be more circumspect regarding this provision in the future.
4. Move that the Presbytery respond to the exception in the September 26-27, 1986 Minutes, page 5, #12, B, (7) by amending the Minutes of September 26-27, 1986, Page 5, #12, B, (7), inserting the sentence, "Mr. Watanabe presented the academic degrees necessary for ordination and was examined in the original languages of Scripture, along with presenting an acceptable theological thesis and exegetical paper required for ordination trials." This sentence to be inserted in line 3 after the sentence ending, "(see Appendix C)."

I trust that you will find these papers in order. If there are questions or further action that needs to be taken on these matters on our part, please write or call.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Rodney S. Mays, Chairman
/s/ Richard Springer, Secretary

APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

BOARD OF DIRECTORS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA June 15, 1991

The Board of Directors of the Presbyterian Church in America held a regular meeting on June 15, 1991, at Briarwood Presbyterian Church, Birmingham, Alabama.

The meeting was convened by Chairman Scott Levy at 9:51 p.m. with RE Ross Cook leading in prayer.

A quorum was declared present. Those attending were as follows:

ATTENDANCE:

TE William Fox, Calvary
TE William Hughes, MS Valley
TE Donald MacNair, Missouri
TE Ronald Shaw, CE&P
TE Robert Wilcox, IFBD

RE Scott Levy, Illiana
RE Edmund Johnston, IAR
RE William Moore, Potomac
RE William Rocap, Jr., C. Carolina
RE John White, MNA
RE Jack Williamson, MTW

STAFF:

RE Ross Cook, Business Administrator
TE Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk
Mrs. Laurel De Bert, Administrative Assistant
Cub and Beth Culbertson, GA Reps

The Minutes of March 1991, BOARD OF DIRECTORS meeting were approved with one editorial change.

MSP to move into Executive Session but requested that Dr. Gilchrist, Mr. Cook and Mrs. De Bert remain.

EX-6/91-1 MSP that the Board of Directors authorize the Stated Clerk to file a complaint with the State of Florida against an attorney for unethical and libelous conduct.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m. with RE William Rocap leading in prayer.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ RE Scott Levy, Chairman

/s/ TE Paul Gilchrist, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
October 5, 1991

The Board of Directors of the Presbyterian Church in America held a regular meeting on October 5, 1991, at the Sheraton Hartsfield West Inn, Atlanta, Georgia.

The meeting was convened by Chairman Scott Levy at 9:20 p.m. with TE Robert Hornick leading in prayer.

A quorum was declared present. Those attending were as follows:

TE Render Caines, CC
TE William Fox, Calvary
TE Robert Hornick, Gulf Coast
TE William Hughes, MS Valley
TE Grady Love, N. Georgia
TE L. Roy Taylor, Grace

RE Neil Adams, IFBD
RE William Bonner, New Jersey
RE Robert Eberst, PCAF
RE Richard Herbert, Mid-America
RE David Huggins, Jr., TN Valley
RE G. Paul Jones, CTS
RE Scott Levy, Illiana
RE William Moore, Potomac
RE William Rocap, C. Carolina
RE Lindsey Tippins, RH
RE Harold Whitlock, Heritage
RE John White, MNA

STAFF:

TE Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk
RE Ross Cook, Business Administrator
Mrs. Laurel De Bert, Administrative Assistant

The Minutes of June 9, 1991, BOARD OF DIRECTORS meeting were approved.

BD-1/91-1 MSP to authorize the staff to refinance the PCA Office Building at any time they can do so, at rates below 10%, between now and the due dates of the present loans.

The meeting was adjourned with prayer by Dr. Paul R. Gilchrist at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ RE Scott Levy, Chairman

/s/ TE Paul Gilchrist, Secretary

APPENDICES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA March 21, 1992

The Board of Directors of the Presbyterian Church in America held a regular meeting on March 21, 1992, at Howard Johnsons Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia.

The meeting was convened by Chairman Scott Levy at 8:45 a.m.. RE Paul Jones led in prayer.

A quorum was declared present. Those attending were as follows:

TE Robert Hornick, Gulf Coast
TE William Hughes, MS Valley
TE Grady Love, N. Georgia
TE Donald MacNair, Missouri
TE L. Roy Taylor, Grace
TE James Shipley, IAR

RE L. B. (Pete) Austin, MTW
RE William Bonner, New Jersey
RE Robert Eberst, PCAF
RE Richard Herbert, Mid-America
RE David Huggins, Jr., TN Valley
RE G. Paul Jones, CTS
RE Scott Levy, Illiana
RE Ralph Mittendorff, CE/P
RE William (Bingy) Moore, Potomac
RE William Rocap, C. Carolina
RE John White, MNA
RE Harold Whitlock, Heritage

STAFF:

TE Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk
RE Ross Cook, Business Administrator
Mrs. Laurel De Bert, Admin. Assistant
Mr. Jerry Kornegay, PCA Historical Center

VISITORS:

Loren Watson, PCA Foundation
Jim Ostenson, attorney

The Minutes of October 5, 1991, BOARD OF DIRECTORS meeting were approved.

BD-3/92-1 MSP that the corporation minutes reflect that the annual corporate filings have been accomplished in a timely manner in all states where the corporation is registered to conduct business.

BD-3/92-2 MSP that the Board of Director's minutes reflect that the annual RPC,ES corporation filings have been accomplished in a timely manner where required.

BD-3/92-3 MSP that the Board of Directors of Presbyterian Church in America (A Corporation) adopt as a policy indemnifying the directors, officers, employees and agents of the corporation to the full extent allowed by the Nonprofit Corporation Code of Georgia as it is currently worded in Official Code of Georgia Annotated Sections 14-3-850 through 14-3-858 or may be hereafter amended.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

BD-3/92-4 MSP that the PCA Board of Directors approve the completion of the Legal Audit Questionnaire developed by the Gammon & Grange law firm and that the services of Gammon & Grange be used in analyzing the audit information.

BD-3/92-5 MSP that all permanent committees and agencies of the General Assembly be asked to participate in (1) the gathering of appropriate information needed for the legal audit, and (2) payment of a proportionate share of the cost of the legal audit, the total cost not to exceed \$5,000. And further that the Board of Directors authorize the preliminary survey through Gammon & Grange for \$275. The preliminary findings and final cost estimates are to be reported at the June meeting.

The meeting was closed at 9:35 a.m. with TE Bob Hornick leading in prayer.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ RE Scott Levy, Chairman

/s/ TE Paul Gilchrist, Secretary

APPENDICES

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE 20TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

*As each one has received a gift,
minister it to one another
as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.*
1 Peter 4:10

The Administrative Committee of the General Assembly has continued to serve the Church of Jesus Christ faithfully "as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." This is true of the committee elected by the General Assembly and of the staff serving the committee and the PCA.

I. MEETINGS BETWEEN THE ASSEMBLIES

Following the annual meeting in June at the 19th General Assembly in Birmingham, Alabama, the committee met twice in Atlanta, Georgia, to take care of the matters assigned to it. The first meeting was held on October 4 and 5, 1991 and another meeting on March 20 and 21, 1992. The annual meeting this year is scheduled for June 15, 1992 in Roanoke, Virginia.

II. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Administrative Committee serves the PCA in its corporate capacity as the Board of Directors. The Board is called to order during the three times the Administrative Committee meets. The minutes of the Board of Directors are attached, see pages 309-312. These minutes contain the routine actions regarding the filing of proper documents with the various States where PCA is incorporated. At the time of this writing, there are no pending suits against the Presbyterian Church in America (A Corporation).

The Board of Directors ratified the two items of correspondence by the Stated Clerk as Secretary of the Board of Directors relative to the use of pension documents by Slavic Mutual Fund Management Corporation which referred to the approval and indemnification by the PCA. The response by the party involved, though delayed, satisfied the directors. The Stated Clerk was authorized to write Slavic Investment Corporation that PCA is satisfied that their "retirement plan has not been endorsed or approved by the PCA or any agency or permanent committee."

Since the beginning of the PCA, there has been a growth of agencies which are serving the church. Some of these have been approved by the General Assembly. There are other organizations which have been developed. The Board of Directors

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

authorized the initial steps of getting a legal audit done regarding our structure and activities as a precaution against the possible existence of any potential liability exposures.

III. GENERAL ASSEMBLY ASSIGNMENTS

The following assignments have been given to the Administrative Committee beyond the responsibilities outlined in the Rules of Assembly Operations:

TRANSLATION OF BCO INTO KOREAN: This assignment has been continued for several years. We are very pleased to report that this has been completed. There are other assignments related to the Korean Language Presbyteries that deal more with the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records.

19-30, p. 80: Personal resolution from TE Timothy Diehl requesting clarification whether the worship services and the evening inspirational services are part of the Assembly and whether committee meetings should be scheduled at these times. The committee's response is incorporated in the recommendations below.

19-36, p. 89: Personal resolution from TE Albert Moginot, Jr. requesting that PCA Bylaws and RAO be printed in such a way so that they fit into the loose-leaf binder of the BCO. The committee's response is given in a recommendation below.

19-67, III, 16 and 17, pp.169-171: Overtures 38 requesting an ad interim committee to study drama and dance in public worship and Overture 39 requesting an ad interim committee to plan the 350th anniversary of WCF were postponed to be docketed for direct consideration by the 20th General Assembly in a timely manner. These have been docketed for Tuesday afternoon, June 16, 1992.

CHURCH ADMINISTRATION MANUAL: For several years, the General Assembly has approved the recommendation of the Committee on Administration (now AC) to develop a *Church Administration Manual* for the benefit of local congregations. Following the litigation related to Old Cutler in Miami, our attorneys have reconsidered the matter by saying that

"if the PCA published a manual telling local churches how to manage their everyday, "temporal" affairs, we could be liable for both what the manual said and did not say. The average judge and jury would have a difficult time accepting the PCA's claim that it only had an ecclesiastical relationship with local churches if it publishes a "how-to" manual for guidance in the legal and administrative affairs of the local church" (Memo from James Ostenson, October 1, 1991).

The AC adopted the recommendations from our legal counsel as follows:

1. That the Administrative Committee discontinue its plans to publish a Church Administration Manual, advising the General Assembly of its concern for the potential civil liability such a project could cause for the Assembly.

APPENDICES

2. That the Administrative Committee return the materials written and developed by various individuals for the Church Administration Manual to those individuals.
3. That the Administrative Committee encourage the publication of a church administration manual or similar resource by a group or entity not under the control of the General Assembly.

19-55, III, 31, p. 126: AC was instructed "to develop a policy and procedure manual with cooperation of all the committees to implement RAO 4-11 in order to independently evaluate the proposed budgets of the permanent committees and agencies." This is being done; a preliminary manual was used for this year's budget review. The committee expects to approve the Manual with some changes at the June 15 meeting.

17-81, II, 51, pp. 147f, part 2: Re: policy audits. The matter of policy and program audits for the permanent committees and agencies was to be studied together with a method to accomplish this. Unfortunately this has not been accomplished. It is our hope to do something with this this coming year and report to the 21st General Assembly.

IV. PCA OFFICE BUILDING

We have a mortgage balance of \$2,044,000 as of June 1, a reduction of \$173,000 from June 1991. Beginning July 1 the mortgage will be refinanced for 5 years at 9.0%. With the building fully occupied we can continue to operate at a breakeven level and apply all contributions to the principal.

V. PERSONNEL

We continue to function with the same size staff that we have had for over two years, with basically no turn-over. The PCA growth rate of 5% a year and the development of new presbyteries increase the workload on our staff. The product enhancements in our ACS software and the constant retraining of our staff in computer utilization has helped to keep our productivity apace with the demands.

We are especially grateful for the hardworking and efficient staff we have. Ross Cook, as Business Administrator, has put in very long hours during the last several months, especially researching the matters relating to D and O liability insurance. Administrative Assistant Laurel De Bert manages a dedicated staff of 5 other ladies very well, keeping track of priority tasks to insure they are completed in a timely fashion. Elsewhere, you have the report of our very able archivist and Director of the PCA Historical Center, Jerry Kornegay.

VI. SOME OF THE MORE IMPORTANT ACTIONS TAKEN

1. Approved new exhibitors for General Assembly subject to space availability: Baker Book House, AMMI, POLYCON Management Services, Palmer Home

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

for Children, Operation Exodus-Inner City, Soli Deo Gloria, Atlantic Coast Communications, Partners International, Family Entertainment Network, Biblical Counseling Foundation, International Society of Christian Endeavor, Logos Research Systems/Librarian's Helper, and Burks Moving & Storage; also to reconfirm Literacy and Evangelism International as an exhibitor.

2. Approved speakers and participants as requested by the 20th GA Arrangements Committee: Cal Thomas, John Whitehead, Mark Beliles, Stephen McDowell, Os Guinness; and three musicians: Lori McGinnis, Debbie Kier, Teresa Moshelle.
3. Set the following dates for AC meetings: June 15, 1992 in Roanoke, October 9-10, 1992 in Atlanta, March 19-20, 1993 in Atlanta, June 7, 1993 in Columbia, South Carolina, and October 1-2, 1993 in Atlanta.
4. Made a thorough evaluation of the Stated Clerk's work.

VII. RESPONSE TO EXCEPTIONS TAKEN TO MINUTES

1. The AC respectfully disagrees that the Board of Directors minutes should be excepted. The Minutes of the Board of Directors of 6/6/90 were mistaken by the Committee of Commissioners for the March 16, 1991, minutes which had not been approved. These minutes were corrected at the June 1991 meeting which met concurrently with the Committee of Commissioners on Administration and the correction was so reported to the Committee of Commissioners but was not taken into consideration. The Board recognizes it has no power to amend the Bylaws on its own authority.
2. The AC respectfully disagrees that the minutes of 3/15-16/91 call for an exception in item BF-3/91-13. The minutes of 3/15-16/91 reporting the budget amounts are not discrepancies. The budget recommended prior to the committee meeting was in fact changed by the Administrative Committee to incorporate the increase in compensation recommended by the officers of the Committee. Hence the two different figures. This also was reported to the Committee of Commissioners, but was not taken into consideration.
3. The Administrative Committee agrees that the AC changed the date of the close of the 19th General Assembly from Friday to Thursday. Within the spirit of their assignment the AC scheduled the close on Thursday for the following reasons: (1) General Assembly has encouraged AC that the docket should be streamlined and made more efficient; (2) the experience of the last two or three years has been that the Assembly did in fact conclude its business earlier than docketed; (3) when preparing a docket the AC is under no mandate to stretch out the business just for the sake of filling time; (4) in the interest of stewardship having a shorter meeting is more economical; (5) historically, the Monday through Friday Assembly period was set to avoid having an Assembly in 2 calendar weeks.

APPENDICES

4. The AC agrees with general exception 2 that we have not completed the "Church Administration Manual." As long as there was litigation against PCA, Inc., we were advised to hold off on this project. Subsequently we have been advised by legal counsel that production of such a manual is not advisable. (See Section III above.)
5. The AC agrees with general exception 3 that no progress report was given on the PCA Logo. The AC will seek to give a progress report to the 20th General Assembly.
6. The AC respectfully disagrees with the general exception 4 regarding the deficit reported in the *Handbook* and the audited statement. The report in the *Handbook* was the unaudited (and therefore not the final corrected) statement. The formal audit was received after the *Handbook* went to press, hence the audited statement is the correct figure in any case. This was reported to the Committee of Commissioners but was not taken into consideration.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the 20th General Assembly accept the invitation from Mississippi Valley Presbytery to host the 26th General Assembly in 1998 in Jackson, MS, subject to review of the facilities in Jackson for housing, etc.
2. That the 20th GA accept the invitation from Potomac Presbytery to host the 27th GA in Baltimore, MD, in 1999.
3. That the 20th GA accept the invitation from Southwest Florida Presbytery to host the 28th GA in Tampa, FL, in the year 2000.
4. That the 20th GA commend the Korean *BCO* translation team for their excellent endeavors, namely: Rev. Nah, Sung Kyun, Rev. Kim, Hosea Ju, Rev. Kim, Paul Taek Yong, Dr. Dan Kim of MNA and Dr. Dwight Linton of CE&P.
5. That the 20th GA refer all pending matters relative to the records of the Korean language presbyteries to the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records, in accordance with *MISGA*, 15-96, III, 19, p.207, namely:
 - a) Each Korean presbytery should check its current bylaws or standing rules for conformity to the *BCO*,
 - b) New English translation of each presbytery's rules be submitted to the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records,
 - c) Each Korean presbytery should appoint a representative to certify the English translation of all Korean minutes submitted to the Committee on Review (or to serve on the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records to review other Korean minutes). [Note: this latter part has been recommended by the officers of the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records.]

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

6. The 19th General Assembly received the following personal resolution from TE Albert Moginot, Jr. and referred it to the Administrative Committee:
Whereas the Rules of Assembly Operation (RAO) is about 25 pages long and is printed for every commissioner every year, resulting in large printing costs and a waste of paper,
Therefore be it resolved that the General Assembly print the RAO on paper that will fit into the looseleaf BCO, so they can be saved and used every year and updated as necessary in the same manner that the BCO is updated.
- Response: (a) That the 20th GA authorize the Stated Clerk to produce the Certificate of Incorporation, Bylaws and RAO to be inserted with the BCO rather than in the *Handbook for Commissioners*. Copies are to be made available at each General Assembly.
(b) That the Stated Clerk be instructed not to print these documents in the *Minutes of General Assembly* since they will be updated and printed along with any amendments to the BCO following each General Assembly.
7. That the 20th GA respond to Overture 2 from Missouri Presbytery "Print RAO to Fit Looseleaf BCO" (which is the same as personal resolution from TE Albert Moginot) by reference to recommendation 6 above.
8. That the 20th GA take note that the concerns of Overture 4 from New Jersey Presbytery ["Worship Services at General Assembly"] have been reflected in this year's docket.
9. That the 20th General Assembly answer Overture 4 in the negative.
Grounds: It will unduly limit the time and content of the worship services at General Assembly.
10. The 19th GA received the following personal resolution from TE Timothy Diehl and referred it to the AC:
"Request clarification for future General Assemblies: (1) a statement as to whether the worship and/or inspirational evening services are a part of the Assembly, and (2) if it is determined that they are a part of the Assembly, that no committee meetings be scheduled/held during the service(s) and that the AC report back to the 20th General Assembly."
Response: (a) The docket of the 20th GA has been structured so that the stated worship services during the docketed time of the Assembly are part of the Assembly and committee meetings should not be scheduled for those times. The evening inspirational meetings and other seminars are not considered part of the Assembly docket.
(b) The AC recommends that this procedure be adopted for future General Assemblies.
11. That the 20th GA respond respectfully to communication 2 from Westminster Theological Seminary in the negative.

APPENDICES

GROUNDS: There are already several members of the PCA on the Westminster Seminary Board and Faculty and do not see the necessity of adding a non-voting observer.

12. That the AC be released from the responsibility of producing a *Church Administration Manual* since this could have unnecessary legal implications.
13. That the 20th GA express its heartfelt appreciation for the AC staff in Atlanta and St. Louis, and that Dr. Paul R. Gilchrist be commended for his good work as Stated Clerk and be elected for another year of service.
14. That the General Assembly approve Robins, Eskew and Farmer, PC as auditors for the Administrative Committee, Christian Education & Publications, and Mission to North America for the calendar year ending December 31, 1992.
15. Approve the Administrative Committee budget for \$992,336, and ASKINGS budget of \$851,886, and approve the PCA Office Building budget for \$620,650.
16. Approve the Covenant College budget for \$9,427,527 and the ASKINGS budget of \$1,308,000. It was noted that the President's salary and benefits exceed the recommended cap for CEO salaries.
17. Approve the Covenant Seminary budget for \$3,296,700 and the ASKINGS budget of \$1,525,000.
18. Approve the PCA Insurance, Annuities & Relief budget for \$750,000.
19. Approve the Investors' Fund for Building and Development budget for \$322,553.
20. Approve the Mission to North America budget for \$3,458,000 and ASKINGS budget of \$3,110,000.
21. Approve the Mission to the World budget for \$16,300,550 and ASKINGS budget of \$15,695,000.
22. Approve the MTW Impact budget for \$2,709,390.
23. Approve the Ridge Haven budget for \$565,575 and ASKINGS budget of \$508,075.
24. Approve the PCA Foundation budget for \$399,000.
25. VACATED

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

26. Approve the Christian Education & Publications budget for \$2,011,357 operating expenditures and ASKINGS of \$1,218,477, exclusive of *Messenger* subsidy. This means disapproval of the line item of \$100,000 for the PCA *Messenger* support subsidy.
27. That the 20th General Assembly rescind actions of 1982, 1988 and 1989 where GA authorized funding of the *Messenger* by undesignated funds, namely:
 - 1982, p. 117,10-90,III,16: *That the General Assembly instruct the PCA Business Administrator to pay for the total printing and postal cost of the Messenger out of the total of undesignated funds given to the General Assembly each month prior to percentage distribution of those funds to the Permanent Committees. . . .*
 - 1988, p. 122, 16-33, III,15: *That whereas, the PCA Messenger is seeking to serve the entire church as a vital part of the PCA's programs; and . . . Therefore, CEIP requests that the General Assembly continue to allow the use of the undesignated funds to assist with the printing and postage of the PCA Messenger, to be reviewed at the 1989 Assembly.*
 - 1989, p. 81, 17-47, III, 8: *That the General Assembly continue to allow the use of undesignated funds to help with the cost of publishing the PCA Messenger and that local churches be encouraged by the Assembly, through the Stated Clerk, to participate in the every-family plan subscription.*
28. That the 20th General Assembly require all the committee and agency budgets to be in the same format as financial statements.
29. That the 20th General Assembly erect an Ad Interim Committee to develop a PCA Logo to be presented to the GA subject to adequate funding "for consultation with professional designers".
30. That the 20th General Assembly require all committees and agencies to participate in the Legal Audit Questionnaire.
31. That the 20th GA direct the completion of a Representative Legal Audit Analysis for the PCA, the cost not to exceed \$17,398, which is to be divided equally among the ten committees and agencies. Further, if adopted that the budgets for committees and agencies be adjusted accordingly.
32. That the 20th GA direct the completion of an on-site representative field audit contingent on obtaining designated funding through PCA Foundation or otherwise. The cost is approximately \$10,000.

APPENDICES

33. That the 20th General Assembly approve the auditing firm of Ernst & Young to audit Mission to the World and MTW/*IMPACT*'s book of account for the year 1992.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Scott T. Levy
Chairman

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 1

REPORT OF THE PCA HISTORICAL CENTER TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

Purpose: The purpose of the Historical Center is to fulfill the records management and historical preservation/research needs of the Presbyterian Church in America, its agencies and the churches of the denomination.

Assessment: The Historical Center has begun an annual survey and assessment program based on a model developed by the Society of American Archivists. Under this program annual reviews are conducted to identify areas of strength and weakness in archival operations in areas such as, administration, facilities, security, record processing and outreach. The survey of the Historical Center revealed several areas that needed to be improved or modified. Items identified for immediate action included:

- development of a written training manual
- improvement of outreach programs

Training Manual: For the past year the Historical Center has used trained students workers to process church histories and manuscript collections. At the beginning of the Spring 1992 semester new workers needed to be hired and trained. A comprehensive instruction manual (on all aspects of archival work at the Center) has now been developed to facilitate training of all new personnel.

Intern Program: An internship program has been established with Missouri Baptist College. Students interested in archival training will work in the Historical Center, for up to twelve hours per week, for an entire semester. While this program will provide the Center with additional personnel, at no financial cost, the interns will require close supervision by the director for a short period of time until they can be certified as fully trained. The Center's first intern, Yael Davis, worked for us during the Spring semester of this year.

Outreach Program: As part of an expanding outreach effort a slide/tape seminar program is being developed for use by the Women In the Church. This seminar program will include handout materials, information on writing a church history and a brief description of the functions of the Historical Center. Current planning calls for the slide/tape program to be available for the WIC Conference in September 1992.

Museum Display: Photographic materials and original newspaper articles from the James A. McAlpine Collection were recently loaned to the Sheerar Museum in Stillwater, Oklahoma. Reverend McAlpine was the director of a Japanese Language School at Stillwater for the United States Navy during World War II. The Historical Center was able to provide photographs of the staff, students and student life for the

APPENDICES

Oklahoma display. Some of the material loaned to the Sheerar Museum is part of this year's Historical Center General Assembly display.

Research: Over the past twelve months two professional researchers/writers visited the Historical Center. In July, Dr. Eldon Hay, Professor of Religious Studies from Mt. Allison University in Canada visited the Center. He was researching Reformed Presbyterian ministers in Canada during the late 1800's. Earlier in the year, Mr. Art Matthews of "World Magazine" was in the Center gathering information on the National Association of Evangelicals. The Center continues to receive additional requests for information by telephone and mail.

Oral History: The Oral History program begun late last year is progressing well. Volunteers, in many parts of the country, have conducted interviews with the following individuals: Robert Hastings, C. Gregg Singer, Henry G. Welbon, Todd W. Allen, and William A. Mahlow Sr. Additional interviews are scheduled to be completed over the next several months. The Oral History program is also being assisted by another volunteer, Mrs. Cindi Millen, who is transcribing the oral interviews for the Historical Center. She has completed the transcription of the interview with Dr. Robert G. Rayburn and is now working on the interviews between J. Oliver Buswell and Edward A. Steele.

Processing: The following collections have been fully processed over the past twelve months and have been entered into the Center's computer data base:

Presbyterian Journal Records
Papers of Dr. J. Oliver Buswell
Papers of Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Papers of Rev. James A. McAlpine

Computer Data Base: The MicroMARC system of computer archival record keeping and retrieval is up and running for nearly half of our processed records and collections. The system establishes a data base much like a library card catalog system. The system will continue to be updated on a regular basis. This system has already provided valuable assistance in responding to reference requests.

Staff: The staff of the Historical Center consists of a full time director, one student intern and four volunteers.

Margaret Stephens, Mrs. Al (Florence) Graham, Mrs. Robert (LaVerne) Rayburn and Mrs. Cindi Millen are our volunteers. They have been active processing collections, organizing photographic materials and in transcribing oral interviews.

Historical Center Sub-Committee: Members of the Sub-Committee are:

Mr. Scott T. Levy, Chairman	Dr. David B. Calhoun
Miss Lannae Graham	Mr. Edward S. Harris
Dr. Donald J. MacNair	Mrs. Paul (Georgia) Settle

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Contributions: We greatly appreciate the continued prayers and financial support we have received over the past year from individuals, the WIC's and congregations of our denomination. Unfortunately, contributions to the work of the Historical Center declined approximately ten percent over the past calendar year. As a result of this reduced funding no seminary student workers were hired in the Fall Semester. This led to a reduction in the number of man hours devoted to the processing of records and personal collections. A portion of this shortfall has been made up by our volunteers and student intern.

Next twelve months: During the next year emphasis will be given to the processing of local church histories, responding to all reference requests and collecting oral interviews with our more senior denominational leaders. The Center will continue to look for ways to increase its outreach and service to the denomination.

Jerry Komegay
Director

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 2

APPROVED 1993 ASKINGS (1)
for the PCA
GENERAL ASSEMBLY MINISTRIES

	1992 EXPENSE BUDGET	1993 EXPENSE BUDGET	1993 ASKINGS	percent of TOTAL	\$ Per MEMBER
Administrative Committee (4)	\$1,601,981	\$ 1,614,726	\$ 853,626	3.5	\$ 4.50
Christian Education & Publications	1,947,252	2,013,097	1,220,217	5.0	6.43
Mission to North America	3,561,772	3,458,000	3,111,740	12.9	16.40
Mission to The World	14,953,000	16,302,290	15,696,740	64.8	82.73
Covenant College (3)	8,729,339	9,429,267	1,309,740	5.4	6.90
Covenant Seminary (3)	2,965,950	3,298,440	1,526,740	6.3	8.05
Ridge Haven	491,358	567,315	509,815	2.1	2.69
IMPACT	2,878,798	2,709,390	-0-	-0-	-0-
Insurance, Annuities & Relief	785,000	751,740	-0-	-0-	-0-
Investors Fund for Building and Development	366,585	324,293	-0-	-0-	-0-
PCA Foundation (2)	(350,168)	(400,740)	-0-	-0-	-0-
TOTALS	\$38,281,035	\$40,468,558	\$24,228,618	100.0%	\$127.70

TOTAL COMMUNICANT MEMBERS (1991 STATISTICS) = 189,737

- (1) The ASKINGS is that portion of the approved expense budget which is dependent on contributions from the PCA churches and individuals. When the contributions are less than the amount of the ASKINGS, the committees, agencies and institutions cannot fulfill the programs and services which the General Assembly approved at the June 1992 meeting.
- (2) The PCA Foundation budget is included in the budgets of the participating committees and agencies for reimbursement. Therefore, its budget is not added to the total.
- (3) Institutions are on a July 1 through June 30 Fiscal Year.
- (4) The PCA Office Building budget is not included in the ASKINGS. The gifts for the Office Building Fund are over and above the ASKINGS and benefit all of the committees and agencies in Atlanta.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 3

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS FOR 1993

The budgets have been built on actual history, future plans and assumptions listed below.

A. Stated Clerk/Administration

1. Cost of Living (COL) Index for 1993 will increase 4.0%.
2. Postage (mailings) rates will increase 10%.
3. Health insurance premiums will increase 25% in January 1993.
4. Costs for travel (travel, hotel and food) will increase 15%.
5. Workman's Compensation insurance premiums will increase 15%.
6. The PCA growth rate will be 5%.

B. Office building

1. Increase rent 3.7% to \$14 per square foot starting January 1993.
2. Reduce mortgage \$50,000 in addition to the regular payment schedule in 1993.

APPENDICES

**STATED CLERK/ADMINISTRATION
BUDGETS COMPARISONS**

DESCRIPTION	1991 BUDGET	(1) 1991 ACTUAL	1992 BUDGET	1993 PROPOSED
INCOME				
1 Undesignated	6,000	0	6,000	15,000
2 Designated	834,565	526,407	1,032,981	838,626
3 Earned	18,000	156,161	17,000	135,050
4 Interest	6,000	6,742	6,000	5,400
5 TOTAL INCOME	864,565	689,310	1,061,981	994,076
EXPENDITURES				
6a St. Clrk. Sal. & Housing	57,550	57,550	63,508	59,238
6b St. Clrk. Benefits	9,075	9,075	9,242	15,652
6c Salaries & Benefits	354,300	244,116	418,601	352,076
7 Travel	165,940	89,885	228,820	209,925
8 Rent	42,200	36,567	58,960	40,054
9 Janitor/Grounds	0	0	0	0
10 Mail/Ship	28,500	28,461	29,950	34,126
11 Office Supplies	14,000	13,008	17,220	18,710
12 Telephone	15,750	18,059	21,640	21,680
13 Maintenance	5,500	7,275	8,400	8,685
14 Leased Equipment	9,000	5,141	11,730	9,560
15 Dues/Subscriptions	2,650	5,113	4,920	7,470
16 Insurance	1,500	3,211	10,000	6,270
17 Interest	1,600	130	1,000	500
18 Printing	46,250	66,453	54,070	65,785
19 Training/Development	4,900	2,412	7,800	5,450
20 Promotion	4,000	5,692	6,010	8,540
21 Foundation	37,500	26,875	33,750	49,875
22 Planning	8,000	0	5,000	3,000
23 Professional Services	19,440	14,942	19,060	19,740
24 Taxes	3,500	3,647	3,100	4,000
25 Utilities	0	0	0	0
26 Contingencies	8,250	12,368	25,000	22,240
27 Depreciation	30,600	(2) 28113	24,200	31,500
28 TOTAL EXPENSES	864,565	(2) 678093	1,061,981	994,076
29 Surplus /(deficit)	0	(2) 11217	0	0

NOTE (1) These figures do not reflect the final year-end adjustments.

(2) Revised 4/10/92 -- Auditor's journal entry.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATED CLERK/ADMINISTRATION
PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1993

Description	A B C D E				TOTAL AC OPERATIONS
	Stated Clerk	Historical Center	Standing Committees	General Assembly	
INCOME					
1 Undesignated	818,626	20,000	0	0	838,626
2 Designated	10,000	5,000	0	0	15,000
3 Earned	6,000	1,000	(1) 8,050	120,000	135,050
4 Interest	5,400	0	0	0	5,400
5 TOTAL INCOME	840,026	26,000	8,050	120,000	994,076
EXPENDITURES					
6a St. CK salary	59,238	0	0	0	59,238
6b St CK benefits	15,652	0	0	0	15,652
6c Staff salary/Benefits	271,260	38,816	2,260	360	352,076
7 Travel	68,425	2,100	123,080	16,320	209,925
8 Rent	40,054	0	0	0	40,054
9 Janitor/grounds	0	0	0	0	0
10 Mailing/Shipping	22,326	1,500	2,260	8,040	34,126
11 Office Supplies	13,850	3,500	1,000	360	18,710
12 Telephone	16,600	1,300	2,580	1,200	21,680
13 Maintenance	7,685	1,000	0	0	8,685
14 Leased Equipment	5,000	0	0	4,560	9,560
15 Dues/Subscription	4,960	250	2,260	0	7,470
16 Insurance	6,270	0	0	0	6,270
17 Interest	500	0	0	0	500
18 Printing	22,775	250	2,260	40,500	65,785
19 Training/Development	4,500	750	0	200	5,450
20 Promotion	3,000	3,500	0	2,040	8,540
21 Foundation	49,875	0	0	0	49,875
22 Planning	3,000	0	0	0	3,000
23 Professional Services	19,440	100	0	200	19,740
24 Taxes	4,000	0	0	0	4,000
25 Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
26 Contingencies	15,000	400	0	6,840	22,240
27 Depreciation	30,900	600	0	0	31,500
28 TOTAL EXPENSES	684,310	54,066	135,700	120,000	994,076
29 Surplus/(deficit)	155,716	-28,066	-127,650	0	0

NOTE: (1) Ad-Interim committees funded.

PCA OFFICE BUILDING
PROPOSED BUDGETS FOR 1993

DESCRIPTION	1991 ACTUALS (1)				1992 BUDGETS				1993 PROPOSED BUDGETS				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
	BUILDING CAPITAL CONSOLIDATED OPERATIONS FUND				BUILDING CAPITAL CONSOLIDATED OPERATIONS FUND				BUILDING CAPITAL CONSOLIDATED OPERATIONS FUND				
INCOME													
1 Undesignated	1,800	184,864	186,664	0	240,000	240,000	0	125,000	125,000	0	5,000	5,000	10,000
2 Designated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,000	6,000	6,000
3 Earned	28,323	0	28,323	12,000	0	12,000	465,750	0	0	0	519,300	519,300	519,300
4 Rent	486,437	0	486,437	465,750	0	465,750	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5 TOTAL INCOME	516,560	184,864	701,424	477,750	240,000	717,750	477,750	130,000	666,300	536,300	536,300	130,000	666,300
EXPENDITURES													
6 Salaries & Benefits	0	0	0	8,580	0	8,580	0	3,560	15,700	12,140	0	1,800	1,800
7 Travel	0	0	0	0	1,980	1,980	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 Rent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 Janitor/Grounds	31,810	0	31,810	33,420	0	33,420	0	0	35,000	35,000	0	0	35,000
10 Mail/Ship	102	0	102	1,980	960	2,940	0	250	1,750	250	1,500	1,500	1,750
11 Office Supplies	76	0	76	480	0	480	0	100	200	100	100	100	200
12 Telephone	1,834	97	1,931	1,620	360	1,980	0	500	2,480	1,980	500	500	2,480
13 Maintenance	38,585	0	38,585	24,600	0	24,600	0	0	42,500	42,500	0	0	42,500
14 Leased Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15 Dues/Subscriptions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 Insurance	14,103	0	14,103	4,320	0	4,320	0	15,300	15,300	15,300	0	0	15,300
17 Interest	4,297	185,608	189,905	3,960	157,500	161,460	0	4,500	179,500	4,500	175,000	175,000	179,500
18 Printing	0	1,122	1,122	480	0	480	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	1,000
19 Training/Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20 Promotion	0	2,843	2,843	0	4,800	4,800	0	4,800	4,800	4,800	0	4,800	4,800
21 Foundation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22 Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23 Professional Services	26,114	0	26,114	1,980	0	1,980	0	14,750	14,750	14,750	0	0	14,750
24 Taxes	51,129	0	51,129	49,980	0	49,980	0	55,000	55,000	55,000	0	0	55,000
25 Utilities	88,638	0	88,638	92,400	0	92,400	0	95,870	95,870	95,870	0	0	95,870
26 Contingencies	11,918	0	11,918	3,600	0	3,600	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	0	0	15,000
27 Depreciation	46,103	95,618	141,721	29,400	117,000	146,400	0	40,000	100,000	40,000	100,000	100,000	140,000
28 TOTAL EXPENSES	314,709	285,288	599,997	256,320	283,080	539,400	256,320	332,390	288,260	332,390	288,260	332,390	620,650
29 Surplus (deficit)	201,851	-100,424	101,427	221,430	-43,080	178,350	221,430	203,910	-158,260	203,910	-158,260	203,910	45,650

NOTE (1) Preliminary. These figures do not reflect final year end adjustments.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION & PUBLICATIONS

Proposed Budget

Background, Assumptions and Analysis

January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:

CE/P's proposed budget for 1993 represents a 3% increase over the 1992 approved budget. This increase is primarily due to the increased expenses associated with the production of and utilization of the 1992 Love Gift. However, this increase will be offset by the expected \$100,000 Love Gift income. The proposed surplus of \$35,000 is the portion of the Love Gift that will be left over to fund future WIC activities.

Excluding the impact of the Love Gift, the 1993 budget reflects no material increase over the 1992 budget. It is, however, a significant increase over the actual performance of 1991. The recession during 1991 and the beginning of 1992 has adversely impacted contributions and revenues. CE/P budgeted for 1993 in anticipation of a short-lived recession and consequently plans to return to the level of growth seen during 1990.

It is important to note that CE/P's contribution need only increased \$6,200 (or 1/2%). CE/P has attempted and continues to utilize other revenues to make up for continuous shortfalls in church's support of the ASKINGS.

CE/P's share of the ASKINGS has not increased at a rate comparable to several other committees (MTW and MNA). Consequently CE/P's "piece of the pie" has gotten smaller. For example, a church sends a predetermined amount of money to AC and asks that it be distributed according to the ASKINGS. Because other committees have increased their ASKINGS at a faster rate they continue to receive a larger share. In effect, CE/P continues to lose contribution income.

ASSUMPTIONS AND ANALYSIS:

1. *Salaries and Benefits* budget increased from 1992 to 1993 due to the following:
 - * A 5% salary increase and a 6% increase in annuity benefits from the 1992 budget. NOTE: CE/P has given below COL increases for the past three years.
 - * IAR projects a potential 25% increase in health premiums. Premiums increased 21% from 1991 to 1992.
 - * The part-time Ministry to Elderly Consultant position was removed from the 1993 budget in order to fund the growth in other areas given higher priority in the CE/P's strategic plan. Any efforts in elderly ministries will be in the form of Curriculum/Video Productions in the Publications and Curriculum cost center.
 - * A new position of WIC Administrator is reflected in the 1993 budget. This position will be responsible for the day-to-day oversight of publications, meetings, etc. (Total compensation = \$26,225).
2. *Bookstore Inventory Purchases* is a cash expenditure not cost of merchandise sold. CE/P projects a significant increase over the 1991 actual purchases as CE/P will have to continue to add new titles in order to remain competitive and a full-service bookstore. However, the 1993 projection is less than 1992 as CE/P has computerized its purchasing function thus reducing the average size of its orders.
3. *Supplies, Telephone, Computer Expense, Equipment Maintenance, and Miscellaneous* were collectively decreased 7% from the 1992 budget. The 1990 actual results were exceptionally low due to the fact that CE/P postponed some needed maintenance and purchases. The lease on the PCA's telephone system expires

APPENDICES

in the fall of 1992. The building fund will absorb the largest portion of this; however, certain costs could be passed along to CE/P. Furthermore, the growth of the WIC department, Bookstore and AV Library will drive these overhead expenses up during 1992 and 1993.

4. *Printing* assumes 12,000 *Messenger* subscribers and 340 Bulletin Supplement subscribers. The increase in printing expenses is attributed to inflation and the increased volume driven by the AV Library, WIC and the anticipated need for more promotional literature for the *Messenger*.
5. *Postage and Shipping* increase is due to an anticipated 10% increase. UPS increased its residential delivery rates in February 1992 and future rate increases are anticipated. The portion of the increase is due to the fact that CE/P now provides and plans to continue provided a contract mail service to IAR and AC. This increase is offset by a projected revenue increase.
6. *Equipment* continues to age at a pace faster than CE/P has the capital to replace it. Within the next 1 1/2 years CE/P will have to replace a copy machine, postage meter, the van and eight personal computers which are marginally functional.
7. *Office Rent* has increased \$20,000 for extra space in 1992. Subsequently, CE/P was able to attain 1/4 of the space for a corresponding savings. Part-time staff are sharing space and CE/P anticipates its current office space to be marginally sufficient through 1993.
8. *Liability Insurance* increased 10% due to several offsetting factors. Workman's compensation should decrease as the PCA's experience has improved. However, AC determined that the Director's and Officer's insurance was inadequate so additional insurance was purchased.
9. *Professional Consultants* represents anticipated use of circulation and/or fund raising consultants.
10. *Travel expenses* are anticipated to increase 15% primarily due to the airline industry. However, CE/P plans to offset this increase as the staff typically travels by automobile and is extremely conservative when choosing accommodations.
12. *The Graphics/Design* increase is due to the increased publications of WIC and the additional promotional material and catalogs that will be produced by the Bookstore and AV Library.
13. *Video Purchases* reflect the ongoing need to keep CE/P's library current with new releases, replacing damaged tapes, and serving an increasing membership base.
14. Externally assigned expenses.
15. Meeting Facility represents the cost of accommodations for various conferences - primarily Pastor and Wives' Conferences.
16. *Committee Meetings* expenses are for the CE Committee meeting, WASC and PresWIC meeting. As the WIC has been able to get all presbyteries involved, expenses have exceeded expectations.
17. *Promotion and Special Events* have been used interchangeably. This line item contains expenses for fund-raising letters and appeals, pastors' lunches hosted by CE/P, the *Messenger's* Writer's Conference. These expenses must increase in order for CE/P to keep its ministries in front of the local church.
18. *Curriculum/Video Production* represents \$35,000 of the 1992 WIC Love Gift income which will be used to produce a video and study series for the Women in the Church.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

19. *Love 1992 Production* expenses represent the amount spent on the production and distribution of the Love Gift to the local churches. This video will continue to be used as the foundation to promoting local WIC organizations.

RELATIONSHIP TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

- * The Men of the Covenant and efforts to promote stewardship within the PCA is represented in the Coordinator's and Program Administrator's salary, travel and overhead as they are and will be spearheading these ministries. Any newsletters or other communications pieces would be paid for out of printing in the "Curriculum/Publications" cost center.
- * Any work in the area of establishing assessment centers for pastors and wives would be through the Pastor's Conference ministry. Therefore, only additional travel for participants would be necessary.
- * Youth Ministry is an established cost center.

OTHER ASSUMPTIONS WITH REVENUE IMPACT:

- * Book Sales began to decline in 1991 as anticipated in the assumptions for the 1992 budget. Because the actual 1991 sales were essentially the same as the 1992 budget, the 1993 budget has been decreased by \$10,000 for conservatism.
- * *Messenger* advertising assumes \$8,000 per issue. This is somewhat less than projected for 1992. However, the economy has caused many advertisers to decrease their advertising budgets.
- * Average *Messenger* circulation at 12,000 (currently 10,100). Average Bulletin Supplement circulation at 340 (currently 250).
- * AV Membership Fees assumes 265 churches participating at \$150 each.

REVENUE PROJECTION:

Book Sales	\$ 380,000
Advertising	88,000
Subscriptions	132,130
Seminar Fees	15,000
AV Library Fees	39,750
Postage Reimbursement	58,000
Conference/Meeting Fees	15,000
WIC 1992 Love Gift	100,000
Messenger Subsidy/Support	* 100,000
Contribution Need	1,220,217
 TOTAL INCOME	 \$2,048,097

- * Deleted by action of General Assembly

APPENDICES

PCA CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND PUBLICATIONS

Proposed Budget

January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed
INCOME:				
Contributions and Support	1,047,786	683,859	1,212,252	1,220,217
Contribution of 1992 Love Gift		-0-	-0-	100,000
Messenger Support/Subsidy *		0	0	100,000
Other Revenue	<u>700,000</u>	<u>771,738</u>	<u>735,000</u>	<u>727,880</u>
TOTAL INCOME	1,747,786	1,455,597	1,947,252	2,048,097
EXPENSES:				
Coordinator Department	116,759	108,079	126,051	128,971
Bulletin Supplement	23,471	16,832	25,345	25,594
Messenger	414,965	337,927	381,857	396,718
Training Seminars	139,048	110,695	129,656	140,710
Regional Trainers	28,100	9,760	31,505	20,250
Administration & Development	319,402	289,222	366,360	377,046
Cross Cultural	16,477	13,653	19,095	19,525
Bookstore	481,360	417,083	518,968	524,302
Pastor's Conferences	33,170	19,346	24,200	28,695
Women in the Church	80,500	89,501	134,522	198,341
Curriculum/Publications	40,500	1,398	45,750	43,250
Ministry to Elderly	-0-	-0-	29,920	-0-
Youth Ministries	-0-	-0-	56,638	45,715
Audio Visual	<u>54,034</u>	<u>48,960</u>	<u>57,385</u>	<u>63,979</u>
TOTAL EXPENSES	1,747,786	1,462,456	1,947,252	2,013,097
Surplus/(deficit)	-0-	-6,859	-0-	35,000

LINE ITEM BUDGET

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed
INCOME:				
Contributions and Support	1,047,786	683,859	1,212,252	1,220,217
Contribution of 1992 Love Gift		-0-	-0-	100,000
Messenger Support/Subsidy *		0	0	100,000
Other Revenue	<u>700,000</u>	<u>771,738</u>	<u>735,000</u>	<u>727,880</u>
TOTAL INCOME	1,747,786	1,455,597	1,947,252	2,048,097
EXPENSES:				
Coordinator Salary	50,110	50,117	52,187	54,796
Coordinator Benefits	12,528	13,569	15,479	15,475
Staff Salaries	473,216	445,730	560,716	595,114
Staff Benefits	83,105	71,785	100,582	121,637
Employer FICA Tax	<u>21,632</u>	<u>22,461</u>	<u>29,818</u>	<u>30,064</u>
TOTAL SALARIES AND BENEFITS (1)	640,591	603,662	758,782	817,086

* NOTE: By action of the General Assembly, line items for PCA Messenger support were not approved

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND PUBLICATIONS - Continued

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed
Purchases-Bookstore Inventory ⁽²⁾	250,000	198,219	265,000	235,000
Office Supplies ⁽³⁾	23,000	8,603	18,850	15,150
Telephone ⁽³⁾	25,000	24,983	29,900	30,100
Computer Expense ⁽³⁾	9,500	7,739	7,780	9,350
Printing ⁽⁴⁾	200,000	166,159	201,200	190,000
Postage/Shipping Materials ⁽⁵⁾	105,000	96,317	119,400	126,600
Miscellaneous ⁽³⁾	9,000	2,247	9,975	10,390
Dues and Subscriptions	4,000	1,447	2,050	1,925
Equipment Rental/Maintenance ⁽³⁾	15,000	5,294	10,000	8,400
Equipment Purchases ⁽⁶⁾	5,000	308	3,000	2,000
Capital Expenditures ⁽⁶⁾	25,000	34,823	25,000	40,000
Office Rent ⁽⁷⁾	79,500	79,393	100,495	86,646
Warehouse Rent	2,700	2,700	1,800	2,100
Liability Insurance ⁽⁸⁾	6,500	11,953	7,800	13,150
Property Tax	7,000	5,472	7,700	5,950
Professional Consulting ⁽⁹⁾	5,000	896	5,000	3,000
Travel ⁽¹⁰⁾	75,950	51,379	80,000	75,000
Book Allowance	1,000	1,217	1,170	1,550
Vehicles	7,000	4,316	8,200	7,400
Staff Development	2,500	2,645	3,000	2,800
Graphics/Design ⁽¹²⁾	60,000	40,395	55,000	54,500
Advertising	4,000	515	4,500	54,500
Video Purchases ⁽¹³⁾	20,000	16,217	22,000	22,000
GCP Curriculum	40,000	342	20,000	20,000
PCA Foundation ⁽¹⁴⁾	40,000	26,875	43,750	46,000
GA Shared Expenses ⁽¹⁴⁾	2,945	1,920	3,000	2,500
Audit Fees ⁽¹⁴⁾	6,000	-	5,800	6,000
Meeting Facility ⁽¹⁵⁾	15,000	14,199	12,000	19,000
Committee Meetings ⁽¹⁶⁾	16,000	24,743	22,500	28,500
Honorariums	16,000	15,566	15,700	20,250
Writers and Photography	9,000	2,604	5,600	4,700
Promotion ⁽¹⁷⁾	10,000	4,289	18,500	20,800
Special Events ⁽¹⁷⁾	10,000	900	5,700	5,500
Interest Expense	600	648	600	600
WIC National Conference	-	-	35,000	-
1992 Love Gift Production ⁽¹⁹⁾	-	-	-	28,000
Curriculum/Video Production ⁽¹⁸⁾	-	-	-	45,000
Account Write-offs	-	2,535	1,500	2,500
Ad Hoc Communications Comm	-	1,036	-	-
TOTAL EXPENSES	1,747,786	1,462,456	1,947,252	2,013,097
Net Surplus(deficit)	-	-6,859	-	35,000

APPENDICES

MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA Proposed Budgets for 1993

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed
INCOME:				
Individual	770,000	587,758	780,000	750,000
Church	2,500,000	1,919,948	2,350,000	2,351,740
Corp/Foundation	300,000	120,568	300,000	300,000
Investment	60,000	41,072	78,000	50,000
Misc.	<u>53,668</u>	<u>2,169</u>	<u>54,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>
Total Income	3,683,668	2,671,515	3,562,000	3,456,740
Coordinator				
Salary	51,321		51,321	57,143
Benefits	<u>10,179</u>		<u>10,179</u>	<u>12,857</u>
Total	61,500		61,500	70,000

(These figures are included in the "Operational Support" line items below.)

This budget is a "cost center" budget, therefore administration, finance, General Assembly, and Committee expenses are divided into each department under the line "Operational Support."

CHURCH PLANTING

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed	1993 Growth
ANGLO CHURCH PLANTING					
Enabling Church Planting (Facilitating presbyteries and local churches) ⁽¹⁾	882,000	710,438	937,000	1,000,000	700,000
Training/Assessment	5,000	60,642	33,000	64,000	
Salaries	135,000	65,679	208,500	112,000	
Travel & Telephone	28,000	70,847	42,250	20,000	
Postage & Printing	3,000	9,045	14,000	9,000	
Special Projects		16,352	10,000		
Miscellaneous	4,000	10,583	5,000	5,000	
Church Relations ⁽²⁾				114,000	
Direct Office Space	6,400	7,113	14,800	11,000	
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,041</u>	<u>60,000</u>	<u>210,000</u>	
Total	1,103,400	994,740	1,327,550	1,545,000	700,000

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA - Continued

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed	1993 Growth
MULTI-CULTURAL CHURCH PLANTING					
<u>Hispanic Ministry</u>					
Field Support	250,000	194,231	260,000	260,000	50,000
Houston Project		10,670		25,000	
NYC Project	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	50,000
Border Project	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	50,000
Scholarships	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Total Hispanic	250,000	204,901	260,000	285,000	160,000
<u>French Ministry</u>					
Field Support	94,606	88,100	95,000	95,000	50,000
Quebec Project	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>100,000</u>
Total French	94,606	88,100	95,000	95,000	150,000
<u>Korean Ministry</u>					
Salaries	60,500	60,548	60,500	65,000	
Travel & Telephone	12,000	9,167	14,400	14,500	
Scholarships	10,000	2,000	10,000	10,000	5,000
Printing & Postage	4,000	2,861	4,000	4,000	
Field Support	50,000		20,000	20,000	20,000
K.P.M.C.	5,000		5,000	5,000	2,000
Miscellaneous	2,000		2,000	2,000	2,000
Direct Office Space	<u>6,400</u>	<u>6,544</u>	<u>6,400</u>	<u>7,000</u>	
Total Korean	149,900	81,120	122,300	127,500	29,000
<u>Black Ministry</u>					
Salaries	43,921				
Travel & Telephone	8,000				
Scholarships	14,000				
CUM	27,000	4,280			
Training	5,000				
Field Support	<u>10,000</u>	<u>36,025</u>	<u>35,000</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>50,000</u>
Total Black	107,921	40,305	35,000	-0-	50,000
<u>Japanese Ministry</u>					
Field Support	<u>19,000</u>	<u>18,752</u>	<u>19,000</u>	<u>19,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Total Japanese	19,000	18,752	19,000	19,000	10,000
<u>Portuguese (Brazilian) Ministry</u>					
Field Support				<u>75,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Total Portuguese				75,000	10,000
<u>Chinese Ministry</u>					
Scholarships		1,000	-0-	-0-	5,000
Field Support		<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Total Chinese		1,000	-0-	-0-	15,000

APPENDICES

MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA - Continued

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed	1993 Growth
<u>General Department</u>					
Salaries	62,000	65,077	200,000	90,000	
Travel & Telephone	12,000	6,898	43,250	10,000	
Sharpes/Wycliffe	36,000	30,708	36,000	36,000	5,000
Ministry Development	2,000	8,005	2,000	2,000	
C.U.T.S.	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	25,000
Education/Publication		4,711	10,000		
Special Projects		1,200	10,000		
Church Relations				38,000	
Direct Office Space	4,800	6,176	9,600	7,000	
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,040</u>	<u>60,002</u>	<u>123,500</u>	
Total General Depart.	156,800	166,815	370,852	306,500	30,000
Multi-Cult. Grand Total	778,227	600,993	902,152	908,000	454,000
<u>New York City Project (3)</u>					
Anglo Church Planting	40,000	8,253			
Ministry Oper. Exp.	30,000				
Ethnic Church Planting	80,000	6,168	60,000		
Bridges of Friendship (Mercy)	10,000				
Training/Interns	10,000				
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,041</u>	<u>40,000</u>		
Total NYC Project	210,000	58,462	100,000		
TOTAL CHURCH PLANTING	2,091,627	1,654,195	2,329,702	2,453,000	1,154,000
<u>Campus Ministry</u>					
Salaries	140,000	114,864	150,000	171,000	15,000
Travel & Telephone	14,000	10,158	14,000	14,000	3,000
Printing & Materials	15,000	14,737	15,000	17,000	
Field Assistance	15,000	28	15,000	-0-	15,000
International	200,000	202,769	200,000	250,000	100,000
Training	3,000	3,106	3,000	5,000	
Direct Office Space	13,735	15,267	14,000	16,000	
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,041</u>	<u>40,000</u>	<u>99,000</u>	
Total Campus	440,735	404,970	451,000	572,000	133,000

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA - Continued

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed	1993 Growth
<u>Evangelism & Church Growth</u>					
Salaries	50,000	49,444	50,000	50,000	
Travel & Telephone	5,000	1,843	5,000	5,000	
Conferences	5,000	1,887	5,000		
Publications	-0-	-0-	-0-	15,000	
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,041</u>	<u>40,000</u>	<u>12,000</u>	
Total Evangelism/ Church Growth	100,00	97,215	100,000	82,000	
<u>Chaplains</u>					
Salaries	17,200	18,520	20,000	25,000	10,000
Office Expense	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,200	
Commission	1,500	1,544	1,500	1,200	
Travel	8,000	9,142	8,000	9,100	
Printing	2,500	4,026	2,500	2,500	
Conference	1,500		1,500	1,000	
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,041</u>	<u>40,000</u>	<u>8,000</u>	
Total Chaplains	72,500	79,073	75,300	48,000	10,000
<u>Mercy & Disaster Relief (4)</u>					
Salaries	126,146	29,889	65,000	65,000	
Missionaries	363,000	156,534	340,000	160,000	20,000
Process & Placement	2,400		2,000	1,000	
Internship/Summer Program	65,000		10,000		
Convocations	10,000	167	5,000	500	
Travel & Telephones	12,500	3,191	10,000	3,500	
Printing & Postage	10,000	5,090	12,500	7,000	
Ministry Development	20,000	21,921	15,000	5,000	20,000
Church Relations	20,000	6,594	10,000	7,000	
Direct Office Space	640	588	1,250	4,000	
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,041</u>	<u>40,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	
Total Mercy/Disaster	669,686	268,015	510,750	303,000	40,000
<u>Building & Development Ministries (5)</u>					
Salaries	36,820	51,744	36,820		
Travel & Telephone	11,000	1,084	11,000		
Printing	3,500		3,500		
Postage	2,000	9	2,000		
Legal	1,000		1,000		
Direct Office Space	700	31	700		
Direct Support		9,050			
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>44,041</u>	<u>40,000</u>		
Total Bldg & Dev.	95,020	105,959	95,020		

APPENDICES

MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA - Continued

	1991 Budget	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1993 Proposed	1993 Growth
Church Relations (2)					
Salaries	122,500	111,264			
Travel & Telephone	17,000	8,972			
Education/Publications	25,000	29,746			
Direct Office Space	9,600	8,227			
Operational Support	<u>40,000</u>	<u>67,785</u>			
Total Church Relations	214,100	225,994			
TOTAL SUPPORT DEPTS.	1,592,041	1,181,226	1,232,226	1,005,000	183,000
TOTAL BUDGET	3,683,668	2,835,421	3,561,772	3,458,000	1,337,000

NOTES:

The dynamic '90's require a flexible approach by GA/MNA. In the early days when the PCA was geographically a southern church, GA/MNA needed to open new territories through church planting. Today, the primary thrust of GA/MNA is to assist presbyteries and local churches to plant new churches. This change in primary focus results in changes in the 1993 budget.

1. This line item reflects such things as processing, placement and assessment that used to be separate line items. In addition, regional representatives are included in this line item.
2. Church relations as a department has been overhauled to more accurately represent the amount of work it does for church planting. It now appears as a line item under the various categories and the estimated amounts are computed by the total amount of expenses the department incurs.
3. New York as a project has successfully been completed by MNA and is now being dealt with by specific departments such as multi-cultural.
4. The number of Mercy missionaries has dropped considerably and there are no plans to increase the number until after a coordinator has been employed.
5. Building and Developmental Ministries was moved to the Investors' Fund with GA approval in 1991.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1993

I. REVIEW OF BUDGET FOR 1992

Prior to discussing the criteria followed in the preparation of the 1993 budget, it is important to note that the 1992 budget presented to the Nineteenth General Assembly in 1991 had to be reviewed.

The 1992 budget was prepared in January 1991 at a time when there were no firm numbers to base the estimates on due to the change of the fiscal year from a June 30, 1990, closing to a December 31, 1991, closing. The results for the calendar year 1991 are now available, therefore we have used these figures as a basis for revising the 1992 budget.

In the attached exhibit a detailed comparison is presented between the originally approved budget and the now revised version which is summarized below:

	Actual for 1991	Approved Budget 1992	Revised Budget 1992
Revenues	\$14,089,711	\$15,001,200	\$15,244,000
Expenses	14,369,544	14,953,000	15,299,690
Surplus (deficit)	-279,833	48,200	-55,690

II. CRITERIA FOR PREPARATION OF 1993 BUDGET

A. The proposed budget covers the period January through December 1993 and is prepared on the basis of actual results for the year 1991 and the revised 1992 budget.

B. MTW missionary growth is as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Missionary #</u>	<u>Growth</u>
June 30, 1985	346	--
June 30, 1986	372	7.5%
June 30, 1987	386	3.8%
June 30, 1988	403	4.4%
June 30, 1989	442	10.0%
June 30, 1990	463	4.8%
December 31, 1990 *	476	2.8%
December 31, 1991	497	4.4%
December 31, 1992 (Revised projection)	530	6.6%
December 31, 1993 Projected	560	5.7%

* Six months

The missionary growth is based on the currently approved goal as outlined in MTW's Vision 2000.

C. Missionary support income for the budget year has been projected at 7% over the forecast income for 1992.

APPENDICES

MISSION TO THE WORLD - Continued

Page 2

If income from all sources is included for the budget year under consideration the increase over the revised 1992 income is also 7%.

- D. Expenses for the budget year were adjusted based on individual analysis and projected costs, except those directly related to missionaries for which estimates were taken based on past experience and missionary growth.

III. INCOME GROWTH

- A. The following is the contribution income growth pattern of Mission to the World for the past ten years:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Amount</u> ¹	<u>Growth</u>
1982	\$ 5,747,768	14.0%
1983	6,356,983	11.0%
1984	7,100,639	12.0%
1985/86	8,227,837	16.0%
1986/87	8,798,395	7.0%
1987/88	9,653,928	9.7%
1988/89	10,509,070	8.9%
1989/90	12,165,142	16.7%
1990 ²	11,842,161	³ --
1991 ⁴	14,089,711	18.9%
1992 [*]	15,244,000	8.2%
1993 ^{**}	16,312,740	7.0%

¹ Includes income from all sources

² Calendar year for comparison

³ Not calculated due to change in fiscal year

⁴ Calendar year only

^{*} Revised budget for 1992

^{**} Proposed budget for 1993

The increase in revenues from the year 1981 to 1982 is of 178.8% based on actual results.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

The following is the Administrative cost comparison from previous years actual, revised 1992 budget and budget year 1993.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD - Continued

Page 3

<u>Date</u>	<u>Cost %</u>
1982 calendar year	19.8%
1983/84 fiscal year	17.9%
1984/85	17.3%
1985/86	17.5%
1986/87	15.7%
1987/88	15.7%
1988/89	15.3%
1989/90	13.1%
1990 for six months	13.7%
1991 for calendar year	14.0%
1992 revised budget	15.3%
1993 proposed budget	15.0%

V. BUDGET 1993 - EXPENSE DETAILS

1. Coordinator's compensation - Salary and housing reflect a 5% increase on a reduced 1992 projection. Health and disability costs reflect an increase of 12% due to estimated increases in health insurance premiums. The total increase for Coordinator compensation and benefits is 5.2%.
2. Senior staff salaries reflect a possible increase for cost of living and merit amounting to 5%.
3. Office staff increases reflect proposed cost of living and merit increases of 5%.
4. Missionary salaries and quota increases result from the projected increase in number of missionaries, the high cost of overseas living, and a revised base salary chart.
5. Benefits increase are a consequence of higher compensation costs.
6. Committee meeting expenses have been increased overall by 6.9%, mostly due to high cost of travel which shows an increase of 11.1% as well as lodging costs which have increased by 6.4%.
7. Conferences and meetings have also increased by 6% due to travel costs.
8. General Assembly expense included MTW's share of the PCA Foundation costs. At the time of budget preparation the Foundation's actual proposed budget request had not been given to MTW, therefore the amount included is an estimate.
9. Missionary travel reflects an increase of 8.4% over estimates for 1992. Again high costs of travel and shipping overseas is resulting in greater costs.
10. Personnel Development is showing a substantial reduction of 9.1% over the 1992 revised budget, because there are no plans to have a Team Development Training course in 1993.
11. Communications. Increased postage costs and telephone usage has affected costs in this area.

APPENDICES

MISSION TO THE WORLD - Continued

Page 4

12. **Promotions.** Cost increases are reflected in these accounts as a result of normal price increase in production of promotional printing. Also increased number of missionaries affects the costs since more prayer letters and cards are being printed.
13. **Itineration costs.** As indicated previously in these comments, the higher costs of travel and lodging, as well as increased number of missionaries, have resulted in overall cost increase in these expenses of 16.7%.
14. **Tentmaking expenses** have been included in the budget even though at this time it is uncertain whether some expenses will be incurred.

GDL/jm

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD Proposed Budget for 1993

	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
INCOME:				
Contributions to General Fund (ASKINGS)	559,074	500,000	560,000	596,740
Contributions to Missionaries (ASKINGS)	12,794,188	14,100,00	14,100,000	15,100,000
Field Income	250,543	100,000	250,000	265,000
Project Support	435,908	200,000	300,000	315,000
Donations from Legacies	17,477	-0-	-0-	-0-
Interest Income	6,900	88,000	10,000	10,000
Other Revenue	<u>25,621</u>	<u>13,200</u>	<u>24,000</u>	<u>26,000</u>
TOTALS	14,089,711	15,001,200	15,244,000	16,312,740
EXPENSES:				
Coordinator's Expense	77,078	86,440	82,640	86,950
Salaries	7,703,072	8,402,070	8,359,400	8,941,600
Benefits	2,083,292	2,149,900	2,261,700	2,418,200
Committee Meeting	60,599	48,400	65,500	70,000
Computer Services	95,239	100,470	105,100	110,100
Conferences & Meetings	214,967	186,000	190,000	201,400
General Assembly Expenses	50,020	64,750	66,000	69,300
Professional Services	27,263	48,500	39,700	44,940
Occupancy Costs	183,257	157,470	200,400	210,300
Office Expense	135,852	121,250	137,100	145,100
Missionary Travel	669,131	587,500	740,000	802,000
Associated Missionary Travel	240,941	205,000	209,500	215,600
Personnel Development	297,389	349,250	331,250	301,000
Communications	166,553	151,600	179,700	192,400
Promotions	344,486	311,500	366,700	385,400
Itineration	351,485	334,600	382,000	445,000
Staff Travel Expense	128,125	213,300	157,000	168,200
Other Expenses	143,433	140,000	143,000	145,800
Field Expenses	958,354	965,000	965,000	1,014,000
Project Expenses	448,017	300,000	300,000	315,000
Tentmaking Project	<u>-9,009</u>	<u>30,000</u>	<u>18,000</u>	<u>20,000</u>
TOTAL EXPENSES	14,369,544	14,953,000	15,299,690	16,302,290
Surplus(deficit)	-279,833	48,200	-55,690	10,450

APPENDICES

MISSION TO THE WORLD - Continued

	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
COORDINATOR'S EXPENSE:				
Salary & Housing	65,100	68,350	66,750	70,100
Annuity	6,185	6,000	6,300	6,600
Health	4,078	4,800	4,200	4,800
Disability	1,165	1,290	1,290	1,350
Auto Lease	<u>550</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>4,100</u>	<u>4,100</u>
TOTAL	77,078	86,440	82,640	86,950
SALARIES				
Senior Staff	482,511	534,900	517,800	543,700
Office Staff	667,179	678,600	678,600	712,500
Outside Help	17,747	27,300	25,000	26,000
Missionary Support	4,519,164	4,950,000	4,952,000	5,310,000
Missionary Quotas	1,925,742	2,115,000	2,090,000	2,251,500
Retiree's Supplement	<u>90,730</u>	<u>96,270</u>	<u>96,000</u>	<u>97,900</u>
TOTAL	7,703,072	8,402,070	8,359,400	8,941,600
BENEFITS				
Annuity	524,732	563,000	569,000	608,000
Disability	71,750	82,800	74,200	79,400
Health	1,049,501	976,600	1,140,000	1,220,600
Life Insurance	81,360	83,000	90,000	95,000
Payroll Taxes	347,084	435,000	379,000	405,600
Retiree Medicare	<u>8,865</u>	<u>9,500</u>	<u>9,500</u>	<u>9,600</u>
TOTAL	2,083,292	2,149,900	2,261,700	2,418,200
COMMITTEE MEETING				
Travel	16,470	23,000	18,000	20,000
Hotel	21,758	11,000	23,500	25,000
Group Meals	20,543	13,200	22,000	23,000
Other Expenses	<u>1,828</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>
TOTAL	60,599	48,400	65,500	70,000
COMPUTER SERVICES				
Telephone Lines	4,560	4,920	4,740	5,000
Software Maintenance	21,991	26,360	24,360	25,600
Equipment Maintenance	28,031	32,790	30,000	31,500
Programming/consulting	15,295	20,000	18,000	18,000
Supplies	16,395	10,400	20,000	22,000
Training & Travel	8,633	6,000	8,000	8,000
Software Purchase	<u>333</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
TOTAL	95,239	100,470	105,100	110,100

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD - Continued

	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
CONFERENCES & MEETINGS				
Staff & Missionaries	26,492	33,000	28,000	29,400
Summer Conferences	49,575	65,000	60,000	63,000
Field Conferences	19,759	6,000	20,000	21,000
Annual Missionary Conferences	<u>119,141</u>	<u>82,000</u>	<u>82,000</u>	<u>88,000</u>
TOTAL	214,967	186,000	190,000	201,400
GENERAL ASSEMBLY EXPENSE				
GA Expense	25,581	21,000	26,000	27,300
PCA Foundation	<u>24,438</u>	<u>43,750</u>	<u>40,000</u>	<u>42,000</u>
TOTAL	50,020	64,750	66,000	69,300
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES				
Audit/Accounting	16,375	26,100	26,100	27,400
Research	1,039	5,000	1,200	2,400
Consultants	8,518	15,000	10,000	11,000
Legal	41	900	900	2,640
Other Professional Services	<u>1,290</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>
TOTAL	27,263	48,500	39,700	44,940
OCCUPANCY COSTS				
Office Lease	142,408	132,100	160,000	166,000
Insurance	34,205	23,100	36,000	39,600
Repairs & Maintenance	5,393	900	3,000	3,000
Storage Costs	1,151	1,200	1,200	1,500
Safe Deposit Box	<u>90</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>
TOTAL	183,257	157,470	200,400	210,300
OFFICE EXPENSE				
Bank Charges	5,934	3,850	6,200	6,500
Equipment Lease	218	-	1,200	1,200
Repairs & Maint.-Equip.	10,754	5,000	5,000	5,500
Repairs & Maint.-Auto	3,984	500	1,200	1,200
Hospitality	6,167	3,000	6,000	6,000
Supplies & Printing	63,807	59,400	67,000	71,700
Dues & Memberships	34,158	38,500	38,500	40,400
Subscript. & Public.	<u>10,830</u>	<u>11,000</u>	<u>12,000</u>	<u>12,600</u>
TOTAL	135,852	121,250	137,100	145,100
MISSIONARY TRAVEL				
Travel To/From Field	265,458	300,000	300,000	318,000
Shipping	157,473	121,000	172,000	189,000
Ministry Travel	139,676	82,500	152,000	167,000
Set-Up Expense	<u>106,524</u>	<u>84,000</u>	<u>116,000</u>	<u>128,000</u>
TOTAL	669,131	587,500	740,000	802,000

APPENDICES

MISSION TO THE WORLD - Continued

	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
ASSOCIATED MISSIONARY COSTS				
Computer/Software Purchase	99,271	82,500	82,500	80,000
College Ed. Assistance	32,649	48,000	40,000	42,800
Language Studies	91,879	66,000	72,000	77,800
Continuing Education	<u>16,942</u>	<u>8,500</u>	<u>15,000</u>	<u>15,000</u>
TOTAL	240,941	205,000	209,500	215,600
PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT				
Assessment Center	53,478	36,750	36,750	40,000
Candidate Expense	28,730	25,000	30,000	31,500
Recruitment	2,577	10,000	5,000	6,000
Missionary Training	119,977	130,000	130,000	136,500
Debriefing	38,780	50,000	42,000	44,100
Physicals	27,432	20,000	25,000	26,800
Team Leader Develop.	23,687	77,500	62,500	12,500
Urband Express	<u>2,708</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>3,600</u>
TOTAL	297,388	349,250	331,250	301,000
COMMUNICATIONS				
Courier Fees	2,646	2,700	2,700	2,900
Federal Express	490	1,700	1,200	1,300
U. S. Postage	76,517	77,000	80,000	88,000
UPS	8,896	6,300	10,000	11,000
Telephone-Local	11,764	18,900	14,000	14,500
Telephone-Long Distance	48,315	31,500	50,000	52,000
Telephone-FAX	4,613	30,000	6,000	6,300
Telephone-Equip. Service	7,610	6,000	9,000	9,300
Cables & telegrams	179	1,200	800	800
W.O. EasyLink	<u>56,520</u>	<u>3,300</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>6,300</u>
TOTAL	166,552	151,600	179,700	192,400
PROMOTIONS				
Network	90,010	108,000	108,000	112,000
Promotional Prayer	46,862	31,500	48,000	50,000
Day of Prayer	10,250	15,700	12,000	12,500
Missionary Directory	14,242	14,300	14,500	15,000
Prayer Cards	22,364	22,000	23,000	24,500
Prayer Letters	159,850	120,000	160,000	170,000
Other Promo. Material	<u>808</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,400</u>
TOTAL	344,486	311,500	366,700	385,400
ITINERATION				
Lodging/Meals	40,047	45,000	44,000	49,000
Telephone	74,296	65,000	82,000	89,000
Travel	221,744	218,000	240,000	290,000
Other	<u>15,397</u>	<u>6,600</u>	<u>16,000</u>	<u>17,000</u>
TOTAL	351,484	334,600	382,000	445,000

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD - Continued

	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
STAFF TRAVEL EXPENSE				
Coordinator	13,880	28,000	15,000	15,000
Senior Staff	99,940	151,000	120,000	130,000
Office Staff	2,611	8,800	3,200	3,500
Foreign Regional Coord.	-6,103	10,500	800	1,200
US Regional Coordinator	8,742	10,000	9,000	9,500
Staff Hospitality	<u>9,054</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>9,000</u>	<u>9,000</u>
TOTAL	128,125	213,300	157,000	168,200
OTHER EXPENSES				
Donations (Gifts)	11,950	4,000	4,000	4,000
Other Taxes	8,361	6,000	8,400	8,700
Interest	9,069	-0-	8,000	8,300
Depreciation	102,573	115,000	110,000	112,000
Other Expenses	1,289	5,000	2,600	2,800
Contingencies	<u>10,192</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>
TOTAL	143,433	140,000	143,000	145,800
FIELD EXPENSES				
Field Expenses (Gross)	<u>958,354</u>	<u>965,000</u>	<u>965,000</u>	<u>1,014,000</u>
TOTAL	958,354	965,000	965,000	1,014,000
PROJECT EXPENSES				
Projects (Gross)	<u>448,017</u>	<u>300,000</u>	<u>300,000</u>	<u>315,000</u>
TOTAL	448,017	300,000	300,000	315,000
TENTMAKING PROJECT				
Tentmaking Project	<u>-9,009</u>	<u>30,000</u>	<u>18,000</u>	<u>20,000</u>
TOTAL	-9,009	30,000	18,000	20,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	14,369,543	14,953,000	15,299,690	16,302,290

APPENDICES

MTW//IMPACT BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1993

I. REVISION OF 1992 BUDGET

Prior to discussing the criteria followed in the preparation of the 1993 budget, it is important to note that the 1992 budget presented to the 19th General Assembly in 1991 had to be reviewed and revised.

The 1992 budget was prepared in January 1991 at a time when there were no firm numbers to base estimates due to the change of the fiscal period from a June 30, 1990, closing to December 31, 1991. The results for the calendar year 1991 are now available, therefore these figures have been used as a basis for revising the 1992 budget.

In the attached exhibit a detailed comparison is presented between the originally approved budget and the revised version which is summarized below:

	Actual for 1991	Approved Budget 1992	Revised Budget 1992
Revenues	1,953,324	2,917,664	2,354,480
Expenses	1,856,689	2,878,800	2,240,950
Surplus (deficit)	96,636	38,864	113,530

II. CRITERIA FOR PREPARATION OF 1993 BUDGET

A. The proposed budget covers the period January through December 1993 and is prepared on the basis of actual figures for the year 1991 and the revised 1992 budget.

B. The growth for all programs is based on MTW's Vision 2000 goals for numbers of missionaries as follows:

	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>
Two-Year (average for year)	97	108
Two-Month	80	92
Two-Week	1800	2300

III. BUDGET 1993 - EXPENSES DETAILS

A. Salaries. Office staff increases reflect a 6 percent projected salary increase from estimated 1992, plus an addition of two staff (one secretary and one two-week assistant). Missionary salaries and quotes represent the increase in the average number of two-year missionaries and a projected 4 percent increase in the cost of overseas living from 1992.

B. Benefits. The increase reflects higher total salaries as well as a 10 percent increase in group medical benefits.

C. Conferences. The increase reflects a realignment of missionary miscellaneous conferences to the local field conference item. The area retreat, to be held for the Latin America area in October 1993, has many more MTW//IMPACT missionaries projected to attend than the Europe/Africa Retreat scheduled for April 1992 and thus the significant increase.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD//IMPACT - Continued

Page 2

- D. Professional Services. MTW Financial Services reflects an estimated charge of \$1,296 monthly to MTW//IMPACT to be paid to MTW for services rendered (i.e. receipting, payroll, check-printing, etc.).
- E. Travel Missionaries. Travel to/from field reflects a 15 percent increase as well as an increase in two-year missionary numbers. Program Travel reflects transportation expenses related to ministry.
- F. Associated Missionary. IMPACT Ministry reflects a 4 percent increase in the amount spent by two-year missionaries on non-transportation expenses related to ministry (i.e. supplies, materials, hospitality, etc.).
- G. Personnel. Recruitment reflects additional expenses related to travel by an additional recruiter in the fall months. Urbana expenses reflect estimated expenses for the December 1993 Urbana Conference.
- H. Communications. Increased postage costs and telephone usage has affected costs in this area.
- I. Promotion. Prayer cards and letters reflect increased numbers of two-year missionaries. Decreased expenses for Brochures/Printing and Video/Other reflect the development of new promotional materials (i.e. video, brochures, etc.) in 1992 with primarily reprint costs in 1993.
- J. Staff. Travel reflects a 15 percent increase over 1992 estimates due to the high cost of domestic and international travel.
- K. Projects. Expenses are based on the following past and present numbers:

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>
Two-month	65	55	80	92
Two-week	1050	1600	1800	2300

APPENDICES

MISSION TO THE WORLD/IMPACT

Proposed Budget for 1993

FISCAL YEAR:	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
INCOME:				
Missionary Support	1,252,949	1,818,029	1,504,730	1,739,810
Project Support				
Two Month	130,352	316,497	189,600	235,490
Two Week	517,870	711,628	605,910	803,990
Interest	28,890	42,898	30,050	31,200
Other	<u>23,263</u>	<u>28,612</u>	<u>24,190</u>	<u>25,120</u>
TOTAL INCOME	1,953,324	2,917,664	2,354,480	2,835,610
EXPENSES:				
<u>Salaries</u>				
Office Staff	213,241	231,540	230,090	293,210
Outside Help	243	1,803	260	330
Missionary	443,307	826,803	532,390	615,560
Quotas	<u>55,437</u>	<u>43,996</u>	<u>66,580</u>	<u>76,980</u>
TOTAL SALARIES	712,228	1,104,142	829,320	986,080
<u>Benefits</u>				
Annuity	16,408	19,604	19,530	22,730
Disability	8,741	15,297	10,400	12,110
Health	142,400	232,156	179,280	219,170
Life Insurance	13,747	17,909	16,360	19,040
Payroll Taxes	46,153	74,616	54,940	63,930
Other	<u>2,048</u>	<u>484</u>	<u>2,460</u>	<u>2,840</u>
TOTAL BENEFITS	229,497	360,066	282,970	339,820
<u>Committee Meeting</u>				
Travel	3,440	2,182	3,780	4,130
Hotel/Meals	11,817	10,557	14,190	16,410
Other	<u>312</u>	<u>496</u>	<u>370</u>	<u>430</u>
TOTAL MEETINGS	15,569	13,235	18,340	20,970
<u>Conferences</u>				
Miscellaneous (GA, STL, etc)	7,989	7,139	2,900	2,900
Local Field Conference	2,146	5,735	7,580	2,980
Annual Area Retreat	<u>18,909</u>	<u>25,034</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>26,260</u>
TOTAL CONFERENCES	29,044	37,908	18,480	32,140

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD/IMPACT - Continued

Page 2

FISCAL YEAR:	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
<u>Professional Services</u>				
Audit/Accounting	5,520	9,702	5,740	5,960
MTW Financial Services	14,400	15,840	14,980	15,550
Other	<u>189</u>	<u>702</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>
TOTAL PROF. SERVICES	20,109	26,244	20,920	21,710
<u>Occupancy</u>				
Lease/Office	16,507	17,347	17,170	17,830
Other	<u>78</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>80</u>
TOTAL OCCUPANCY	16,585	17,519	17,250	17,910
<u>Office</u>				
Repairs and Maintenance	145	109	150	160
Supplies and Printing	2,795	3,227	2,910	3,020
Other	<u>1,318</u>	<u>1,999</u>	<u>1,370</u>	<u>1,420</u>
TOTAL OFFICE	4,258	5,335	4,430	4,600
<u>Travel Missionaries</u>				
Travel to/from Field	43,632	107,527	57,940	72,930
Shipping	11,232	40,280	13,490	15,600
Program Travel	24,956	57,653	29,970	34,650
Setup	17,656	18,606	21,200	24,520
Passports/Visas/Shots	<u>5,979</u>	<u>7,232</u>	<u>7,180</u>	<u>8,300</u>
TOTAL MISS. TRAVEL	103,455	231,298	129,780	156,000
<u>Associated Missionary</u>				
Language Study	12,180	12,000	14,630	16,910
IMPACT Ministry	16,245	15,788	19,510	22,560
Special Projects	<u>7,751</u>	<u>11,758</u>	<u>9,310</u>	<u>10,760</u>
TOTAL ASSOC MISSIONRY	36,176	39,546	43,450	50,230
<u>Personnel</u>				
Candidate Expenses	12,893	10,341	15,480	17,900
Recruitment	3,291	2,867	5,500	4,570
Missionary Training	37,146	50,792	44,610	51,580
Debriefing	5,453	16,317	6,550	7,570
Staff Development	765	349	830	1,030
Urbana	<u>1,621</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>8,000</u>
TOTAL PERSONNEL	61,169	80,666	72,970	90,650
<u>Communications</u>				
Postage	11,985	20,391	14,730	16,870
Telephone	13,197	18,702	16,220	17,590
Tax	908	640	1,120	1,210
Federal Express	<u>47</u>	<u>304</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>60</u>
TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS	26,136	40,037	32,130	35,730

APPENDICES

MISSION TO THE WORLD//IMPACT - Continued
Page 3

FISCAL YEAR:	1991 Actual	1992 Budget	1992 Revised	1993 Proposed
<u>Promotion</u>				
Onwards	1,290	2,144	1,340	1,390
Prayer Cards	7,956	5,780	9,550	11,050
Prayer Letters	8,479	16,091	10,180	11,770
Brochures and Printing	6,616	-0-	6,880	3,000
Video/Other	<u>165</u>	<u>16,455</u>	<u>25,000</u>	<u>180</u>
TOTAL PROMOTION	24,506	40,470	53,950	27,390
<u>Staff</u>				
Senior Staff Travel	2,719	-0-	3,130	3,530
Staff Travel	3,449	8,940	3,970	4,480
Staff Hospitality	<u>1,385</u>	<u>666</u>	<u>1,440</u>	<u>1,500</u>
TOTAL STAFF	7,553	9,606	8,540	9,510
<u>OTHER</u>	169	-0-	180	180
<u>Project</u>				
Two Month	122,754	269,379	185,690	221,760
Two Week	<u>447,481</u>	<u>603,349</u>	<u>523,550</u>	<u>694,710</u>
TOTAL PROJECT	570,235	872,728	709,240	916,470
TOTAL EXPENSE	1,856,689	2,878,800	2,240,950	2,709,390
Surplus(deficit)	96,635	38,864	113,530	126,220

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COVENANT COLLEGE
PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1992-93

BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

FISCAL YEAR:	90-91 Budget	90-91 Actual	91-92 Budget	92-93 Proposed
<u>Fall Enrollment</u>				
New Students	178	178	185	190
Full Time Equiv.	489	489	534	536
Quest	103	103	190	100
<u>Residence halls</u>				
On Campus	388	387	400	402
Apartments	47	35	43	40
Board Plan Partic.	380	385	400	399
<u>Fees:</u>				
Tuition	3,700	3,700	3,950	4,200
Avg. Room	723	723	769	807
Apartment	850	850	900	945
Avg. Board	<u>832</u>	<u>832</u>	<u>885</u>	<u>930</u>
TOTAL FEES (NO APT.)	5,255	5,255	5,604	5,937
ANNUAL FUND	1,290,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Salary Scale Inc.	2.5%	2.5%	6.0%	4.5%
Total Avg. Salary Inc.	2.5%	2.5%	6.0%	4.5%
Student/faculty Ratio	13.0	13.0	14.6	13.7
Student/Staff Ratio	6.6	6.6	6.9	6.7

BUDGETS

REVENUE

Education & General:

Trad. Tuition/Fees	3,514,416	3,606,876	4,105,235	4,472,336
Quest Tuition/Fees	613,996	757,702	715,082	729,708
M Ed Tuition/Fees	875	-0-	29,502	110,619
Government Appro.	156,300	110,492	156,300	156,300
Gifts (ASKINGS)	1,290,000	1,280,016	1,308,000	1,309,740
Challenge Grant	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Endowment	36,500	56,599	60,200	60,200
Other	60,615	11,073	155,833	132,027
Student Aid	<u>405,200</u>	<u>564,504</u>	<u>479,700</u>	<u>479,700</u>
TOTAL E & G	6,077,902	6,487,262	7,009,852	7,450,630

APPENDICES

COVENANT COLLEGE - Continued

FISCAL YEAR:	90-91	90-91	91-92	92-93
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Proposed
REVENUE - Continued				
<u>Auxiliary Enterprises:</u>				
Residence Halls	625,725	607,724	664,365	687,354
Board Plans	632,320	636,411	703,788	725,636
Tuck Shop	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Lookout Inn	80,000	99,591	100,000	100,000
Summer conferences	452,683	356,379	475,000	500,000
Other	<u>-0-</u>	<u>13,314</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
TOTAL AUXILIARIES	1,790,728	1,713,419	1,943,153	2,012,990
TOTAL REVENUES	7,931,630	8,200,681	8,953,005	9,461,880
EXPENSES:				
<u>Education & General</u>				
Trad. Instr.	1,908,181	1,873,093	1,724,487	1,946,347
Quest	454,397	451,101	541,691	561,709
M Ed	22,500	13,414	95,618	135,619
Academic Support	171,000	201,022	490,893	347,625
Public Service	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Library	201,715	200,439	208,265	217,131
Student Services	878,352	887,219	945,742	572,195
Main. of Plant	604,241	657,919	684,870	675,780
Inst. Support	1,172,543	1,214,269	1,351,780	** 1,766,505
Student Aid	<u>1,039,353</u>	<u>1,279,886</u>	<u>1,157,366</u>	<u>1,300,317</u>
TOTAL E & G	6,452,282	6,778,362	7,200,712	7,523,228
<u>Auxiliary Enterprises:</u>				
Residence Halls	517,846	422,004	566,898	654,667
Board Plans	472,177	468,380	561,082	616,922
Tuck Shop	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Lookout Inn	63,696	88,190	78,554	79,994
Summer Conferences	403,363	342,665	426,560	426,766
Other	-0-	<u>20,995</u>	<u>37,010</u>	<u>38,761</u>
TOTAL AUXILIARIES	1,457,082	1,342,234	1,670,104	1,817,110
Contingency	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,740
Transfers	22,266	<u>75,053</u>	<u>82,189</u>	<u>87,189</u>
TOTAL EXPENSES & TRANS.	7,931,630	8,195,649	8,953,005	9,429,267
SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)	-0-	5,032	-0-	34,353

** Included in the Institutional support figure of \$1,766,505 above is the President's salary of \$82,187 and benefits of \$7,436 including the following: Retirement \$4,109; Insurance \$3,327 (estimated). No car or housing allowances are provided.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COVENANT COLLEGE - Continued

FISCAL YEAR:	90-91 Budget	90-91 Actual	91-92 Budget	92-93 Proposed
Revenues by Source:				
Trad. Students	60.2%	59.2%	61.1%	62.2%
Quest Students	7.7%	9.2%	8.0%	7.7%
M Ed Students	0.07%	0.9%	0.0%	1.2%
Donors	18.1%	19.3%	17.1%	16.1%
Government	5.3%	4.5%	4.7%	4.4%
Profit Business	6.7%	5.7%	6.4%	6.3%
Other	<u>1.2%</u>	<u>2.0%</u>	<u>2.4%</u>	<u>2.0%</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Education & General Expenses by Category:				
Trad Instr.	29.6%	27.6%	23.9%	25.9%
Quest	7.0%	6.7%	7.5%	7.5%
M Ed	0.3%	0.2%	1/3%	1.8%
Academic Support	2.7%	3.0%	6.8%	4.6%
Library	3.1%	3.0%	2.9%	2.9%
Student Services	13.6%	13.1%	13.1%	7.7%
Main. of Plant	9.4%	9.7%	9.5%	9.0%
Inst. Support	18.2%	17.9%	18.8%	23.5%
Student Aid	<u>16.1%</u>	<u>18.9%</u>	<u>16.1%</u>	<u>17.3%</u>
	95.6%	100%	100%	100%

APPENDICES

COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY NEW BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS FY 92-93

I. Revenue:

A. Tuition and Fees:

1. Tuition in most programs is increasing from \$140 per credit hour to \$150. This will still keep our tuition competitive with other similar seminaries. The Doctor of Ministry tuition is increasing from \$160 per credit hour to \$175. The increase is necessary to cover increased program costs since tuition pays for less than a third of total costs.
2. Enrollment is expected to grow to 444 students from the 401 enrolled in the Fall of 1991. We expect a growth to 281.92 full-time equivalent students from 262.6 enrolled in the Fall of 1991. In addition we expect 42 students to be auditing classes.

B. Endowment: Earnings available for use are expected to continue at 8%. With management expenses the net income to the operating budget is 7.7%. We had hoped to reduce usage to 7.2% but could not begin reducing usage. If we are successful in raising major gifts for endowment we will begin reducing usage as new money comes in.

C. Gifts & Grants: Gifts & Grants increased from \$1,385,000 to \$1,525,000. This is approximately a 10% increase. Part of the increase is required to support a possible new counseling program for one year. It is expected by the second year the program will more than pay for itself. Also, with a growing student body there are increased pressures to provide programs and added departmental staff to service them. You will see reference in several expense budgets reflecting increases due to a larger enrollment.

D. Student Aid: Student aid revenue will increase only slightly. This revenue needs to be developed. There are specific efforts to increase student aid endowment significantly.

E. Other Income: This revenue will increase to \$38,040 from \$29,700 this year with increasing media production sales and growth in syllabi sales.

F. Auxiliary Enterprises: Revenue will increase due to a 5% rent increase. This is the first increase since the apartments opened three years ago.

II. Expenditures:

A. General:

1. The budget assumes overall salary increases of 4%. The increases will be a mixture of cost of living and merit where appropriate. Salary increases had to be kept low in order to maintain a balanced budget.
2. We are uncertain of what increase to expect for medical insurance. To be conservative we have budgeted a 20% increase based on the best judgment of our insurance agent.
3. General expenses were increased by 5% based on inflation projections provided by the Kiplinger Letter.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

B. Educational & General:

1. President & Trustees: Only inflationary increases were given.
2. Instruction - general budget:
 - a. A possible Counseling Professor was added plus moving expenses.
 - b. Student labor was restored to earlier year levels because more professors are using student graders. Other student labor was added to help with clerical support in lieu of adding a part-time secretary.
 - c. Special adjunct faculty were added because key personnel will be on sabbatical next year.
 - d. Duplicating costs continue to increase with increased use of computer by the faculty and a growing student body.
 - e. Computers are aging. We begin an ongoing replacement program with this budget.
 - f. With more and more prospective student interest in the seminary we must print more and more catalogs each year. So these costs continue to rise.
3. Instruction - Doctor of Ministry: Provision is made to move a new director and homiletics professor here. Increased enrollment which would most likely be generated would pay any extra costs.
4. Instruction - Master of Theology: One more class will be taught.
5. Instruction - Evening Program: The current program continues.
6. Instruction - Extension Program: No changes are anticipated by the budget.
7. Instruction - Francis Schaeffer Institute:
 - a. Expenses for a new Board and a road show are added.
 - b. One more speaker is added.
8. Instruction - Church Planting: The program is essentially unchanged except for provision for inflation. This program continues to be almost fully funded by Restricted Gifts.
9. Registrar's Office: With larger graduating and entering classes support costs are increasing.
10. Library:
 - a. New Librarian is here a full year, and he starts on the retirement program.
 - b. Some increase in Contract Services occur with our new automated reference system - OCLC.
11. Standard Services:
 - a. Student labor is doubled to try to correct the demands of a larger student body.
 - b. Faculty stipends for Covenant Groups is now charged to this budget rather than Instruction.
 - c. Other support costs increase with larger student body.
12. Family Nurture Program: With more students and therefore more children the babysitting budget is increased.
13. Student Aid:
 - a. More of Wallace Anderson's time is allocated to this budget to reflect how he spends his time.
 - b. Financial Aid is increased to reflect higher tuition cost.

APPENDICES

- c. Average awards (as a % of tuition) are targeted to be more consistent with history. Each year I have under budgeted here and I am trying to correct this.
 - 14. Development:
 - a. Current staff size is maintained, but one position has been replaced with someone who will devote full time to deferred giving to increase endowment and in the long run help reduce dependence on gifts and grants.
 - b. Other expenses are increased to meet expected inflation.
 - 15. Admissions: New student goals go from 218 to 265 next year. Cost increases are necessary to meet the goal.
 - 16. Electronic Media Production:
 - a. Equipment needs to be repaired and replaced in order to produce video tapes.
 - b. Tape sales have been growing rapidly, so production costs are more than offset by added revenue.
 - 17. Business Office:
 - a. One position goes from 20 hours to 30 hours which is more consistent with current time necessary to service a growing student body. This increase still leaves the business office personnel overloaded.
 - b. One staff position (new in the current year) goes onto the retirement program next year.
 - c. Duplicating costs increase.
 - d. Mailing cost decreases.
 - e. Travel cost decreases.
 - f. Contract Services increases less than expected. We add a bi-annual financial aid audit, but we anticipate using a less expensive auditing firm.
 - g. Equipment maintenance cost increases. We will be on the new computer system. Even though the overall maintenance cost goes only from \$15,000 to \$15,750 the Business Office bears a larger percentage of the cost.
 - h. Bad Debt expense decreases.
 - 18. Physical Plant: Provides only inflationary increases.
- C. Auxiliary Enterprises:
- 1. General operations provide for expenses related to the new Balcon Estates Home.
 - 2. Student Apartments:
 - a. Provision is made to cover the cost of apartment manager - budget error previously.
 - b. Longer term employees begin retirement program.
 - c. With 7-8 single student apartments phone costs, utilities and repair costs increase.
 - 3. Timeless Insights expenses are decreased with less subscriptions.
- D. Transfers:
- 1. With Educational & General facilities we expect to spend the following capital projects:
 - a. \$2,900 to paint the brick on the Administration Building.
 - b. \$5,000 - heating repair in Edwards annex.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- c. \$43,700 - to service debt on the Administrative Computer System.
 - d. \$1,290 to restore the cost of the postage machine (purchased 2 years ago) to Renewal & Debt.
2. In our Auxiliary facilities we plan the following for capital:
- a. \$40,800 to be set aside as reserves for future apartment repairs.
 - b. \$1,000 touch up paint - Jones'
 - c. \$26,400 loan amortization on Balcon home.
3. Contingency is reduced from the current year.

FES/pb

APPENDICES

COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Proposed Budget 1992-93

	90-91 Budget	90-91 Actual	91-92 Budget	92-93 Proposed
REVENUES:				
<u>Tuition:</u>				
General	545,550	534,385	557,200	776,600
Doctor of Ministry	43,510	31,460	48,400	54,400
Master of Theology	10,500	22,317	20,200	25,200
Evening Program	99,375	65,544	92,400	74,400
Extension Programs	18,450	5,438	18,900	17,100
Auditors	-0-	17,125	16,900	20,200
Fees	<u>25,000</u>	<u>23,546</u>	<u>26,000</u>	<u>27,000</u>
TUITION & FEE	742,385	699,815	776,600	995,200
Endowment	200,100	207,500	230,500	237,100
Gifts & Grants - ASKINGS *	1,385,100	1,410,596	1,385,000	1,526,740
Restricted Gifts	108,945	129,985	56,000	58,000
Student Aid	131,600	139,722	128,000	135,300
Other	<u>37,950</u>	<u>37,744</u>	<u>29,700</u>	<u>38,040</u>
TOTAL ED & GEN'L	2,606,080	2,625,263	2,605,800	2,990,380
<u>Auxiliary Enterprises:</u>				
General	40,160	42,933	42,800	38,210
Student Apartments	121,150	133,580	249,600	262,150
Timeless Insights	<u>10,200</u>	<u>9,971</u>	<u>9,900</u>	<u>7,700</u>
TOTAL AUXILIARY	171,510	186,485	302,300	308,060
TOTAL REVENUES	2,777,590	2,811,646	2,908,100	3,298,440
EXPENDITURES:				
<u>Educational & General:</u>				
Pres\Trustees Expense	57,687	53,222	57,132	57,835
President - Salary	57,383	57,383	57,383	60,826
President - Benefits	<u>9,891</u>	<u>9,891</u>	<u>10,571</u>	<u>11,347</u>
PRESIDENT/TRUSTEE	124,961	120,496	125,086	130,008
<u>Instruction:</u>				
Instruction-D.Min	568,024	538,456	577,723	693,740
Instruction-Th.M	38,112	14,074	29,201	30,798
Instruction-Th.M	8,400	8,463	8,800	10,361
Instruction-Evening	13,405	15,693	22,537	22,532
Instruction-Extension	40,248	25,424	39,049	39,595
Instr.-Schaeffer Inst.	71,232	73,214	73,998	90,750
Instruction-Ch.Plty	<u>104,217</u>	<u>87,410</u>	<u>48,685</u>	<u>54,974</u>
INSTRUCTION	843,638	762,734	799,993	942,750

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY - Continued

	90-91 Budget	90-91 Actual	91-92 Budget	92-93 Proposed
Registrar's Office	55,103	52,639	58,958	65,846
Library	108,064	75,100	133,252	148,724
Student Services	56,366	60,426	83,907	103,027
Stud.Min/Family Nurture	9,305	11,677	13,990	15,230
Student Aid	220,906	254,870	253,952	355,597
Development	405,471	452,579	414,196	426,670
Admissions	181,159	196,115	197,303	229,781
Electronic Media Prod	74,867	57,526	65,793	70,248
Business Office	198,658	221,903	212,304	227,383
Physical Plant	<u>303,051</u>	<u>340,858</u>	<u>288,177</u>	<u>298,097</u>
TOTAL ED & GEN	2,581,549	2,606,924	2,646,912	3,013,361
 <u>Auxiliary Enterprises:</u>				
Operations	22,244	14,857	21,761	22,483
Student Apartments	63,165	76,730	105,833	123,227
Timeless Insights	<u>11,752</u>	<u>15,067</u>	<u>15,404</u>	<u>13,279</u>
TOTAL AUXILIARY	97,161	106,654	142,998	158,989
Transfers	93,880	98,140	111,490	121,090
Contingency	<u>5,000</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>6,700</u>	<u>5,000</u>
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,777,590	2,811,717	2,908,100	3,298,440
Net Revenue(Expenditures)	-0-	130	-0-	-0-
Cumulative Fund Balance	3,893	4,024	4,024	4,024
H C Enrollment, Fall	257	358	373	444
FTE	256.2	195.2	220.93	281.92
			Actual: 401	
			262.6	

* Actual ASKINGS outcome:
1990-91: Of the per capita ASKINGS of \$8.05 only \$2.45
was received from churches.

APPENDICES

PCA INSURANCE, ANNUITIES and RELIEF
Proposed Budget for 1993

	Budget 1991	(unaudited) Actual 1991	Budget 1992	Proposed Budget 1993
INCOME:				
Insurance Funds	377,930	377,930	375,000	383,000
Retirement Funds	255,825	255,825	270,000	283,740
Relief Funds	<u>143,650</u>	<u>143,650</u>	<u>140,000</u>	<u>85,000</u>
TOTAL INCOME	\$777,405	\$777,405	\$785,000	\$751,740
EXPENSES:				
Director's Salary	57,750	57,750	61,750	61,750
Director's benefits (1)	16,800	13,946	15,600	17,700
Other Salaries	280,390	192,446	212,790	199,250
Other Benefits	59,220	45,193	50,140	51,300
Employers FICA	<u>26,500</u>	<u>19,141</u>	<u>21,200</u>	<u>21,200</u>
TOTAL SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$440,660	328,476	361,480	351,000
Actuarial	5,300	442	3,180	1,000
Audit	19,080	16,500	19,080	19,000
Legal	<u>10,600</u>	<u>16,741</u>	<u>29,220</u>	<u>21,740</u>
TOTAL PROFESSIONAL FEES	34,980	33,683	51,480	41,740
Board Meetings	21,200	19,208	23,320	23,000
Computer (2)	53,000	29,219	31,800	40,000
Consulting Fees	10,600	1,162	5,300	8,000
Depreciation on equipment	12,900	6,200	10,600	8,000
GA Nominating Co.	-0-	1,237	2,120	3,000
Insurance	-0-	-0-	-0-	24,000
Marketing	10,600	5,763	6,360	10,000
Office	20,140	13,293	21,200	16,000
PCA Foundation (3)	38,000	19,375	40,280	-0-
Postage	15,900	8,528	15,900	12,000
Printing	21,200	43,173	21,200	50,000
Rent	40,280	33,148	43,460	37,000
Telephone	15,900	7,964	12,720	10,000
Third Party Admin.	-0-	84,843	98,580	90,000
Training	5,000	2,022	5,300	3,000
Travel	<u>35,100</u>	<u>14,138</u>	<u>33,900</u>	<u>25,000</u>
TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES	299,820	289,273	372,040	359,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$775,460	\$651,432	\$785,000	\$751,740
Surplus (deficit)	1,945	125,973	-0-	-0-

NOTES:

- (1) Each year includes insurance, retirement and personal automobile expenses
- (2) Amounts include depreciation of computer hardware and software.
- (3) Foundation Expenses will be netted against Gifts received from the PCA Foundation instead of being paid from Ministerial Relief Funds in 1993.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

INVESTORS FUND FOR BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT
PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1993

	1991 BUDGET	1991 ACTUAL	1992 BUDGET	1993 PROPOSED
INCOME:	342,372	322,097	370,250	327,518
EXPENSES:				
Director's salary	31,755	32,071	33,497	33,137
Director's benefits	15,100	15,100	22,056	22,416
Salaries/benefits	113,900	94,514	88,182	55,000
Travel	14,280	-0-	1,500	1,500
Telephone	6,300	6,151	7,500	7,800
Office	2,100	4,832	3,500	6,000
Rent	10,500	8,434	19,500	8,100
Legal-loans	22,000	-0-	24,000	-0-
Legal-Registration	7,500	10,170	7,500	10,000
Postage	3,500	3,272	3,500	7,000
Printing	2,000	2,466	2,500	3,500
Marketing	17,250	24,440	25,000	25,000
Management	63,000	67,884	75,000	85,000
Trustees	2,500	958	2,500	3,000
Accounting	4,500	3,620	4,750	5,500
Misc/Ins.	2,500	2,272	3,100	6,600
GA/Conferences	2,000	2,091	2,000	2,000
Consultants	-0-	1,000	-0-	1,740
Loans	6,000	320	6,000	6,000
Depreciation amt.	2,714	1,119	-0-	-0-
Contributions	<u>-0-</u>	<u>17,700</u>	<u>35,000</u>	<u>35,000</u>
TOTALS	338,983	298,982	366,585	324,293
Surplus (deficit)	3,389	23,113	3,665	3,225

APPENDICES

PCA FOUNDATION, INC.
 PROPOSED BUDGET FOR
 JANUARY 1, 1993 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1993

	BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET	PROPOSED BUDGET
	1991	1991	1992	1993
INCOME:				
Undesignated	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
C & A Support	<u>200,000</u>	<u>207,339</u>	<u>250,000</u>	<u>300,740</u>
TOTAL	300,000	307,339	350,000	400,740
EXPENSES:				
1. DIRECTOR'S SALARY	48,362	48,362	50,539	51,000
2. DIRECTOR'S BENEFITS	11,017	9,941	11,994	14,986
3. PLANNED GIVING FIELD STAFF WAGES	35,000	36,263	35,000	50,000
4. OFFICE STAFF WAGES	39,418	49,506	53,600	60,000
5. OFFICE STAFF BENEFITS	3,495	4,058	3,824	7,563
6. PAYROLL TAXES	8,084	8,471	10,100	12,317
7. TRAVEL DIRECTOR	30,000	17,832	36,000	31,000
8. TRAVEL PLANNED GIVING FIELD STAFF	0	5,432	15,000	13,000
9. TRAVEL STAFF	0	380	0	750
10. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	23,200	44,543	35,000	46,740
11. PROMOTION/ADVERTISING	30,000	28,361	31,500	43,000
12. OFFICE EXPENSE	9,000	10,056	9,450	10,000
13. POSTAGE		5,201		6,000
14. TAXES & LICENSES		1,664		500
15. RENT	18,408	18,408	19,328	19,824
16. TELEPHONE	8,000	6,876	9,000	8,000
17. DUES/SUBSCRIPTIONS	300	393	400	450
18. STAFF TRAINING	8,000	2,300	8,000	5,600
19. BOARD EXPENSE	7,000	12,046	8,400	9,000
20. CAPITAL EXPENSES	3,000	0	3,500	2,500
21. OFFICE INSURANCE	5,000	3,894	5,000	5,500
22. GA NOMINATING COMMITTEE	0	1,237	0	1,500
23. OPERATING RESERVE	12,716	4,914	4,365	1,510
TOTAL	300,000	320,138	350,000	400,740
Surplus (deficit)	-0-	-12,799	-0-	-0-

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RIDGE HAVEN CONFERENCE CENTER
PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1993

	1991 BUDGET	1991 ACTUAL	1992 BUDGET	1993 PROPOSED
INCOME:				
From Facilities	70,000	57,245	95,000	57,500
Net Operating for GA ASKINGS	<u>323,345</u>	<u>322,624</u>	<u>396,358</u>	<u>509,815</u>
TOTAL INCOME	393,345	379,869	491,358	567,315
EXPENSES:				
Administrator's Salary	58,000	53,000	58,000	60,000
Admin. Benefits				
Other salaries	90,000	134,040	143,358	156,000
Summer/parttime workers	14,000	35,572	40,000	44,500
Equipment/Vehicle Expense	12,000	12,639	12,000	35,000
Utilities	29,000	32,963	42,000	44,000
Property Taxes	7,000	6,273	5,500	7,500
Maintenance Tools	13,000	14,626	18,000	18,000
Casualty Insurance	14,000	12,839	12,000	18,000
Telephone	5,000	4,963	7,500	7,500
Promotional Expense	85,000	33,370	85,000	85,000
Travel	1,000	939	1,000	2,500
Board Meeting Expenses	2,400	4,843	3,500	6,000
Office Expense	7,500	5,045	7,000	8,500
Audit	3,000	2,380	2,500	5,000
Miscellaneous	1,000	89	1,000	2,740
Payroll Taxes	12,000	9,827	13,500	15,000
Foundation Support	37,500	15,224	37,500	49,875
Nom. Com. Expenses	<u>1,945</u>	<u>1,237</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,200</u>
TOTAL EXPENSES	393,345	379,869	491,358	567,315
Surplus (deficit)	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

APPENDIX D

**THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION & PUBLICATIONS
TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA**

Introduction

The following report contains four parts. A biblical theological precise for the ministry of CE/P, a present program update, future concepts and plans and a list of recommendations to the General Assembly. This report is offered to the Twentieth Assembly with the hope and prayer that the Presbyterian Church in America, through its Christian Education and Publications program, will reflect an unusual faithfulness to the sovereign God through whom all things hang together, a solid biblical base and a proper understanding of the signs and times of the present and future context of our ministry.

I. Biblical/Theological Base

God has raised up the PCA for days such as these. Western civilization is dying spiritually. Morality is hedonistic. Culture is more and more oriented to secular humanism. Religion is dealt with privately with little or no social implications. World powers are breaking up to come together in configurations that we may or may not sanction. Families are breaking apart and relationships are suffering. Dysfunctional people, families and institutions receive top billing today because they are so impacted by the worldly influences of modernization.

The church does not appear to be that clear about its role. People, even professing Christians, are not operating from a self-conscious world and life view. As someone has said, "If you win a person's heart but fail to win their mind, then you may lose their heart." Conformity to the world is often practiced within the church family to such an extent that there seems to be little difference between the outsiders and insiders. The same double standards seem to be demonstrated far too often.

These are crucial days and what happens within the closing years of the twenty-first century will be so significant that the twenty-first century will either be indebted to this 1990's decade or it will curse it. The difference humanly speaking will be the kind of people that emerge to set direction and make decisions that will take us into the twenty-first century.

There is great uncertainty as to who those leaders will be or where they will surface. This could be the finest hour for the Christian church. But if it is willing to settle for mediocrity, it could be our most embarrassing moment.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Sometimes opportunity does knock only once. We know from our biblical theology that God's plan will not be thwarted. The people that He wants disciplined will be. What we must remember is that He could use us (PCA) if we are willing and obedient or He could choose to use someone else.

God has a role for the PCA that could be transforming and definitely make a difference as we both approach and enter the twenty-first century. The PCA has a unique ministry before it. However, certain things must happen for that leadership role to develop.

We need a strong global vision and program to help implement that vision through world missions. We need to develop new churches in order to spread our influence. It may be true that planting new churches may be one of the best ways to reach new people and grow numerically, hence we need a strong church planting effort in the PCA. We have approximately 1200 PCA churches in existence.

Christ tells us to make disciples, to equip the saints for the work of ministry and to develop a plausibility structure where people can come together for worship, fellowship, ministry, witness and encouragement. This underscores the necessity of a ministry such as CE/P whose purpose in the life of the church is not only to be personally involved in the disciple-making process, but to help equip others to equip others to equip others.

Realizing our responsibility to teach what is consistent with sound doctrine (Titus 2:2) and to help churches to do the same, CE/P has a major role in the PCA's present and future effectiveness.

Today is the day to wake up to reality (Romans 13:11,12). Today is of utmost importance. We need to realize that we are engaged in spiritual combat that is requiring the best training and equipping in the history of the church.

Within the scope of biblical theology we know that the world is steadily moving towards a cataclysmic point of no return. As we come closer to that day and as the day of salvation draws near, we are told that spiritual forces will be unleashed on the world and church, that if possible would deceive even the very elect of God. It appears that the storm clouds are gathering on the horizon and that day is fast approaching.

We need to realize what is happening in the world around us and how that impacts our service and ministry for the Lord. There is a certain sense in which history, though linear in direction, is cyclical in patterns at times. It appears that we are in a similar position to the early church where the Christians found themselves living in the midst of a godless culture. The Christian message didn't make any sense then. The church was almost non-existent.

First century Christians had the task of building a significant witness in the world and building the church, as a symbol of God's power and presence, into the life of the community. Despite the efforts of the Moral Majority in the 80's, Christians, and

APPENDICES

particularly the church, are not that influential in today's world. Often the world really doesn't know what we are talking about.

Therefore, the challenge is before us. Are we going to make a difference? Are we going to settle for mediocrity and for churches that have a definite socialization process effectively operating yet making very little impact on the world around us?

We want to glorify God by being all and doing all that He wills. We want to continue to develop a ministry that will give us depth and breadth. We want to help change lives and culture, where possible, and to reflect the lordship of Christ and the sovereignty of God in all areas.

II. Present Program Report

The Christian Education and Publications Committee has been working over the past twelve years with three year increments of "strategic faith planning." The last year of the most recent three-year segment ends this summer 1992. Deciding to look a bit further down the pike, the CE/P Committee and staff have been through an 18-month general evaluation of CE/P's purpose, plans and implementation.

To carry out that task the CE/P Committee was divided into four task forces to evaluate the present ministry and to make some faith projections for the next five years. The four task forces are: internal analysis, external or environmental analysis, resources, and communications. The *Internal Analysis Task Force* took the entire program of CE/P, seminars, WIC, bookstore, curriculum, consulting, audio-visual lending library and general educational resources and sought to determine whether the programs were: 1) consistent with programs authorized by the Assembly; 2) consistent with the PCA distinctives and CE/P's purpose statement; 3) the effectiveness of the programs according to the evaluations of participants; and 4) the programs that should be maintained during the next five years.

The criteria used was doctrinal consistency, pedagogical soundness and responsiveness to the context of the PCA's and CE/P's ministry.

The *Internal Analysis Task Force* evaluated not just a part of the program but the whole. What were the strengths and weaknesses of each part in light of the above criteria? What did the people involved in using the programs in the local church say? How did the staff feel about their effectiveness? What was the committee's overall assessment?

Several examples that grew out of the evaluation were: the need to develop and include a seminar on catechism instruction; and the need to develop some specific programs for officer training, possibly on video and with written materials, to compliment the leadership training seminars. There was also a determination to develop more programs dealing with family subjects. (This will be discussed under future plans.)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The *Resource Analysis Task Force* evaluated the facilities, budgeting, staffing and general resources presently in place as well as those needed for the future of CE/P's program. Needs for people, equipment, hardware and software were evaluated quite thoroughly. Present program and support staff were considered in the process.

The *Communications Task Force* evaluated the *PCA MESSENGER* and other communication materials of CE/P, both present and future needs. This task force was concerned to have in place the proper resources for effective communication that would also assist local churches in networking people and resources available to them in their local ministries. This task force was also concerned to evaluate the needs in communicating the PCA's ministry to the constituents.

The *Environmental Analysis Task Force* did significant research over the 18-month period, using materials and information relating to environmental scanning. What is going on in the world around us, trends, projections, needs, etc.? What should CE/P and the PCA be doing to address the present cultural context in which we exist? Realizing that God determines the times and places where we live (Acts 17:26) and realizing that we are to serve God's purpose in this generation (Acts 13:36) and realizing that the Bible calls us to wake up to reality (Romans 13:11), this task force researched numerous key result areas of ministry that pertain to the PCA and CE/P. Several examples: the need to put strong emphasis on the covenant family, the need for biblical stewardship, the need for training in spiritual warfare and the need to help churches in multi-cultural training, particularly as we are realizing phenomenal growth of the Muslim religion, the Church of the Latter Day Saints, secular humanism, cult and occult growth, particularly in light of the New Age Movement.

How can Christians be prepared to be an effective witness for the Lord? As the following scenario (III) suggests, the need to be concerned to minister to the minister and his family, to assist local churches in their music and worship programs, to assist local churches in training laymen for ministry and to help the PCA see itself as a part of God's whole master plan and how we interface with others in the body of Christ.

The fruit of the many man hours invested in the two-year project will help CE/P play a significant role as we concern our energies, efforts and resources in the following manner.

III. Future Scenario

We are addressing several areas of importance to the life of the PCA. Our training programs, Sunday school curriculum, video library, bookstore, Women In the Church, *MESSENGER* publication, along with our personal consulting services, specialized publications, and our cooperative work with Pioneer Clubs have been strategic. What we are trying to put together--a Youth strategy, as well as the Music Association, and Men of the Covenant--give us a present challenge.

There are several areas that are listed in the present and future ministries--the WIC, the training programs, present and future publications, ethnic training, programs more

APPENDICES

related to the ethnic or multi-cultural life of the PCA, more continuing education programs, counseling services, and a more effective stewardship program for the PCA are some of the areas we will need to consider.

Examples (not in priority order):

1. With 98 Korean congregations in the PCA we must increase our efforts to minister to and assimilate them into the PCA. We want to develop training programs and conferences for the Korean churches. We will use them to help us know their needs. We are already aware of some needs for materials translated into Korean.

Help in family areas due to the problems that exist in living within an Anglo culture, children tending to move more into the Anglo culture creates unique family needs. The Koreans are a significant segment of the PCA and with our commitment to focus on strengthening God's covenant family, we must address those needs.

2. We want CE/P to develop an assessment program and counseling center designed for pastors and wives primarily, but which also could serve the broader constituency. We are presently doing "some" of this embryonically with the pastor and wives conferences but we are only scratching the surface as to what we need to do for our people.
3. We want CE/P to soon have in place the "PCA School of Christian Education," primarily for laymen, but then for professional church staffs in continuing education and training. We would like to do the latter in conjunction with our college and seminaries.

We would like to move forward with a 12-year-old idea to develop a Christian study center where we can help disciple our present church workers and provide a place for retreat and study. This could be a master plan coordinated and directed by CE/P, working with the college, seminaries and conference center where possible. We would like to see a minimum facility in the Atlanta area where people--individuals or couples--could come for a short time for retreat, counsel, instruction and study.

4. We want CE/P to continue to study trends in the world and help our people evaluate them in light of the Word and our reformed and evangelical heritage. This will enhance the development of a distinctively biblical world and life view. We want to show our people how to be biblically reformed with a renewed mind and heart in all that we do. We want to help model for them things that they can do in the local church. (To date our WIC program has been one of the most successful training and modeling programs that we have.)

Peter Senge in *The Fifth Discipline, The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization* points out that there are five disciplines required for the effective organization of the 90's and into the twenty-first century. They are: systems

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building shared visions and team learning. That definitely underscores and reflects some of our own thinking about CE/P's role. If those things are to happen effectively, being good stewards and networking, not reinventing the wheel, is something that we will need to do more of. Networking is also a means of showing the catholicity of the church.

5. We want to add a top-notch youth specialist to the staff as soon as possible. With the challenge facing "this generation at risk" we need to develop a strategy for youth ministry that will keep the PCA's present and future for our youth on the cutting edge. We have been grateful in the past 30 years for the work of parachurch groups such as InterVarsity, Campus Crusade, and Navigators.

We want this generation of youth to be disciplined in a church that is not only teaching from a biblically reformed and evangelical perspective, but we want them to have that kind of "church" experience that many of our present young adults and later baby boomers did not experience. We want to be used to communicate the relevancy of the church in a world that doesn't care that much about the church.

6. We want CE/P to take the leadership in the PCA in developing a stewardship program for the PCA that will help create a plausibility structure where our people will appreciate the biblical concepts of stewardship reflected both in their personal lifestyles, but also in their commitment and support of the ministry of the PCA.

The church's work is one work--one mission--with different facets. This is especially crucial at a time when not only do the people not have a particular felt need for understanding this, but neither do some of our leaders. Our role in the PCA agrees with this direction and the coordinators and committee chairmen have agreed that CE/P should be the coordinating agent for this kind of program.

We want our people, young and old, to have a sense of pride and good feeling about being part of the PCA. We want them to appreciate what we believe is really a modern day movement of God. There are some aspects of tradition that should not be lost even as we seek to work together with the broader universal church. This could also be the major area where we can serve to pull the church together in the best sense of the term.

7. We want to continue to address the pastors through avenues such as *EFFECTIVE CHURCH LEADERSHIP*, challenging them to think biblically about relevant issues plus encouraging them to read and study key books and periodicals. We could see this developing into a regular synopsis and review of the best books and periodicals that pastors and church leaders need to know about. We want to help them love the reformed faith in the fullest and most winsome perspective.
8. We want to better minister to our CE/P staff members and help encourage them to sharpen their skills, to keep them on the cutting edge in their fields. We

APPENDICES

believe we have an opportunity to help the PCA demonstrate biblical leadership in an extremely important area in our church and world.

9. We want to continue to develop the most effective means of placing the *MESSENGER* into the most PCA homes that we possibly can. Plus we want to continue to develop effective means of funding this publication. This is a vital key for the accomplishment of some of the above areas, particularly stewardship.
10. We want to continue to develop a viable Men of the Covenant type movement/organization throughout the PCA. Our men need to catch the vision for the value of the connectional aspect of the PCA.

We want to have presbytery, regional and denominational activities that will give the PCA even greater visibility in society. We do not believe we can talk about strengthening the covenant family without having a strong ministry for men and helping local churches and presbyteries to do that.

11. We also have a dream during the next few years to try to work with CE/P presbytery chairmen seeking to develop an effective network such as we have done with the PresWICs.
12. We want CE/P to have a higher visibility during the next five years because of our unique role. John Frame in his recent book, *Evangelicals Reuniting*, refers to the PCA's world mission model of a denomination and the OPC's Christian education model. We don't want the PCA to be either but both.

We want to continue to minister to the breadth of the PCA without being identified with any "special interest group." We also want to demonstrate how to work together with our evangelical brothers and sisters in the broader church. We cannot have influence by withdrawal. We cannot disciple without working together at some level. We must not draw back from this crucial role.

13. In order to promote our theme, "Strengthening God's Covenant Family," we want to both locate existing programs, develop other seminars, video training and written studies relating to the immediate family, the extended family, the one-parent family and the blended families. We also want to talk about the church family using things such as intergenerational learning experiences.
14. We want CE/P to be the focus of a "think tank" in the PCA, and possibly in the broader reformed and evangelical world, that helps people think through issues. We see conferences designed to deal with specific contemporary issues, maybe even a specialized publication for the leadership, that becomes a forum for presenting issues in a relevant, challenging and refreshing way that doesn't simply rehash our history but also that doesn't neglect it either. Realizing that we cannot understand the present and future without understanding the past, neither can we speak prophetically the Word of God by merely restating the past.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

15. We want to train six regional people to help with the leadership/consulting services of CE/P. The idea of renewal, vitalization and revitalization are CE/P's concern for local churches. We believe having six key people can help us multiply our ministries and make the services more economic for local churches.

Summary: We think the idea of networking will be a key concept for CE/P during the next five years. Maybe the economy will force us to do what we ought to do anyway. We should help our churches locate the best and pull together the most effective resources to help PCA churches, presbyteries and Assembly to be the leaders in today's church world.

IV. Recommendations

1. That the 20th General Assembly express gratitude to the Women in the Church for their generous support of the 1991 Love Gift designated to IAR (over \$94,000 was contributed).
2. That the 20th General Assembly approve the 1993 WIC Love Gift designation for Investor's Fund.
3. That the 20th General Assembly encourage local churches to participate in the 1992 WIC Love Gift, designated to CE/P and its WIC ministry. (The video presentation is also part of the WIC's curriculum for local churches regarding WIC ministries.)
4. That the 20th General Assembly docket, at the end of this report, a time of prayer for the 1992 WIC Conference and the 3200 plus women who will participate.
5. That the 20th General Assembly join with the CE/P Committee in encouraging the use of either the *Catechism for Young Children* developed by GCP and authored by Paul Settle and G.I. Williamson or the original version, and that churches be encouraged to send the names of children reciting the catechism to CE/P and the *PCA MESSENGER* for recognition.
6. That the 20th General Assembly go on record as expressing their appreciation to the Great Commission Publications' staff and board for their diligence in publishing biblical and reformed Sunday school curriculum and that those churches not presently using the curriculum be encouraged to evaluate it for use.
7. That the 1993 budget be adopted as presented by the Administrative Committee.
8. That Dr. Charles Dunahoo be called to serve as CE/P coordinator for 1992-93 and that thanks be given for his 15 years of faithful service to the whole church through CE/P.

APPENDICES

9. That the CE/P minutes of June 17, 1991, September 25-27, 1991 and February 20-21, 1992 be approved as presented.
10. That the 20th General Assembly assist CE/P in encouraging and recommending the stewardship program and materials developed and coordinated by CE/P in order to promote the one work of the church concept, (*Book of Church Order* 14:1-13).
11. That the CE/P office be authorized to coordinate and develop a data bank for staff level PCA youth workers.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

APPENDIX E

REPORT OF COVENANT COLLEGE to the Twentieth General Assembly Presbyterian Church in America

The focus of Covenant College, operated by its board of trustees which is elected by the PCA General Assembly, is expressed in its motto, based on Colossians 1:18, "In all things . . . Christ pre-eminent." Accordingly, the college seeks to provide for its students a comprehensive, Christ-centered preparation for life and service.

This report summarizes activities and achievements of the college from March 21, 1991, to March 20, 1992.

I am pleased to report that the overall condition of the college is good. Enrollment is at an all-time high and the fiscal condition of the college is strong. Recognizing that these are difficult times for any college, we give thanks to the Lord for His provision and His faithfulness.

In his report to the executive committee in February, President Frank Brock expressed his vision for the college in these terms:

1. Selective in admissions, attracting topnotch academically qualified Christian students
2. Spiritually alive at every level
3. Having an outstanding faculty
4. Nurturing a carefully constructed community of believers (people from varied backgrounds, seeking to learn, willing to be accountable)
5. Giving students a high sense of mission to God and country

Covenant College was cited in the Chronicle of Higher Education (November 13, 1991) in a feature article entitled "Christian Values and Academic Inquiry." Covenant was described as a place where "professors and students are constantly seeking ways to bring Jesus Christ into their lives and their curriculum."

At commencement in May, former Senator Bill Brock addressed the graduates and their families. Ninety-one graduates received degrees, including Quest students.

APPENDICES

With an especially strong retention rate (87%), total enrollment for the fall semester was more than 100 above any previous year:

	Fall 1991	Fall 1990
Traditional Students	559	510
Quest	148	103
Master of Education	20	NA
TOTAL	727	613

In October Covenant's board of trustees appointed advisory trustees to serve on the six standing committees of the board. On each committee there will be two advisory trustees, one nominated by the PCA Women in the Church and one nominated by Covenant's alumni executive committee. This new development is the result of many months of planning.

New this year to the ranks of Covenant's faculty are Rodney Miller, dean of records, and Jarda Tusek, director of career planning, placement and experiential education. Rodney is replacing Rudy Schmidt who retired this summer after thirty years of service at Covenant. Chris Page is Covenant's new director of human resources. Replacing Rodney Miller as director of student financial planning is Becky Bigger.

Growing out of several years of faculty study and planning, a new core curriculum has now been approved (copy attached for Committee of Commissioners). The intent of this revision is to strengthen further Covenant's basic liberal arts program for all students.

In December the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools approved Covenant's Master of Education program. Twenty students are currently enrolled in this new graduate-level degree program.

Organization of the faculty into divisions was implemented this year to coincide with the fall semester sabbatical of Nick Barker, vice-president for academic affairs. President Brock indicates that the divisional structure has been effective. Beginning this year Covenant's Continuing Education programs, including Quest, will be reporting to Dr. Barker.

Counseling services have been significantly expanded for Covenant students this year. Dean of Students Scott Raymond announced that Carrie Holland and Susan Neder will be available to consult with students seeking personal counseling. Mr. Jarda Tusek and the staff of the Career Planning Center also provide needed services to students. Jerry Johnson also offers leadership training and counseling beginning this year.

This spring more than sixty Covenant students, faculty and staff members are participating in Break-on-Impact, initiated by Associate Dean Barb Schreur and Resident Director Krue Brock. During the traditional spring break (March 7-16) five

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

teams will be serving, witnessing and learning in the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Miami, Nebraska (in a native American community) and Altamont, Tennessee.

Dr. Richard Allen, vice-president for advancement, has implemented a new structure for the areas of development and admissions emphasizing three regional directors of advancement located in Orlando, Atlanta (or Chattanooga) and Baltimore. Nick Arnett began his work this summer as regional director in Florida. This concept has proven very effective. The college is now seeking the two other regional directors.

Applications for admission for the fall semester are running more than twenty percent above last year at this time, a very encouraging indicator.

Our annual fund goal for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1992, is \$1,250,000. As of the end of February, unrestricted annual fund gifts are somewhat below the level needed. Giving from PCA churches is \$34,000 ahead of last year at the same time. Participation in Covenant's Church Partnership Promise has increased sharply compared to last year.

Covenant's planned giving program is picking up momentum this year. Mr. Ray Lyne has been assisting the college with promotional materials and consulting services.

Progress on the capital campaign has been slow recently. Toward the goal of \$17 million the college has now received contributions and pledges totaling \$13.5 million. Several new possibilities for reaching this goal are now being explored.

As indicated in the audit report for 1990-1991, the college ended the last fiscal year with a positive balance in spite of the fact that contributions received fell short of the unrestricted annual fund goal of \$1,250,000 by \$62,000. Because expenditures came in below budget and other revenue was above budget, the college closed its fiscal year with a balanced budget.

Improvements in college facilities this year included interior renovation of Carter Hall areas, new furniture in student rooms and a new college-wide telephone system, providing a telephone in each student room.

Having reached the goal of \$4 million for a new wing of the residence hall, plans are now proceeding to begin construction in the next few months. Toward the goal of \$6.1 million for the new science/classroom building, the college has now received \$4.8 million in gifts and pledges.

Several new ventures are now under consideration at this time. Covenant's board of associates has proposed the establishment of a college foundation to augment financial resources for the college. A cooperative venture for executive education for Czechoslovakian business leaders is being explored in conjunction with the Chattanooga World Trade Center, Quest and the new government of Czechoslovakia.

APPENDICES

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

1. That the General Assembly approve the 1992-1993 operating budget
2. That the General Assembly approve October 18 as Covenant College Sunday and encourage churches to observe the day and where possible allow students on fall break an opportunity to speak on behalf of the college.
3. That the General Assembly urge every church to participate in financial support of the college at the level of the PCA ASKINGS.

Approved and respectfully submitted for
the Board of Trustees of Covenant College

Robert S. Rayburn, Chairman

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

APPENDIX F

REPORT OF COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY To The 20th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America

Covenant Seminary continues to be one of the fastest growing seminaries in the United States. This year we had the largest entering class ever with a total enrollment of 401 students. That number represents a growth of 13 percent over the 1990-91 enrollment. Only five accredited seminaries showed any growth in the M. Div. degree program. Significantly, Covenant recorded a 37 percent growth (full-time equivalency) in our M. Div. degree program. Covenant remains committed to focusing its entire program on training for ministry.

A number of very special people have come to work at Covenant during this past year. Dr. Dan Doriani was Professor of New Testament at Geneva College and associate pastor at a nearby PCA church before coming to the Seminary as head of the New Testament Department. The second professor to be added to the faculty fills out the New Testament Department. He is Dr. Robert Yarbrough, who was twice recognized as "Teacher of the Year" at Wheaton College. The record growth can be directly attributed to the careful building of the faculty. Covenant waited three years to find just the right men for the New Testament Department.

Jim Pakala, Covenant's new Library Director, started his work on August 1. By Christmas he had made a good start at computerization of the library's system, and had eliminated the backlog of uncataloged books. The retroconversion of our old card catalog system to computer will be completed by Christmas of 1993. Mr. Pakala came to Covenant from Biblical Seminary, where he chaired committees of the American Theological Library Association and served as president of the Presbyterian and Reformed Library Association.

Dr. George W. Long, who served for over 30 years as a pastor, many of those years at the Lookout Mt. Presbyterian Church, joined the staff of Covenant Seminary as director of a new Seminary outreach, the Barnabas Ministry. This position provides spiritual support for men and their families in the gospel ministry.

We need the prayers and support of our denomination as we continue to meet the needs that God has laid in front of us. We are faced with adding more faculty, building a new academic building and limiting our enrollment, all of this next year as we meet the blessings of growth which God has brought to Covenant Seminary.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Paul D. Kooistra

APPENDICES

APPENDIX G

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSURANCE, ANNUITY AND RELIEF FUNDS TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Participation in our programs was as shown below:

<u>Program</u>	<u>12-31-88</u>	<u>12-31-89</u>	<u>12-31-90</u>	<u>12-31-91</u>
Health Insurance	2,057	2,013	1,319	1,249
Supplemental Life Insurance	829	838	580	404
Relief*	69	65	52	44
Money Purchase Pension Plan	469	439	**	**
Tax-Sheltered Annuity Plan	1,154	1,233	***	***
Employer Contribution			1,296	1,482
Salary Reduction Contribution			303	394
Death and Disability Plan	956	974	****	****
Lay Disability Plan	59	80	****	****
Term Life Insurance			978	955
Long-Term Disability Plan			1,061	1,110
Total Active Retirement Participants	1,252	1,366	1,383	1,593
Frozen Retirement Accounts	336	335	335	395
Retirees/Surviving Spouses				
Receiving Retirement Plan Benefits	112	112	113	137
Disabled Participants				
Receiving Benefits	7	6	3	6

- * Family units receiving regular monthly financial assistance.
- ** Money Purchase Pension Plan contributions frozen 12/31/89. All new contributions are applied to Tax-Sheltered Annuity Plan accounts.
- *** In previous years participation in this plan was stated in terms of total participants and was not broken down by type of account.
- **** Death and Disability Plan separated into Long-Term Disability Plan and Term Life Insurance Plan effective July 1990.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RETIREMENTS, DISABILITIES AND DEATHS

During 1991 the following retirement participants began receiving benefits: TE Joseph D. Beale, TE Gustav L. Blomquist, TE Robert L. Craggs, TE Gerritt DeYoung, TE John P. Hoogstrate, Mr. Laverne Lampen, TE Grady E. Simpson, Jr., TE Lynden H. Stewart, TE Eulice D. Thomas, Mr. James W. Thrasher, Jr., Dr. Warren F. Thuston and TE E. Lee Trinkle.

During 1991 the following plan participants died: TE Homer Emerson, TE Doyle Hulse, TE Edward T. Noe, TE Frank Morse, TE Stanley Peters and TE Otto Weisman. Total life insurance benefits paid to survivors amounted to \$209,000.

COMMENTARY

The crisis in the Middle East accelerated into a shooting war in early 1991. After early losses, the financial markets rallied when Iraq was attacked.

The U.S. economy continued in recession as the prospects for better times proved elusive during the remainder of the year. More white collar workers lost their jobs as businesses hurt by slowing sales attempted to adapt to leaner times.

The break-up and demise of the Soviet Union brought more wonder to the world during the year. The easing of restrictions on spreading the Gospel in the Eastern block proved an exciting challenge for the Church.

In the often volatile political, social and economic upheavals, the financial markets moved sideways during the third and fourth quarters until a sudden one percent drop in the discount rate on December 20 pushed the stock market to all time highs and added momentum to the bond market as well.

In these uncertain times your Board of Trustees faced a number of challenges in the operations of the PCA insurance and retirement plans.

RETIREMENT PLANS

Retirement plan assets grew from \$34,755,434 to \$41,844,176 during the year, a 20.4% increase. Of this amount, \$4,035,055 represented contributions to participant accounts and \$5,559,509 represented investment income. Net return for the Equity Fund was 16.1%. The Balanced Fund produced 19.8%, and the Income Fund 9.7%.

In the late fall the Board decided to add Wedge Capital Management as a fourth manager for the Equity Fund for 1992. Also, beginning January 1, 1992, INVESCO, an Atlanta investment management firm, was added as the second manager for the Balanced Fund, joining Wedge Capital Management, which has been the sole manager of the Balanced Fund since July 1989.

APPENDICES

Another change for 1992 was to move the record-keeping function for the retirement plans from Wachovia, our custodial bank, to Benefit Services Corporation (BSC). This change enabled us to reopen the Tax-Sheltered Annuity Plan loan program effective April 1, 1992. The loan program had been closed down to new loans since March 1989. Numerous requests from participants led to a protracted search for how to handle the administration of a new loan program. We are confident that BSC has the capability to handle not only the record-keeping and the loan program but also other enhancements to better service our participants. One feature which will be added during 1992 is an 800 phone number so that participants can have toll-free access to their account information 24 hours a day.

The change in record-keepers, the addition of INVESCO and the adjustment in fund managers demonstrate the determination of your Board to constantly improve the way we serve the ministers and lay church workers of the PCA.

During 1991 we amended the plan documents for the Annuity Fund for Ministers, the Employees' Annuity Fund and the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod Pension Fund Plan to allow for the purchase of commercial annuities to handle the terminal funding for retirees covered under those plans. The Nineteenth General Assembly approved these amendments, enabling us to purchase annuities for the sixty-one retirees in October. After competitive bids were considered, the terminal funding contract was awarded to Life Insurance Company of Georgia.

RETIREMENT PLANNING PROGRAM

For several years, Teaching Elder Loren Watson has spearheaded the Board's educational efforts to assist ministers and church lay employees prepare for retirement. The focus of this program is towards those age 50 and over. An annual information letter entitled Retirement Planning Notes is sent to all PCA ministers in this age group and to lay employees who participate in the PCA retirement plan.

Additionally, those age 57-62 receive a series of twelve booklets, two each year, for six years. Each booklet deals with some aspect of retirement living or preparation for retirement. The program has been well received. The Board is grateful to Loren for this much-needed ministry.

INSURANCE

In early 1991 the Board recognized that continuing problems related to claims processing with Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Michigan warranted our investigating alternatives for 1992. Much time was spent during the year working with insurance carriers to secure quotes for the plan. The Board made the decision to move to Pacific Mutual, the original insurance carrier of the PCA plan in 1973.

Grotenhuis Underwriters in Grand Rapids, Michigan continues to handle administrative details of the plan for us. The normal transitional adjustments were overcome early in the new year. We believe the claims processing problems experienced with the former

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

carrier have been significantly reduced by moving to Pacific Mutual. Approximately half the plan participants live in metropolitan areas serviced by the PHCS Preferred Provider Organization network. Those who use PPO providers (doctors and hospitals) receive a larger co-insurance reimbursement for their claims.

No changes were made to the Long-Term Disability Plan and the Term Life Insurance Plans during 1991.

RELIEF

During 1991 the Board spent a significant amount of time considering the future direction of the Ministerial Relief ministry assigned it by the General Assembly. The alternatives are discussed in the section entitled "Responses to General Assembly Actions" below.

The Christmas Gift offering for the 1991-92 season amounted to \$234,038 (through mid-March). We are heartened at this response from the church. It is the largest offering received to date. We are especially grateful to our Lord and the church for such a generous response during a year of recession.

RESPONSES TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY ACTIONS

The Nineteenth General Assembly asked the Board of IAR to respond to three requests. The first two came as recommendations from the IAR Committee of Commissioners and the third came as a recommendation from the Investor's Fund Committee of Commissioners.

1. Action: Item 11. (p.153) of the GA Minutes is as follows:

That IAR study the present philosophy and structure of the Ministerial Relief Fund and make the necessary changes to the fund that will reduce administrative costs within three years to 20% or less, and report back to the 20th General Assembly.

Response: The Board and Staff considered a number of alternatives. Among them are the following.

- a. Continue to operate the Relief ministry while attempting to increase income and reduce costs.
- b. Transfer Ministerial Relief to another PCA committee or agency where it can be combined with another ministry (such as Mercy Ministries of MNA).
- c. Transfer Ministerial Relief to the presbyteries.

Our considered opinion is that alternative a. is currently the best choice for several reasons:

APPENDICES

- (1) IAR has operated the Ministerial Relief Fund since the beginning of the denomination and has a better understanding of how to promote and run the program than other PCA committees, agencies or presbyteries.
- (2) There is a logical tie between the retirement program and Ministerial Relief since IAR has access to retirement data and has closer contact with retirees, disabled ministers and lay workers and their surviving spouses and dependent children.
- (3) Combining Ministerial Relief and other mercy ministries may reduce the funds available to assist needy retired church workers in an effort to promote a broader assistance program for the church at large.

The Board passed the following actions in an attempt to reduce administrative expenses charged to the Relief Fund.

- a. That PCA Foundation expenses be netted out of gifts through the Foundation and not be considered as administrative expenses of the Relief Fund for the year 1992 and following.
- b. That administrative expenses for the Relief Fund, to the extent possible, be paid from investment income generated by Relief Fund assets for 1991 and following. (Due to excellent investment performance all administrative expenses of the Relief Fund were paid from investment income during 1991.)

2. **Action:** Item 12. (p.153) 1991 GA Minutes:

That IAR investigate providing low cost, high deductible coverage for the basic package of health insurance, with options of further coverage at additional cost to those who qualify, and report to the 20th General Assembly.

Response: The Staff and Board spent several months negotiating with insurance carriers during 1991. The most we could persuade them to do was offer a \$500 deductible plan in addition to the \$250 deductible we currently had. Pacific Mutual is willing to consider adding a \$1,000 deductible for 1993, depending on their experience with our group during 1992. It is interesting to note that only about 21% of our group chose the \$500 deductible plan for 1992.

3. **Action:** Item 8. (p. 87) 1991 GA Minutes:

That the General Assembly request the Board of Trustees of IAR to consider allowing participants to specify that all or a part of their retirement contributions be invested in IFBD and report to the 20th General Assembly with appropriate recommendations.

Response: IAR's legal counsel was consulted on the matter and after significant research issued an opinion strongly advising the Trustees not to allow new retirement

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

funds to be invested in the Investor's Fund notes because of a number of real and potential legal problems for the retirement plans.

We subsequently consulted another attorney in Washington D.C. who is significantly involved in legal matters for a number of church pension boards. His advice was the same. We also consulted several church pension boards and were given the same advice. One such board, that of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, shared their experience of several years ago. They submitted a private letter ruling request to the Internal Revenue Service attempting to secure approval for investments in their denominational church building program. After three years of consultations with the IRS they finally withdrew their request, when they learned they could expect a negative response.

As a result of these opinions the Trustees passed an action at their September 13, 1991 meeting as follows:

That, on advice of legal counsel, no future loans be made to or investments be made in any PCA church or agency with funds from PCA retirement plans and that the Board's Investment Policy be amended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Minutes of Board meetings of September 13, 1991, November 1, 1991 and March 6-7, 1992 be approved.
2. That the audit report dated December 31, 1991 by Arthur Andersen & Company be received.
3. That the General Assembly approve the use of Arthur Andersen & Company to conduct the 1992 audit.
4. That the 1993 budget be received with the understanding that this budget is a spending plan and that adjustments will be made during the year, if necessary, by the Trustees.
5. That the General Assembly approve the addition of Section 8, entitled "Conflict or Duality of Interest" to Article II of the Trustees' Bylaws (see Attachment 1) and the accompanying Certificate and Disclosure Statement. (See Attachment 2.)
6. That the General Assembly urges its member churches to receive an annual offering or budget regular benevolent giving to support relief activities through the Ministerial Relief Fund.

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 1

BYLAWS

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, INSURANCE, ANNUITY AND RELIEF FUNDS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

ARTICLE II

Section 8. Conflict or Duality of Interest.

All trustees, agents and employees of this Board shall disclose all real or apparent conflicts or dualities of interest which they discover or which have been brought to their attention in connection with this Board's activities. "Disclosure" as used in the Bylaws shall mean providing promptly, to the appropriate persons, a written description of the facts comprising the real or apparent conflict or duality of interest. An annual disclosure statement shall be circulated to trustees, certain identified agents and employees to assist them in considering such disclosures, but disclosure is appropriate and required whenever conflicts or dualities of interest may occur. The written notices of disclosure shall be filed with the Chairman or such other person designated by the Chairman to receive such notifications. All disclosures of real or apparent conflicts or dualities of interest shall be noted for the record in the minutes of meetings of the Board of Trustees.

An individual trustee, agent or employee who believes that he/she or an immediate member of his/her family might have a real or apparent conflict of interest shall, in addition to filing a notice of disclosure, abstain from: (1) participating in discussions or deliberations with respect to the subject of the conflict (other than to present factual information or answer questions), (2) using their personal influence to affect deliberations, (3) making motions, (4) voting, (5) executing agreements, or (6) taking similar actions on behalf of the Trustees where the conflict or duality of interest might pertain by law, agreement or otherwise. At the discretion of the Board of Trustees or a committee thereof, a person with a real or apparent conflict or duality of interest may be excused from all or any portion of discussion or deliberations with respect to the subject of the conflict.

A member of the Board of Trustees or a committee thereof, who, having disclosed a conflict or duality of interest, nevertheless shall be counted in determining the existence of a quorum at any meeting where the subject of the conflict is discussed. The minutes of the meeting shall reflect the disclosure made, the vote thereon, the abstention from participation and voting by the individual making disclosure.

There shall be no business transactions, whether in the nature of employment, contract, purchase or sale, between the Board and a Trustee during his term in office and, for a period of one year thereafter. For purposes of this Section 8, the payment of any benefit to which the Trustee might otherwise be entitled, shall not be deemed a business transaction.

The Chairman shall ensure that all Trustees, agents, employees and independent contractors of the Board are made aware of the Board's policy with respect to conflict or dualities of interest.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 2

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
INSURANCE, ANNUITY AND RELIEF FUNDS
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
CONFLICT OR DUALITY OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

CERTIFICATION

I have read and understand Article II, Section 8, Conflict or Duality of Interest of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees. In accordance with Article II, Section 8, I hereby declare and certify the following real or apparent conflicts or dualities of interest (if none write "NONE"):

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

(if necessary, attach additional documentation.)

Dated: _____

(Signature)

(Title)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX H

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERCHURCH RELATIONS TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

I. Membership

TE Henry Lewis Smith	SE Alabama	1994
RE George H. Gulley, Jr.	Grace	1994
TE Robert Vasholz	Missouri	1993
RE Jack Merry	Northeast	1993
TE K. Eric Perrin	Heritage	1992
RE Michael Frey	Philadelphia	1992
TE Paul Gilchrist	Stated Clerk	ex officio
TE Tim Fortner	Covenant	alternate
RE Wilson Barbee	C. Carolina	alternate

II. Meetings

July 15, 1991 (telephone conference call)
January 16, 1992 (telephone conference call)
March 26, 1992 (telephone conference call)

III. Issues Discussed And Actions Taken

A. NORTH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED COUNCIL

The Seventeenth annual meeting of NAPARC was held November 7, 1991 in Pittsburgh, PA. The PCA was represented by TE Paul Gilchrist, TE John E. Grauley and TE James D. Hatch. TE Morton Smith was reelected secretary for the 1991-92 year, and TE Henry Lewis Smith was elected vice-president.

Perhaps the most significant action of NAPARC '91 was the adoption of a resolution offered by the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, noting that 1993 will be the 350th Anniversary of the convening of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. This requested member churches to appoint members to a committee to plan for conference commemorating this anniversary, to be held at Westminster Abbey, London, site of the Assembly. TE Henry Lewis Smith was appointed to represent the PCA on this committee.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Concern was again expressed over the action of the 1990 Synod of the Christian Reformed Church, permitting the ordination of women as teaching and ruling elders subject to ratification by the 1992 Synod. NAPARC sent a second communication to the CRC asking that this action be reversed.

The application of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church for membership in NAPARC was put on hold by EPC's Fraternal Relations Committee.

The 1992 meeting of NAPARC is set for October 28-29 at Bonclarken ARP Assembly, Flat Rock, NC.

B. THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY COMMEMORATION COMMITTEE

We heartily commend to our teaching and ruling elders and entire membership the conference in London, England, September 23-25, 1993, commemorating the 350th Anniversary of the seating of the Assembly. Plans include a great service of thanksgiving in the nave of Westminster Abbey, and a brief pageant in the Jerusalem Chamber where the Assembly met for daily work sessions. Permission for the use of these was secured through the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America and also Dr. Robert Norris of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, a native of and formerly a pastor in the United Kingdom.

Also scheduled are a series of eight lectures by respected American and British scholars on the times, the men, the work, the faith and the documents of the Westminster Assembly. These will be held in the nearby Westminster Chapel.

A banquet and a final service on Saturday afternoon at a downtown London church will conclude the commemorative conference, whose purpose will be:

"To give thanks to God for the work of the Westminster Assembly,
To promote unity among Reformed Churches around the world, and
To advance the Reformed faith by focusing attention on the work
of the Assembly."

In addition to the London conference historical tour packages will be offered, visiting spots in Scotland associated with John Knox, Jenny Geddes, Ebenezer Erskine, and the Covenanters, and in England at York, Cambridge, and the Lake District. Information will be made available to pastors interested in securing and organizing tour groups.

It is hoped that arrangements can be made for credit hours toward the D. Min. degree at several Presbyterian and Reformed seminaries.

Members of the Westminster Assembly Commemoration Committee are RE Charles Carlisle (ARP), TE Charles G. Kromminga (CRC), TE Myung Doh Kim (Korean PCA), TE Charles Dennison (OPC), TE Thomas Reid (RPCNA), and Henry

APPENDICES

Lewis Smith (PCA), who serves as committee chairman. TE David Hall (PCA) heads the subcommittee on Advancing the Westminster Standards in the Church today.

C. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS

At its March 3-5, 1992 convention in Chicago, NAE celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. Its history is chronicled in a commemorative book, *Standing Up, Standing Together* by PCA's Arthur Matthews, with foreword by Billy Graham.

President George Bush addressed the World Relief luncheon, saluting the work of World Relief and the NAE Office of Public Affairs. He asserted; "Let me be clear: I support the right to life."

TE William Barker was elected NAE Executive Board member for 1992-93 anniversary.

A complete report on the 50th Anniversary meeting of NAE in Chicago, March 3-5, 1992 is attached.

D. CONVOCAION OF PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REPRESENTATIVES AT WORLD EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP IN THE PHILIPPINES

The convening of great interest and attention has centered on representatives Presbyterian and Reformed bodies affiliated with WEF (through their own national groups, as the PCA is through membership in the National Association of Evangelicals) at the forthcoming WEF assembly Lake Tael, the Philippines June 21-26, 1992. This action was authorized by the 19th General Assembly and has gone forward under the capable leadership of committee member Eric Perrin.

Invitations have been issued to some sixty-five churches throughout the world, the list being provided through the assistance of Carl Wilhelm of the MTW staff. A number of replies and expressions of interest have been received. This gathering of Presbyterian and Reformed brethren is set for Thursday, June 25, at which time those assembled will determine if they desire to form a closer organization of conservative and evangelical Presbyterian and Reformed churches.

We will nominate three PCA representatives to this convocation who will attend without expense to the General Assembly. (See recommendations.)

E. THE ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Your committee has corresponded with the OPC Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, answering questions raised in their paper of December 2, 1991, "Stipulations". This was done carefully within the instructions of the 18th General Assembly "that this committee continue to be available to the (OPC Committee) for discussion of matters relating to the joining and receiving process."

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 19th General Assembly placed in the hands of this committee a letter from the 58th General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in which it "reaffirm(s) to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America our desire for closer union with the PCA, and pleads with our brethren to reconsider their rejection of organic union by any process except J & R." Our proposed response is set forth in Attachment 2

F. FRATERNAL DELEGATES have been appointed to the 1992 Assembly of these churches with whom we are in ecclesiastical fellowship:

**Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church - June 8-10,
Bonclarken, Flat Rock, NC** **TE Henry Lewis Smith**

**Christian Reformed Church - June 11-20,
Calvin College** **TE Robert Berkey**

**Korean American Presbyterian Church - June 16-19,
Iguasa, Paraguay** **--to be arranged if possible by MTW**

**Orthodox Presbyterian Church - June 4-12,
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA** **TE William S. Barker**

**Reformed Presbyterian Church in NA - August 6-13,
Northfield, MN** **TE John P. Smith**

G. OVERTURE 17 - REPORTING ON WORK OF NAE Heritage Presbytery has overtured this Assembly as follows:

Concerning promoting awareness of NAE in PCA --

Whereas the PCA joined the National Association of Evangelicals several years ago, and

Whereas the General Assembly has not heard much about our involvement in NAE recently,

Therefore, be it resolved, that as long as PCA remains a part of NAE, that the Inter Church Relations Committee is hereby charged with the responsibility of annually reporting upon and keeping the General Assembly aware of the work of the NAE, and also keeping the entire PCA aware through the PCA *Messenger* or other appropriate means.

We are recommending a response in Recommendation 7.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the proposed letter (Attachment 2) be adopted by the 20th General Assembly of the PCA as its response to the letter from the 58th General Assembly of the OPC. (See *M19GA*, p. 61).

APPENDICES

2. That Fraternal Delegates from the NAPARC churches be welcomed and invited to address the Assembly.
3. That the General Assembly hear Dr. Robert Norris, pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Washington and observer from the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, bring greetings and speak concerning the 1993 Westminster Assembly Commemoration.
4. That the General Assembly hear the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Brazil for three minutes.
5. That the General Assembly endorse PCA participation in the NAPARC - sponsored conference marking the 350th anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, September 23-25, 1993, and that full participation by its ruling and teaching elders and membership in the aims of this conference be encouraged, including attendance by those who find it feasible.
6. That the General Assembly appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for this conference as the PCA's share of the estimated expenses.
7. That Overture 17 from Heritage Presbytery be answered as follows:

"That Interchurch Relations Committee accepts the responsibility as outlined in the overture. Further, that the report of the representatives to NAE will be distributed as is being done this year."
8. That the 20th General Assembly pause to pray for God's blessing on the WEF General Assembly and the Presbyterian and Reformed Fellowship meeting.
9. That Teaching Elders Paul Gilchrist and K. Eric Perrin and Ruling Elder Carl Wilhelm be authorized to represent the PCA as delegates to the WEF General Assembly in Lake Taal, The Philippines. (Independent funding has already been secured for travel expenses.)

Grace and peace,

/s/ Henry Lewis Smith, Chairman
for the Committee on Interchurch Relations

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 1

REPORT ON NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS

Meeting in Chicago

March 3-5, 1992

Paul R. Gilchrist

The 50th Anniversary of the NAE was celebrated in Chicago on March 3-5, 1992. The PCA was represented by Richard Aeschliman, Hudson Armerding (a former president of NAE), Nick Arnett, Frank Brock, Mark Dalbey, Charles Dunahoo, Paul Gilchrist, George Grant, Susan Hunt, John Kyle, Arthur Matthews, Paul and Joanne McKaughan, Michael Alford, Robert Michaels, Lee Troup, Leon and Lorraine Wardell, Luder Whitlock and Earl Witmer. In order to express its congratulations to the NAE, the PCA took out a full page ad in the anniversary issue of Action. This was the March-April 1992 issue of the NAE's magazine.

Arthur Matthews was the author of the 50th anniversary book *Standing Up, Standing Together*. This is a very readable history of the growing impact that the NAE has had on the nation and throughout the world. The book has a Foreword by Billy Graham.

President George Bush addressed the NAE during a luncheon sponsored by World Relief. He saluted the work of World Relief, the NAE's Office of Public Affairs in Washington, and was strongly supported in his assertion, "Faith, family -- these are the values that sustain the great nation on earth. And to these values we must add the infinitely precious value of life itself. Let me be clear; I support the right to life."

Robert Dugan, Director of the NAE's Washington Office of Public Affairs, officially launched the Christian Citizenship Campaign, "A counterattack in the culture war." The effort aims at recruiting millions of evangelicals to pray more specifically and knowledgeably for their political leaders, and at registering one million new voters who will meet their civil and biblical responsibilities as citizens.

NAE's Board of Administration adopted and presented a new statement of mission, as follows:

"The mission of the National Association of Evangelicals (USA) is to extend the kingdom of God through a fellowship of member denominations, churches, organizations, institutions and individuals, demonstrating the unity of the body of Christ by standing for biblical truth, speaking with a representative voice and serving the evangelical community through united action, cooperative ministry and strategic planning."

In the Wednesday morning Leadership Session, Dennis Kinlaw, Chancellor of Asbury College, Wilmore, Kentucky, stressed the importance of theology in our day. He said that the most needed message in our intellectual world is that "God transcends everything we know as he stressed the sovereignty and personal dimensions of the Trinity. He added, "We need to tell the world about the Trinity, as it is the model for

APPENDICES

relationships and the basis for morality and Christian ethics. The difference between right and wrong starts in the heart of a sovereign God."

Charles Dunahoo reported as follows:

"The National Christian Education track, the Women's track and the Stewardship Ministries' track gave members of the Christian Education & Publications staff an opportunity to learn what was going on in the various ministries impacting CE/P. Seminars were conducted during the week which gave participants an opportunity to share programs, ideas and plans for future. From CE/P standpoint, the challenge in local churches for teaching people how to live with cultural and ethnic diversity was most helpful and challenging. What is and should be done in ministering to ministers' families was also valuable input for the CE/P Committee and staff given the present assignment in this area.

"Women's ministries and stewardship are also high on CE/P's agenda. The NAE gave the staff opportunity to meet with others working in these same areas for an exchange of ideas.

"My personal conclusions have been reinforced. The NAE needs the PCA and the PCA needs NAE. The national press, the address from President Bush and the presence of Dr. Billy Graham underscored the significance of such a meeting."

Susan Hunt, Director of the PCA's Women in the Church, attended the Women's Commission. She reported the following:

"I represented the PCA on the Women's Commission of the NAE. This was an encouraging experience for me. Interacting with women from many denominations was a great blessing. I appreciated their love for Jesus, the warmth with which I was received, and the resources I gathered. I was moved by the World Relief project of the Women's Commission and look forward to sharing this with PCA women. It was also helpful to learn of the things being done to minister to pastors' wives. This information will be of great help as we continue to develop our ministry to these women.

"The Convention broadened my scope of what is being done by evangelicals and equipped me to better serve PCA women."

Richard Aeschliman attended the Christian Stewardship Association. He reported the following:

"The Christian Stewardship Association, which is the newest affiliate of the NAE, sponsored a luncheon, and several workshops at the convention. They were stimulating and the presentations touched on both ends of the spectrum. Topics dealt with "Stewardship and Baby Boomers" -- all the way to "Preparing Pastors for Retirement."

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

"It is good for us in the PCA to interact with other evangelical Christians. We all face similar problems and opportunities. Stewardship is one area that highlights these things. The emphasis in stewardship workshops was upon the biblical principles that need to be taught and modeled."

At the World Evangelical Fellowship luncheon on Thursday, outgoing director David Howard summarized the growth and development of WEF during his ten-year tenure in office. The new Executive Director, Jun Vencer, will be installed at the June meeting of the WEF General Assembly in the Philippines. He spoke of the challenges for evangelicals around the world and the great potentials as we approach the turn of the century.

The PCA is beginning to have an increasing impact on the NAE. William S. Barker was elected to the Executive Committee of the Board of Administration as well as serving on the Theological Committee (class of 1995). Luder Whitlock and Paul Gilchrist were elected to the Board of Administration, class of 1995. Earl Witmer and Michael Alford serve the Board of Administration by virtue of state representation. Paul McKaughan serves on the North American Council of the World Evangelical Fellowship as ex-officio member.

Billy Graham spoke at the concluding banquet of the 50th anniversary of NAE. He spoke of this as "a time for celebration, ... a time for reaffirmation, ... a time for anticipation." He concluded with a challenge: "Is all we do still accompanied by prayer and fasting, or have our modern insights and tools made them redundant? Are we still burdened by a passion for those who do not know Christ or have our neighbors become statistics and the abstract "unreached"? Is our faith integrated and applied in all our lives or is it relevant only in the private world? Is it still our heart's desire to know and love God above all else or is it enough simply to be an evangelical?"

ATTACHMENT 2

PROPOSED RESPONSE FOR GENERAL ASSEMBLY ADOPTION

(See text and action at 20-22, p. 63)

APPENDIX I

**REPORT ON THE INVESTOR'S FUND
FOR BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT
TO THE 19TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA**

I. Introduction

- A. From its small beginnings in 1986, The Investor's Fund for Building and Development has grown steadily as it assists PCA congregations to develop their first building or add space to house expanding ministries. Until recently, one of the best kept secrets in the PCA, it is now attracting substantial attention from across the denomination as a source of assistance in building, and equally as important, as a place to invest God's money in God's Kingdom.
- B. 1991 was the most active year in the Fund's history by any measure of success. The total number of loans made was 175% of the total the year before. New investments in 1991 were greatly enhanced as more than \$1.1 million dollars was added to the Fund. The BCS program saw a doubling in its participants and added a new level of service--the Development Consulting Program.
- C. God is using the Investor's Fund in some unique ways never anticipated back in 1986. In order to be worthy of, and faithful to, this calling, the Trustees and staff have sought to live to these three simple principles.

-God's Money for God's Kingdom . This is still the heart and soul of the work. The IFBD is a vehicle, a tool, for God's people to put some of the monies God has entrusted to us directly back to work above and beyond our gifts and tithes. Through investments in IFBD the Master is honored while PCA congregations and presbyteries which desire help in church growth--financial help that is found in few other places--can secure it.

-A commitment to serve . We want to be known as an agency that exists to meet needs in the churches and presbyteries. Thus, the Fund is always listening for and asking, "How can we help" and "What would make your job better, faster or different?" It is out of simply asking this question of a few churches that the Development Consultant Program arose. A number of churches coming to the point of being ready to design and build, have asked if we could put a team together to assist them; hence this program is working with a number of congregations right now.

-A "get it done" attitude as we serve in pursuit of the vision we seek to be productive, in the power of God, to bear fruit in our labors so that the church

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

grows. Thus we seek to be creative, and to stretch ourselves, in order to accomplish what is best for the church, the PCA and the Kingdom.

- D. All of these commitments and values came into play this year on a project in Atlanta, Georgia. Like so many other congregations, this church was caught in the classic vise of Catch-22. In order to grow they needed more room, to get more room they needed more money, to get more money they needed to grow, but they couldn't grow because they needed more and better room.

The one thing this congregation was able to do was purchase property in such a way as to make portions of it available for building. But buying the property used up all their cash and they had a significant debt outstanding on the property. That's another wrinkle to Catch-22; you can buy property but you can't build because your building money is paying rent while the land lies empty. The church was without a pastor at the time, but gifted with a get-it-done type leadership who had a vision for their church. Their interim pastor brought them to the Investor's Fund.

At that time the Fund, in the consulting program, was working on its daycare/lease/purchase approach to assist young churches to cut the knot of their building Catch-22. The church leadership agreed to give the creative approach a try, and so the IF staff went to work. With the minimal amount of funds the church had available, a complete program of building and financing was developed. An architect and builder were brought in to assist and a unique church with daycare or preschool was designed to be financed through a unique lease/purchase agreement with an investor.

But the IF staff did not rest content at that point. Committed to good stewardship, GMGK (God's Money for God's Kingdom)--even as final financial documents were being drawn up and building permits obtained--the staff of IF found a way to finance the church's \$700,000 building program through a combination of Investor's Fund and outside loans. It was a stretch for all, not the least by the church, but it was best in the long run for the congregation.

After 18 months of work, untold hours of planning and negotiating, the congregation moved into the new facility January 12, 1992. From their first Sunday, their attendance and finances have doubled. The church just asked IF to find a way to refinance their total land and building in such a way as to add much needed classroom space immediately.

This building stands as a testimony of what a great God, working through a committed congregation, assisted by those committed to serve the church, can do.

APPENDICES

II. Activity in 1991

A. Investment Activity

1. The Investor's Fund is now registered in the following states:

Alabama	Maryland	Indiana
Georgia	Virginia	Pennsylvania (limited)
Florida	West Virginia	Delaware
Mississippi	North Carolina	New Jersey
Tennessee	South Carolina	

2. Registration is pending in Texas, Missouri, Colorado and Louisiana.
3. An additional approximately \$1,100,000 in new investments were received in the Fund in 1991. This would have brought total investment into the Fund to approximately \$5.7 million dollars by December 31, 1991. Unfortunately due to other circumstances the Fund redeemed the first of three large investments by Insurance Annuities and Relief on October 1, 1991, Certificate # 41 was redeemed in excess of \$980,000 thus lowering the total assets of the fund, leaving it with only a net 6.1% increase in investment assets. (As of the writing of this report, Fund investment assets had reached 5.1 million).

B. Loan Activity

1. Investor's Fund loans. As of December 31, 1991 the Fund had made direct loans for the year of \$2,263,000 bringing the total of loans made in the past four years \$6,715,730.00. An additional \$1,400,000.00 in loans will be made by the 19th General Assembly (See Appendix 1)
2. In July of 1992 Investor's Fund began administration of the Five Million Fund on behalf of the Assembly. The total amount of new loans made from the Five Million Fund this year was \$230,000.00. The total amount in loans as of December 31, 1991 was \$1,457,219 (Appendix 2)
3. By our informal record keeping, the Fund--through its assisted financing program--has directly placed loans of approximately \$950,000.00 in 1991 and bond programs exceeding \$4,800,000.00. In the first quarter of 1992 an additional \$4,335,000.00 in bond financing will have been issued, bringing the five year total for assisted financing to more than \$25,000,000.00.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

C. Consulting Activity

1. The BCS - Basic Consulting Program now has more than 60 participant churches (See Appendix 3). A number of the initial participants have "graduated" into buildings--some into facilities they built, others into pre-existing structures. The balance of those in the program are making progress towards the appropriate outcome with guidance from the consulting staff. Many churches contemplating expansion also are taking part in the program.
2. A new level of consulting has been added - Development Consulting. Though as a GA agency IF cannot take actual responsibility for putting up buildings, IF staff has over-seen the pulling together of development teams--including architect, engineer, builder and lender--to the advantage of the church. The IF consulting staff works with the church to develop and execute its building plan.

D. Administrative Activity

1. As a result of action taken by the 18th General Assembly, IFBD has fully integrated into its operation the responsibility for an administration of the MNA Building Department (including the Five Million Fund). The transition has been smooth and has resulted in a more efficient operation of all the programs. It has enabled MNA to focus on its primary mission of planting and growing churches, while enabling IFBD to function as a "full service" building department.

E. Future Activity

In the next year, in the grace of God, IFBD seeks

1. To continue to help the growing number of PCA congregations which will require some type of financing assistance, IFBD is seeking to:
 - a) Find new ways to interest PCA members and friends to take advantage of the investment opportunity offered by IFBD.
 - b) Continue to register IFBD in new states, providing more PCA people the chance to participate in the investment program.
 - c) Develop new innovative financing sources, resources and strategies.
2. To continue to expand the consulting services of the BCS and Development Consulting through use of regional consultants. This is one of the most effective ministries we have and can have a significant impact on the PCA's Vision 2000.
3. To add to the number of building packages which churches can use. Based on last year's experience, additional packages in which design,

APPENDICES

financing and construction are presented as a unit are going to be in increasing demand.

III. Recommendations

- A. That the General Assembly express its gratitude to God for continued growth of IFBD and its ministries to churches, as well as encourage churches, presbyteries, individuals and Committees of the Assembly to participate in IFBD programs.
- B. That the General Assembly give thanks to the Father for the work of the staff of IFBD, TE Cecil A. Brooks, Coordinator; TE John T. Ottinger, Associate Coordinator; Shirley S. Covington, Virginia Harris, John Underwood.
- C. That the General Assembly approve the audit of the year pending December 31, 1991 (IFBD has already moved to a calendar year).
- D. That the General Assembly adopt the Budget for the year ending December 31, 1993.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Attachment 1
Investor's Fund Loans

Church	City	Amount	Purpose
Pinelands	Miami, Fl	220,000	land
Grace Covenant (1)	Blacksburg, VA	41,930	land
Christ	Jacksonville, FL	257,000	land
Hope	Ballston Spa, NY	180,000	renovate
Emmanuel	Philadelphia, PA	210,000	renovate
Christ	Arlington, VA	176,000	purchase
Sycamore	Midlothian, VA	315,000	build
Murphy-Blair	St. Louis, MO	42,000	purchase
Frontier	Birmingham, AL	80,000	purchase
Chinese Christian	Falls Church, VA	240,000	purchase
North Coast (1)	Enchinitas, CA	315,000	expand
Lake Stevens	Lake Stevens, WA	61,800	refinance
Coquina (1)	Ormond Beach, FL	120,000	land
Sycamore	Midlothian, VA	82,000	build
Aliso Creek (1)	Laguna Nigel, CA	215,000	purchase
Hope (1)	Marietta, GA.	210,000	land
Covenant	Short Hills, NJ	100,000	renovate
Christ	Olathe, KS	90,000	land
Shady Grove	Gaithersburg, MD	240,000	land
Cornerstone	Tallahassee, FL	75,000	land
West Boca	Boca Raton, FL	40,000	build
Calabasas	Calabasas, CA	300,000	build
New City Fellowship	Chattanooga, TN	220,000	purchase
Cornerstone	Tallahassee, FL	290,000	build
New Life (2)	Philadelphia, PA	100,000	purchase
Christ (2)	Mobile, AL	77,000	build
Korean (2)	St. Louis, MO	100,000	purchase
Promise	Philadelphia, PA	55,000	purchase
Good Shepherd	Valpariso, IN	165,000	build
First	Crossville, TN	183,000	build
Trinity	Statesboro, GA	275,000	build
Korean Canaan	Flushing, NY	60,000	build
Trinity	Plano, TX	200,000	land
Parkwood	Applevalley, MN	60,000	purchase
Our Saviors	Lawrenceville, GA	425,000	build
Emmanuel	Philadelphia, PA	80,000	renovation
Bay Area	Clear Lake City, TX	300,000	land
New Covenant (2)	Raleigh, NC	100,000	build
Perimeter-East	Atlanta, GA	415,000	build
Total Loans		6,715,730	

(1) Loan paid off

(2) Participation loan

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 2 FIVE MILLION FUND LOANS

Church	City/State
Auburn Road Presbyterian Church	Venice, FL
Calvary Presbyterian Church	Kannapolis, NC
Calvin Presbyterian Church	Phoenix, AZ
Carlisle Ref. Presbyterian Church	Carlisle, PA
Chesapeake Presbyterian Church	Sunderland, MD
Christ Presbyterian Church	Owensboro, KY
Christ Presbyterian Church	Mobile, AL
Coquina Presbyterian Church	Ormond Beach, FL
Comerstone Mission	Conyers, GA
Covenant Presbyterian Church	Lander, WY
Covenant Presbyterian Church	Chattanooga, TN
Evangel Presbyterian Church	Helena, AL
Evangel Presbyterian Church	Wichita, KS
Faith Presbyterian Church	Montgomery, AL
Faith Ref. Presbyterian Church	Vancouver BC, Canada
First Presbyterian Church	Markham, Ontario, Canada
Glen Burnie Evangelical PC	Glen Burnie, MD
Good Shepherd PC	Maple Grove, MN
Grace Presbyterian Church	Braintree, MA
Grace Presbyterian Church	Laconia, NH
Harvester Presbyterian Church	Springfield, VA
Immanuel Reformed PC	Belleville, IL
Korean Bethel PC	Chicago, IL
Korean First PC	Decatur, GA
New Covenant Fellowship	Atlanta, GA
New Covenant Fellowship	Atlanta, GA
New Covenant Fellowship	Atlanta, GA
New Covenant PC	Hickory, NC
New Life PC	Virginia Beach, VA
New Song Fellowship	Baltimore, MD
Nursery Road PC	Columbia, SC
Our Saviors Presbyterian	Lawrenceville, GA
Perimeter Church Northwest	Marietta, GA
Perimeter Presbyterian Church	Tucker, GA
Pine Ridge PC	Orlando, FL
Presbyterian Church of	Wellsville, NY
Princeton PC	Princeton NJ
Rock Presbyterian Church	Stockbridge, GA
South Valley PC	Chandler, AZ
Sycamore Presbyterian Church	Midlothian, VA
Tampa Bay Presbyterian Church	Tampa, FL
Town North Presbyterian Church	Richardson, TX
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Elberton, GA

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Church	City/State
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Statesboro, GA
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Mobile, AL
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Rochester, MN
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Hollsopple, PA
W. Springfield Covenant Church	W. Springfield, MA
West Boca Presbyterian Church	Boca Raton, FL
West Valley Korean PC	Boca Raton, FL
Westminster Presbyterian Church	Boone, NC
Whiteside Presbyterian Church	Cashiers, NC
Wildwood Presbyterian Church	Tallahassee, FL

ATTACHMENT 3 BCS PARTICIPANTS

Church	City/State
Bay Area Presbyterian Church	Houston, TX
Bucks Central Church	Newtown, PA
Chapel PCA	Beaver, PA
Chestnut Mtn. Presbyterian Church	Chestnut Mtn., GA
Christ Community Church	Titusville, FL
Christ Presbyterian Church	Greenville, NC
Christ Presbyterian Church	Lewisville, TX
Church of the Good Shepherd	Chapel Hill, NC
Church of the Servant	Hershey, PA
Community Presbyterian Church	Louisville, KY
Comunidade Crista Presbiteriana	Louisville, KY
Cornerstone Presbyterian Church	Conyers, GA
Cornerstone Presbyterian Church	Manassas, VA
Cornerstone Presbyterian Church	St. Peters, MO
Covenant Presbyterian Church	Edwardsville, IL
Covenant Presbyterian Church	Harleysville, PA
Covenant Presbyterian Church	Milledgeville, GA
Decatur Presbyterian Church	Decatur, AL
Eastern Shore Presbyterian Church	Montrose, AL
Faith Presbyterian Church	Cheraw, SC
Faith Presbyterian Church	Gainesville, FL
Faith Reformed PCA	Quarryville, PA
First Presbyterian Church	Crossville, TN
First Presbyterian Church	Plantation, FL
Good Shepherd Presbyterian Church	Maple Grove, MN
Grace Presbyterian Church	Hudson, OH
Grace Evangelical Church	Memphis, TN

APPENDICES

Church	City/State
Grace Presbyterian Church	Port Charlotte, FL
Grace Presbyterian Church	San Diego, CA
Grace Presbyterian Church	Stone Mtn., GA
Harvest Presbyterian Church	Medina, OH
Harvestwood Covenant Presbyterian	Floyd, VA
Hazelwood Reformed Presbyterian	Hazelwood, MO
Heritage Reformed Presbyterian	Glencoe, MO
Kiski Valley Presbyterian Church	Leechburg, PA
Metrocrest Presbyterian Church	Carrollton, TX
New Hope Presbyterian Church	Eustis, FL
New Life Presbyterian Church	Tifton, GA
North Augusta Presbyterian Church	North Augusta, SC
Northwood Presbyterian Church	Dothan, AL
Olathe Presbyterian Church	Olathe, KS
Our Savior's Church	Lilburn, GA
Parkwood Presbyterian Church	Apple Valley, MN
Peace Presbyterian Church	Waynesboro, VA
Presbyterian Church of the Covenant	Houston, TX
Providence Presbyterian Church	York, PA
Providence Reformed PC	Crestwood, MO
Ridge Bible Fellowship	Paradise, CA
Shady Grove Presbyterian Church	Germantown, MD
South Dayton Presbyterian Church	Centerville, OH
Southwood Presbyterian Church	Huntsville, AL
Spring Valley Presbyterian Church	Schaumburg, IL
Sycamore Presbyterian Church	Midlothian, VA
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Murfreesboro, TN
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Spartanburg, SC
Trinity Presbyterian Church	Statesboro, GA
University City Presbyterian Church	Charlotte, NC
Westminster Presbyterian Church	Gainesville, GA
Westminster Presbyterian Church	Martinez, GA
Westminster Presbyterian Church	Sumter, SC

APPENDIX J

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA
TO THE 20TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF
THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

I. INTRODUCTION

"To God be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus throughout all generations forever and ever!"

Paul's ringing doxology in Ephesians 3:21 calls us to a renewed appreciation for our own reformed ecclesiology. Amazingly, God's glory is to be expressed through His church.

There are indeed many wonderful agencies and organizations that God has raised up in our day. Yet it is the church, the people of God, who are the object of His affection, the recipients of His promises, whose leadership and sacraments are instituted by Him.

It is the people of God, the church, that will be as the sand of the sea, the stars of the sky (Genesis 22:17). It is the church for whom Christ gave his life (Ephesians 5:25). It is the church that Christ will build, against which the gates of Hell will not overcome (Matthew 16:18). It is the church, which, under the headship of Christ, is His very fulness (Ephesians 1:22). It is the church that is to mirror to the unseen hosts the wisdom and glory of God in uniting gentiles and Jews in Christ (Ephesians 3:10). It is the church that will be presented to Christ without blemish, but holy and blameless (Ephesians 5:27).

"To God be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus throughout all generations forever and ever!"

As biblical reformed Christians, our goal is then the glory of God in His church. As the Presbyterian Church in America, one small part of His church, we seek to exist, function and grow in biblical ways that bring Him glory and demonstrate that glory.

The glory of God in His church drives Mission to North America in its basic purpose:

"In obedience to and in dependence upon our sovereign God, the purpose of MNA is to enable PCA churches and presbyteries to start and develop healthy, reproducing churches in North America by providing vision communication, strategic planning, training, support services, and special ministries, so that a movement of multiplying reformed churches is initiated and sustained."

APPENDICES

It is God's church then that is our goal--its extension and health. Further, the church is also our means. The work of MNA is increasingly to be an enabling ministry, assisting congregations and presbyteries in starting and growing healthy churches. The active involvement of presbyteries and local churches throughout the Presbyterian Church in America will insure that the work of Mission to North America is carried out.

We praise God for His continued work in and through this portion of His church, the Presbyterian Church in America.

II. DEPARTMENTS

Anglo Church Planting

The goal of Mission to North America is enabling the PCA to help start and grow churches. The PCA has always placed a priority on church planting; in our opinion, this must even increase if we are to see our continent under the Kingship of Christ.

In accordance with its purpose statement, Mission to North America continues to place high priority upon developing a regional and decentralized approach to church planting. While MNA will continue to pursue an aggressive plan to start churches in world class cities (e.g. New York, Toronto, Los Angeles), in strategic locations, and in certain frontier areas, for many of our projects the presbytery and local church will take the initiative and provide the majority of the funding. Through MNA regional coordinators, enabling presbyteries and local churches to do effective church planting will be the measure of our success.

In these cases, the MNA focus will be upon recruitment, assessment, and training of church planters, as well as providing a resource base for strategic planning.

Dr. J. Philip Clark led the way in this regard, becoming the Western Representative for MNA in 1986 at his retirement as MNA Coordinator. Under his leadership, the Western Region became a five-year focus for the PCA. In the thirteen western states, the number of presbyteries grew from three in 1985 to six in 1991 and churches and missions from approximately fifty to seventy. An annual regional conference on church planting and growth provides pastors and laity quality training, fellowship and encouragement.

On December 31, 1991, Dr. Clark again retired. His expertise, commitment and untiring efforts have led to a growing PCA presence in the West for which we are deeply grateful. The MNA Committee expresses its appreciation to Dr. Clark for his five and a half years of faithful service to the PCA and to MNA as Western Representative.

The Midwest also illustrates what MNA hopes to see throughout North America. TE Corbett Heimburger joined the staff of MNA full-time in 1991 as Midwestern Regional Coordinator, coming from a joint regional venture with Covenant Seminary and MNA.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

From St. Louis, he serves seven presbyteries in fourteen states, with half his financial support coming from the region itself. MNA is gratified to see the midwestern presbyteries enthusiastic about church planting and actively pursuing their own church planting objectives in close cooperation with the Assembly MNA.

Canada has also begun to function on a regional basis. Local churches and presbyteries are sponsoring a Vision 2000 - PCA Canada Project. The goal is to plant twenty-four churches by the year 2000, with a special focus upon the major centers of Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. Our Canadian brothers have already produced a quality bi-monthly national magazine, Coast to Coast, to promote the plan. Canadian churches have also committed the actual funding towards at least two church plants in 1992.

After nearly a year without someone in the post, MNA has appointed a new Coordinator of Church Planting. TE John Smed comes from Calgary, Alberta, Canada, where he started a church with MNA. As a pastor in Calgary, John also led the Canadian churches to new enthusiasm and participation in church planting nation-wide.

In addition to other church planting that will take place under John's leadership, the Anglo Church Planting Department is coordinating a three-year national strategy plan called "Enabling Called Men to Plant PCA Churches." The objective is to pray to the Lord of the harvest and to find, assess, train and place one hundred fifty called men throughout the United States and Canada by 1995. Implementation will be on a region-by-region basis.

MNA continues to offer an effective assessment program to churches and presbyteries in their church planting efforts. Four Assessment Centers were held in 1991, one in Orlando and three in Atlanta.

The annual church planter training conference was held in Atlanta August 5-9 with one-hundred and four in attendance. The training was similar to previous years, providing three "tracks" of learning experiences. The training covered (1) the church planter's arrival on the field until the first worship service, (2) the first service until organizing as a particular church, and (3) church development and growth for the established congregation.

An on-the-job church planter training and coaching plan is now being designed and field tested. This will enable church planters in the future to be equipped while in place on the field in a manner based upon their own needs and educational and learning goals.

Church planters supported by MNA during 1991 will be found as Attachment 1.

Multicultural Church Planting

MNA's Department of Multicultural Church Planting has as its purpose the starting of movements of church multiplication among Hispanics, Korean, African-Americans, and French Canadians. We also have been providentially involved in ministries among Japanese, Chinese and Brazilians.

APPENDICES

Movements of church multiplication can occur in America's subcultures as Christians focus on four priorities:

- * Corporate prayer
- * Saturation evangelism
- * Leadership training
- * Church multiplication

Corporate prayer is the united prayer of faith of an obedient people (Matthew 18:20). Each Multicultural Missionary under MNA has a band of persons committed to prayer. These groups strengthened by believers mobilized for prayer on the frontiers spearhead the church planting effort. In answer to prayer the Holy Spirit opens resistant hearts and convicts men of sin, righteousness and judgment.

Saturation evangelism is the extensive proclamation of the Word in a winsome way that God's Spirit can use in calling people to salvation. The forms used are culturally inviting: music, films, family retreats, personal testimonies, Bible studies, evangelical "fiestas." In addition to establishing relationships, these encounters open doors for in-depth presentations of the Gospel.

Leadership training is the full-orbed development of Christians from babyhood to maturity in Christ. The types of leaders to be trained include personal evangelists (hundreds), lay preachers (dozens), pastors (many), and movement leaders (some). Without the training of leaders there will be no maturing movement of people advancing in Christ. A great need is for missionaries from the ethnic groups we are involved with to move forward to help us train the emerging leaders God is giving His church.

Church multiplication is the result of the momentum of an evangelistic movement with leaders who nurture God's people. Church growth is the maturation of a single church. It involves growing strong numerically, spiritually and organically. Church multiplication is the evangelization of a region through the addition of dozens of churches. We believe God wants both growth and multiplication.

We anticipate specific movements of church multiplication under the leadership of several new movement leaders God has brought to us. MNA is now working in cooperation with Mission to the World on the US/Mexico border. Rev. Moises Zapata functions as the Border Coordinator and is coordinating church planting there for MNA.

In greater New York City, under the leadership of Dr. Timothy Keller, team leader of the New York City Project, TE Demetrio Rodriguez and TE Nelio Da Silva are not merely planting Hispanic and Brazilian churches respectively, but rather, each is developing house churches and core groups, recruiting and training pastors and leaders that will lead to movements of church multiplication.

The Korean churches continue with encouraging growth. In 1991, three churches and four missions were added, with a total now of ninety-four churches and missions, plus one-hundred and thirty-nine teaching elders.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MNA's multicultural church planting department is praying and planning for a harvest of souls and churches.

Multicultural missionaries and staff serving in 1991 will be found as Attachment 2.

Campus Ministry

Reformed University Ministries

Campus ministry for MNA is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The end for campus ministry is the church -- the building and strengthening of the church. The staff of Reformed University Ministries (the campus ministry of Mission to North America), lead in establishing a beachhead on the secular culture of college campuses through student-led ministries which reach out to other students. These ministries on thirty-six campuses are a means for reaching unchurched and "de-churched" students with the gospel and for equipping Christian students for ministry not only on the campus but in the church and society. (See Attachment 3 for listing of campuses and staff.)

Through the years, over sixty percent of the students involved in our ministries have been non-Presbyterians. Most of our campus groups are between seventy percent and ninety percent non-Presbyterian. In tracking students that have been actively involved in the ministry for at least two years, we have found that fifty percent of those students from non-PCA churches have joined PCA churches within five years after graduation. Churches are strengthened and grow as these Reformed University Ministries alumni become members, Sunday School teachers, and officers in local churches and presbyteries in the church at large.

I am seeing a number of Reformed University Fellowship students emerging into key leadership positions at First Church. They express to me the vital role that RUF played in preparing them for these leadership positions which range from Sunday School teachers to deacons, elders, and committee members.

Bill Hughes
First Presbyterian Church
Jackson, Mississippi

Over my many years in campus ministry at the University of Florida, I joyfully watched a number of students graduate, move on and get involved in both full time Christian ministry and the local church. Some went to the mission field while others are now serving as elders and youth ministers in PCA churches in Florida. Still others have written to me expressing their active involvement in their local church wherever they might be.

Rod Culbertson
Christ Community Presbyterian Church
Clearwater, Florida

APPENDICES

What a joy to have students with an RUF background participate in the life of the Kirk. They bring a love of God's Word, a comprehensive understanding of God's truth, a commitment to God's church, and heart for God's people -- send me all you can!

Wilson Benton
Kirk of the Hills Presbyterian Church
St. Louis, Missouri

Our campus staff demonstrate the ministry's commitment to the church through their involvement in local PCA churches. This modeling and teaching is observed and imitated by students involved in the campus fellowship groups. Students not only attend worship and come to experience first-hand what the church is, but also in some cases become actively involved in the local church's ministry through working with youth, working in the nursery, participating as choir members, and participating in small group Bible studies.

One of the greatest blessings I have enjoyed from the Lord in the PCA has been the privilege to both participate in the ministry of RUF and observe its impact. That impact is not only on the college campus but also in our churches as many of our students have now been exposed to a solid teaching and fellowship ministry during their college life. Also, many non-PCA students have been meaningfully exposed to and instructed in the Reformed faith.

Harry Reeder
Christ Covenant Presbyterian Church
Charlotte, NC

I consider Reformed University Ministries a mother lode of potential church leaders that we have tapped and plan to continue to tap for staff and leadership in our church. One resource that we have already used is our present youth director who came from the Reformed University Fellowship at Mississippi State and who will become a full time student this summer at Covenant Seminary. Another young lady from the RUF group at Ole Miss served in a summer intern program and is returning for a second term this summer. Recently, we received a teacher in our Christian school who came from the Belhaven RUF group.

Ray Cortese
Seven Rivers Presbyterian Church
Lecanto, Florida

Over the years, over seventy individuals, following graduation from college, have spent one or two years in ministry on a campus under a campus minister. The "learning/ministry" campus intern position provides an effective ministry on campus, and also equips future church members and pastors with more depth in evangelism, small group leadership, one-to-one ministry, Biblical/theological knowledge, and spiritual maturity.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

My experience as an intern prepared me to understand my role not only in the local church, but also in every aspect of my life -- family, wife, mother, educator, community service, etc. In regard to the church, my involvement as an intern gave me a Biblical insight to serve Christ in furthering His kingdom through the ordained institution, the church. By becoming more aware of my spiritual gifts of teaching, counseling, and service, the ministry gave me more confidence and experience to fulfill my role in these areas of the local church. I am grateful to Reformed University Ministries for giving me this foundation so that I might bring glory to my Savior and so that He will say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Susan Russell Aldridge

They join some seventy-five former students out of the ministry who also have attended seminary.

The students who come to Covenant Seminary out of Reformed University Ministries are among the most doctrinally sound, theologically balanced, and evangelistically zealous. We stand both grateful and amazed at the wonderfully effective, and often sacrificial, service of the PCA's campus ministers.

Bryan Chapell
Dean of Academic Affairs
Covenant Theological Seminary

Campus ministers have worked with presbyteries and local interested individuals in the starting of three PCA churches in college communities where we had campus ministries with no PCA churches. Campus ministers have done "double duty" leading weekly Bible studies and preaching before an organizing pastor was called.

I have always felt that Reformed University Fellowship students are, without a doubt, the key to the establishing of Grace Presbyterian Church. I remember the start of our church with five or six couples being encouraged and overwhelmed by the excitement and enthusiasm of RUF students eager to start a church. Parents of these college students were also instrumental in supporting the beginning of our church and, even today, continue their prayers and financial support of this church.

RE Sam McReynolds
Grace Presbyterian Church
Starkville, Mississippi

The church is being built and strengthened with a vision for the lost and the world. Cross-cultural Spring Break projects and summer mission opportunities are provided. Over one hundred students participated in one of seven Spring Break Cross-cultural projects located: on the Texas/Mexican border (in conjunction with MTW/Impact), in Chattanooga, Tennessee (with New City Fellowship and MNA/Mercy Ministries), in New York City (with Redeemer Church), and in Acapulco, Mexico (with MTW/Impact).

APPENDICES

I realize that as a philosophy major, I haven't been living in the real world. It was a struggle to communicate the Gospel in this environment.

For me, the biggest blessing of the missions project was getting to share my faith with the project children.

Student Participants
Spring Break Mission Projects

Each summer Reformed University Ministries works with MTW/Impact to provide two-month summer cross-cultural programs. Yearly, between eighteen percent and twenty-three percent of these participants come from Reformed University Fellowship (RUF) groups.

The quality of sincere participants from RUF is consistently exceptional. We are blessed to work with the PCA's cream of the crop from all over the country, and RUF students are usually our core leadership. They understand the Reformed faith and make solid Biblical application to their lives. They work hard, and our Mission to the World church planters love and actually prefer RUF summer servants. Two or three RUF participants from every summer program return for two-year MTW/Impact service.

Dan Camp
MTW/Impact SMP &
Recruitment Director

God's church being built and strengthened -- that is the end toward which Reformed University Ministries works.

International Students Christian Fellowship:

Reformed University Ministries continues to minister to international students through International Students Christian Fellowship (ISCF), with seven missionaries active on over ten campuses across the country. ISCF reaches students in this country who return to their own countries as Christians, many of whom seek to establish churches in places where there is very little or no Christian witness.

I met a man from South America in 1989 who was not a Christian and was having marital and alcohol problems. Through my ministry this man became a Christian, and I was able to equip him with the skills he needed to study the Bible and lead others to Christ. He returned to his home in Loja, Ecuador, taking with him some Bible studies I had prepared. Two years after his return, he continues to lead Bible studies in his home.

Brian DeJong
ISCF Missionary
Jackson, Mississippi

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

I worked with a couple from South China who were attending Georgia Tech University. I met this couple and befriended them through a Chinese New Year's celebration. Nominal Christians, they became the key to a study on Thursday nights for the next three years. Infused with new spiritual life, they have now returned to Fujian Province in Mainland China where they are active in the leadership of a small, non-denominational church. They play a key role in evangelism and in small groups.

Jean Lappin
ISCF Missionary
Atlanta, Georgia

Local ISCF ministries work closely with PCA churches in their area. This provides a way for church members to become involved in world missions in their own local communities. Local PCA church members serving as host families are inviting international students into their homes for meals, times of fun, weekend visits, and overnight stays in Jackson and Starkville, Mississippi; Carbondale, Illinois; Clemson, South Carolina; Atlanta, Georgia; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

In all of these locations, local church members assist students in attending church services and Sunday School classes. They also teach conversational English classes and Bible studies for internationals, and find various ways of showing international students the love of Christ through hospitality and practical assistance.

Over twenty host families were again a very important part of our second annual Christmas Conference held at Orangewood Presbyterian Church in Orlando, Florida. International students, in many cases for the first time, experienced a worship service and an overnight visit in an American home -- a PCA church member's home. Such hospitality was invaluable, but more important was the opportunity for international students to see a Christian family and for that family to be a witness in word and deed.

This year's Christmas Conference drew students from seventy different countries on five continents. Over half of the students were non-Christians -- twenty-two were from Mainland China, thirteen from Japan, nine from the Soviet Union, and six were Muslims. Most of the international students are graduate students or post-doctoral scholars, in many cases sent by their government. Upon returning home, they will fill leadership roles in education, politics, business, and medicine. Such people, when in their homeland, are some of the hardest to reach with the gospel. As we reach these internationals for Christ and equip them to serve Him, we prepare missionaries to go to the farthest corners of the earth with the gospel of Christ.

Evangelism

Mission to North America exists to enable the PCA to start and grow churches. However, a question of integrity emerges. May we start new churches but not be concerned about the outreach and growth of existing churches? The PCA has said no.

APPENDICES

The Evangelism Department is primarily involved in three areas: the promotion of biblical evangelism and church growth in the churches and presbyteries of the PCA; the development of a strong prayer network for church planting, church growth and evangelism across the PCA; and networking with evangelistic and prayer leaders from other evangelical denominations to promote prayer for renewal and revival across America and around the world.

In promoting biblical evangelism and church growth across the PCA, the Coordinator of Evangelism travels across the whole church, meeting and talking with pastors and church leaders and holding seminars and conferences on evangelism, prayer, and missions. The news on evangelism across the PCA is mixed. Many of the PCA churches are growing just because the morale of the congregation is so good, and people are drawn almost unconsciously, and bring friends without being told to do so. But other churches are declining, sometimes because the morale is not good, and sometimes because the community is changing and/or dying. Although the PCA is showing a steady growth, several of our presbyteries have lost more members than have been added. Growing congregations bring visitors; know how to share Christ; have opportunities for ministry, training, and growth; and are reaching young people and young families. Where these ingredients are not present or where they are not possible, churches begin to die. They begin to die unless, by the power of the Holy Spirit, there are loving and intensive efforts to reach people who are not of Presbyterian and Reformed background, and perhaps not even of North American background.

The statistics for 1991 were not received in time to be included in this report. However, a study of the 1989 and 1990 statistics showed an increase in adult professions of faith from 3,574 to 4,728, in children's' professions of faith from 2,348 to 2,524. They showed a growth in Sunday School enrollment from 109,467 to 112,674, and a growth in Sunday morning attendance from 142,211 to 160,089. Added to the PCA roll in 1990 were 19,767, but 13,215 were removed from the roll and total growth was from 216,044 to 222,725.

In seeking to develop a strong base of prayer for church planting and growth and evangelism, efforts are continuing to reach the goal of 10,000 individuals who are committed to pray regularly. To date there are about 6500 enlisted, representing 248 of the approximately 1200 PCA churches and missions.

One of the truly encouraging things in the church today is the growing concern for prayer for renewal and revival in nearly all denominations. There is a network of prayer leaders that gather to share and pray. Reports come in from all areas of the country of interdenominational groups that are meeting regularly to pray for a fresh revelation of the glory and holiness of God and a deep conviction of sin and outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the grace of repentance and godly living. We encourage ruling and teaching elders to become a part of groups praying for God's outpouring on their community and nation.

Late in 1991, TE Jayme Sickert, who served MNA well as Director of Church Relations and who coordinated the MNA Prayer Project, made a move to other ministries.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Chaplains

The goal of MNA is to enable the PCA to start and grow churches. Because PCA chaplains are fine churchmen, the result of their ministry repeatedly is families who have been won and/or disciplined who now look for a church that is reformed and biblically based. The chaplains ministry thus serves well the overall goals of MNA.

The effective and broad ministry of PCA chaplains was highlighted in 1991 in God's providence because of the war in the Persian Gulf. Stories of God's work through chaplains generally and PCA men specifically brought this ministry to the fore. PCA TE Col. David Peterson's leadership of all the armed forces chaplains in that theater further added to the public awareness of PCA chaplains and their work.

Despite the move to cut the military budget, the Director of Chaplain Ministries is encouraged and feels that the reduction in our chaplain force may well not follow the same percentage of cuts as in the military generally. Indeed, from September 1991 to January 1992 the actual numbers increased some eight percent with the addition of six new active duty chaplains.

Statistics are encouraging. At the conclusion of 1991, there were fifty-three PCA active duty chaplains, forty-nine reserve chaplains, and twenty-eight other chaplains, including Civil Air Patrol, hospital, and prison.

We praise God for the conversions, discipleship, training, counseling, and other ministry that goes on worldwide through our "military missionaries." We call on local churches to continue their fine work of adopting a chaplain for whom they pray and with whom they keep in contact.

The report of TE William B. (Bill) Leonard, Jr., Director of Chaplain Ministries for MNA and Executive Director of the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel is found as Attachment 4.

Mercy Word/Deed

While Mission to North America exists to enable the PCA to start and grow churches, another question of integrity haunts us. Is it possible for PCA churches to proclaim the gospel in word without at the same time clothing that message with Christ-like deeds of compassion to those in need? Clearly, no. The world we seek to serve and reach is one full of pain. The Good News must come with the compassion, hope and love of Jesus Christ to the varieties of hurting people through holistic service.

The Mercy Department exists to help enable PCA presbyteries and churches reach out to people effectively in this way. Amid the many crying needs, six key areas receive focus:

APPENDICES

The Poor (especially inner city)
The Senior Adult
The Children
The Prisoner
The Afflicted (emotionally, physically)
Those touched by disaster

The ministry has been hampered in 1991 by the lack of a full-time director and an adequate budget, though significant strides have been made.

Specific how-to manuals are now available on Disaster Relief, AIDS Ministry, and Prison Ministry, which was a specific focus for 1991. In 1992, a number of ministry seminars geared toward equipping pastors and churches will be offered by ministry specialists.

Certain mercy ministry specialists -- Mercy Missionaries -- are fielded among people of particular need. In 1991, six missionary families served various needy communities in Miami, Florida; Chattanooga, Tennessee; and Charlotte, North Carolina; as well as a specialist in Disaster Relief. Since then, three families have moved to other ministries in and outside the PCA.

A list of Mercy Missionaries who served in 1991 is included as Attachment 5.

Bethany Christian Services has for some fifty years served throughout North America in the area of pregnancy counseling and adoption. Uniquely related to the PCA through Assembly endorsement, Bethany continues to provide exceptionally helpful, experienced, and quality service to the churches. We commend Bethany to the presbyteries, churches and individuals of the PCA for involvement and financial support. The annual Bethany report will be found as Attachment 6.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the General Assembly commend TE Terry Gyger for his visionary leadership as MNA Coordinator, and re-elect him for another year.
2. That the General Assembly express its gratitude to God for the staff and personnel of Mission to North America.
3. That the General Assembly further thank God for its PCA campus staff, active and reserve chaplains, mercy missionaries, multicultural missionaries, and the organizing pastors of local church, presbytery or Assembly sponsorship.
4. That the General Assembly reaffirm its commitment to the church, the Body of Christ, as that primary vehicle through which God seeks to receive and to display his Glory and by which He extends His kingdom; and that the Assembly call on the churches and presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church in America to

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

seek to insure that their prayer, energy, manpower, and financial resources actually serve to enhance the building of the Church of our God and Saviour.

5. That the General Assembly approve an offering for PCA Mercy Ministries, to be taken preferably during the Thanksgiving season.
6. That the General Assembly express thanks to God for the long and effective ministry of Bethany Christian Services in the area of pregnancy counseling and adoption, encourage strong support for it by the churches and presbyteries, and invite its representative to speak to the Assembly for ten minutes at this or a more appropriate time. (See report from Bethany Christian Services, Attachment 6.)
7. **Whereas** the PCA Korean churches have been uniquely blessed by God and are the most rapidly growing segment of the PCA, and

Whereas the 10th General Assembly approved the organization of non-geographical Korean Language Presbyteries for a ten-year period, subject to extension by the Assembly (Minutes, 9th GA, 10-66 III 24.b p.92), and

Whereas that ten-year period concludes in 1992, and

Whereas God has richly blessed the Korean churches with growth during this decade so that at this ten-year mark there are now five Korean Language Presbyteries with a total of forty-one churches, fifty-three missions, and one-hundred and thirty-nine teaching elders; and

Whereas the existence of language presbyteries has been a most effective means of assisting growth among Korean churches and a primary bridge between the anglo PCA and emerging second and third generation Korean leaders who come into the PCA;

Therefore, the MNA Committee recommends that the General Assembly extend the organization of non-geographical Korean Language Presbyteries with the following conditions previously approved by the 10th GA:

1. The boundaries of the presbytery will be according to the needs of the Korean churches and will be superimposed on existing presbyteries.
2. The language used in the presbyteries will be Korean but it will be understood that all presbytery minutes and other documents and correspondence which the General Assembly must read will be translated into English for the benefit of the General Assembly.
3. Any Korean church will have the freedom to join the Korean Language Presbytery, or the English-speaking presbytery. Any Korean church applying for membership in the PCA may submit its application to whichever presbytery it prefers.

APPENDICES

4. Permission for separate language presbyteries will be for a period of ten years. At the end of that time, permission can be extended for other ten-year periods as deemed necessary.

RATIONALE:

1. Since the Korean Language Presbyteries are composed of mostly first generation Korean churches, there remains a cultural/language need to continue language presbyteries until second generation Korean churches come into being.
2. The five Korean Language Presbyteries themselves are requesting the extension.
3. The first two sections of the BCO--the Form of Government and Rules of Discipline--have been translated into Korean and time is now needed for Korean presbyteries to adjust to the BCO standards.
4. Historically, it has taken churches from other subcultures three generations to assimilate into American church culture. Time and energy is needed to bring the Korean churches to a point where they feel a part of the PCA.

In answer to the concerns of the Committee on Review of Presbytery Records (Minutes 19th GA, 19-70-III, p. 176) the MNA Committee reports that the translation of both the BCO (through the Rules of Discipline) and the RAO have been completed; and the MNA Committee reports that the translation of the minutes of the five Korean presbyteries has been completed.

8. That the General Assembly reaffirm its absolute dependence upon Almighty God for the growth and health of the PCA and encourage its presbyteries and churches to commit to participation in the Army of Intercessors so that the ministry of church planting is undergirded by earnest and faithful prayer.
9. That the General Assembly encourage congregations to "adopt" a chaplain for prayer and encouragement.
10. That the General Assembly urge every congregation to consider the possibility of participating in starting a daughter church.
11. Since from the time initial discussions are started it normally takes two to four years before a campus minister begins his work on a campus, and since a feasibility study is usually done in conjunction with the presbytery's MNA committee, it is recommended that the GA encourage presbytery MNA committees presently not involved in campus ministry through the PCA's campus work (Reformed University Ministries) to contact GA MNA's campus

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ministries department to work with them in determining the feasibility of starting campus ministries in their areas.

12. That the General Assembly adopt the budget for MNA for 1993 and commit itself to its support.

Respectfully submitted by the Committee on Mission to North America

MNA COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Class of 1995

TE Kenneth A. Smith
TE Lewis A. Ruff, Jr.
RE Eugene K. Betts

Class of 1993

TE Cortez Cooper
RE James C. Turner
RE R. Arthur Williams

ALTERNATES

TE H. Andrew Silman
RE James Hanemaayer

Class of 1994

TE Harry L. Reeder, III
TE W. Wilson Benton, Jr.
RE John B. White
RE John E. Wheeler

Class of 1992

TE William N. Whitwer
TE Gerald Morgan
RE John Jardine, Jr.
RE Arthur Rogers

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 1 CHURCH PLANTERS SUPPORTED IN 1991

Andrew Adams (w-Kathy)
Dayspring PC
Lexington, KY

Larry Allen (w-Kitty)
Northwest PC
Dublin, OH

Richard Anderson (w-Reva)
Good Shepherd PC
Warsaw, IN

William Anderson (w-Diana)
Oak Creek PC
Santa Clarita, CA

Terry Baxley (w-Elizabeth)
Comerstone PC
California, MD

Evan Bottomley (w-Marilynn)
North Ridge PC
Calgary, Alberta

Robert Cassis (w-Kathy)
South Sound PC
Olympia, WA

John Collins (w-Diane)
Faith PC
Spokane, WA

Robert Dillard (w-Juanita)
Southern Pines PC
Shreveport, LA

Ronald (Ron) Ellis (w-Cathy)
Gallatin Valley PC
Bozeman, MT

David George (w-Jayne)
Valley Springs PC
Roseville, CA

Clyde Godwin (w-Valerie)
Friendly Hills PC
Greensboro, NC

Richard (Rich) Hagler
The Church on the Point
Dana Point, CA

John Keen (w-Diane)
Orleans PC
New Orleans, LA

Timothy Kirk (w-Sally)
Christ Community Church
Carmel IN

Ian Lamont (w-Linda)
Trinity PC
St. Albert, Alberta

Steve Laug (w-Irene)
Fraser Valley
Surrey, British Columbia

Alan Lee (w-Sally)
New Life PC
Lansdale, PA

Robert (Rob) McPherson
(w-Ankara)
Valley Springs PC
Palmdale, CA

John Montgomery (w-Linda)
River Oaks PC
Lake Mary, FL

Guillaume (Gil) Odendaal
(w-Elmarie)
Grace PC
Hudson, OH

Paul Owens (Rhoda)
Willow Woods PC
Snellville, GA

Stephen Sanford (w-Susan)
Church of the Hills
Fort Worth, TX

Alan B. Scott (w-Dabney)
Ponte Vedra Beach PC
Ponte Vedra, FL

Roger Sowder (w-Jeanne)
Oak Springs PC
Temecula, CA

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Steve Stahl (w-Gayle)
Kingwood Forest PC
Kingwood, TX

John (Arch) Van Devender
(w-Judith)
Severn Run Evangelical PC
Severn Park, MD

Cecil Wells (w-Kathleen)
PC of the Hills
Fort Worth, TX


Jeff Willey (w-Kerry)
Prairie Winds PC
Moore, OK

Wayne Zaepfel (w-Beth)
University City PC
Charlotte, NC

ATTACHMENT 2 MULTICULTURAL MISSIONARIES SUPPORTED IN 1991

Gerald Austin (w-Gwen)
The New City Church
Birmingham, AL
St. Helena, SC

Francis L. Foucachon (w-Donna)
Eglise Chretienne Reformee
de LaRive Nord
Repentigny, Quebec


Commaunaute Chretienne
De LaRive Sud
St. Lambert Quebec

Jose Martinez (w-Pam)
Hispanic Church Planter
McAllen, TX

Demetrio Rodriguez (w-Dolohiram)
Hispanic Church Planter
New York City Project

Guillermo Salinas (w-Jennie)
Hispanic Church Planter
Brownsville, TX

Claude and Pat Sharpe
Bible Translators with
Sea Islanders

Tsuneyoshi Takeda (w-Makimi)
Westminster Japanese
Christian Center
Roswell, GA

Andrew L. Toth (w-Dorciane)
Hispanic Church Planting Team
Los Angeles, CA

Isaias Uc (w-Ruth)
Emanuel Dios Con Nosotros
McAllen, TX

J. Garnet Zoellner (w-Daryl)
Institut Farel
Charny, Quebec

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 3

ATTACHMENT TO REFORMED UNIVERSITY MINISTRIES 1992 GA REPORT

The Committee on Mission to North America provides support services through Reformed University Ministries-MNA to presbyteries whose campus ministries are affiliated with Reformed University Ministries-MNA. The presbyteries receiving services make a contribution toward their cost. Presbyteries are completely responsible for the funding of ministries within their area and for determining the budget for such ministries. Reformed University Ministries-MNA receives and disburses funds only as directed by those presbyteries.

From January 1991 to December 31, 1991, Reformed University Ministries-MNA received \$1,214,355 and disbursed \$1,166,942 as directed by presbyteries. The funds are received for particular ministries, which are the responsibility of a presbytery as noted below. The responsible body receives an audit report of its funds. The following list gives the presbyteries, campus staff, and location of ministries receiving support services-accounting through Reformed University Ministries-MNA, and other ministries and staff affiliated with Reformed University Ministries-MNA.

PRESBYTERIES

Alabama Joint Committee on Campus Work
(Evangel, Southeast Alabama and Warrior)

Calvary Committee on Campus Work

Central Georgia Committee on Campus Work

Palmetto Committee on Campus Work

Florida Joint Committee on Campus
Work (Central Florida, Gulf Coast,
South Florida, and Southwest Florida)

CAMPUS AND STAFF

Auburn University
Rev. Paul Hahn
University of Alabama
Rev. Billy Joseph

Clemson University
Rev. David Sinclair
Winthrop College
Rev. Sam Joyner

**Georgia Southern
University**
Rev. Craig Higgins
Mercer University
Rev. Henry Morris

**University of South
Carolina**
Rev. Kenny Crosswhite
(part-time)

Area Coordinator
Rev. David Gordon
University of Florida
Rev. Don Bush
Rev. Marty Fields
Florida State University
Rev. Ron Brown
Miami Area
Rev. Dan Newcomb

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Tennessee Valley Committee on Campus Work

University of Tennessee
Rev. Fred Harrell
Vanderbilt University
Rev. Hal Farnsworth

Texas Joint Committee on Campus Work
(North and South Texas)

Texas A & M
Rev. Chris Yates

CAMPUS INTERNS/STAFF

Susan Barlow
Wendy Brown
Susan Bukovsky
Margaret Carroll
Kim Cotten
Jerdone Davis
Jody Elder
Lyn Ford
Charles Godwin
Brian Habig
Tara Hart
Julie Holland

Ricky Jones
Tim Kay
David Kimball
Jean Kinzinger
Russ McAnulty
Laura McReynolds
Polly McReynolds
Elizabeth Moore
Sigrid Morrison
Dean Moyer

Jay Outen
Phillip Palmertree
Ronnie Rogers
Carrie Shaffer
Kim Smith
Todd Teller
Gwynn Llewelyn Wear
Richie Younce
Barbara Vander Zwaag

OTHER AFFILIATED MINISTRIES

Delmarva (Potomac) Presbytery

Mississippi Joint Committee on Campus Work
(Covenant, Grace and Mississippi Valley
Presbyteries)

Texas A & M University
Delta State University
Florida State University
University of Alabama
Mississippi State
Clemson University
University of Arkansas
University of Tennessee
Mississippi State University
Vanderbilt University
Auburn University
University of Southern
Mississippi
University of Tennessee
University of Alabama
University of Arkansas
Winthrop College
Texas A & M University
University of Alabama
Clemson University
University of Arkansas
University of Mississippi
University of Southern
Mississippi
Clemson University
University of Central Florida
University of Mississippi
University of Arkansas
Auburn University
Mississippi State University
Clemson University
Florida State University
Mississippi State University

CAMPUS AND STAFF

University of Maryland
Rev. Chris O'Brien
**Mississippi/Arkansas Area
Coordinator**
Mr. James Elkin
Administrative Assistant
Cindy Baskin
Cindy Thompson
(part-time)
Belhaven College
Rev. Billy Dempsey
Delta State University
Rev. Steve Malone

APPENDICES

Mississippi Joint Committee on Campus Work
(continued)

Mississippi State University
Rev. Sam Downing
University of Mississippi
Rev. Durant Fleming
Mr. Chip Huey
University of So. Mississippi
Rev. Ken Nippert
Mr. Jeffrey Lancaster

Part-Time Ministries
Hinds Junior College
Mississippi College
Jackson State University

Part-Time Staff and Interns
Wally & Reni Bumpus
Jeffrey Lancaster
Sam Maves
Elizabeth Turner Gaston

Philadelphia Presbytery

Chairman of Subcommittee
Rev Carl Derk
**Staff Pastoral Assistant
for Campus Ministry of
Tenth Presbyterian Church**
Christopher Ribaud

Philadelphia Area Schools
University of Pennsylvania
Temple University
Drexel University
University of the Arts
Philadelphia College of
Textiles

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP
Atlanta Area

Rev. Jim Gearing
Jean Lappin
DeKalb Community College
Emory University
Georgia State University
Georgia Institute of Technology

Clemson University

Rick Brawner

Mississippi State University

Julie McLean

Jackson, Mississippi Area

Brian DeJong (part-time)

Philadelphia Area

Rev. Bruce McDowell
University of Pennsylvania
Temple University
Drexel University
University of the Arts

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Philadelphia Area
(continued)

Pennsylvania Academy of
Fine Arts
Philadelphia College of
Pharmacy and Science
St. Joseph's University
Hahnemann University

Southern Illinois University

Derick McDonald

GA MNA OFFICE

Coordinator of Campus Ministries
Rev. Mark L. Lowrey, Jr.
Assistant to the Coordinator
David Cantey
Administrative Secretary
Sheila Wortham

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 4

REPORT FROM THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED JOINT COMMISSION ON CHAPLAINS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL

"When the righteous prosper, the city rejoices . . . thru the blessing of the upright a city is exalted . . . righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a disgrace to any people." (Proverbs 11:10,11 14:34)

Our PCA chaplains, active and reserve, military and VA, and all chaplain categories, are bearing fruitful witness to the righteousness and holiness of God in key segments of our population virtually unreached by the church at home. Pray for their good influence to our nation in an hour of great peril when we most surely face His judgement unless we repent!

This has been a fruitful year for Chaplain Ministries. Your Director served for two years on the Chaplain Resource Board for the NAE Commission on Chaplains, producing reports in support of chaplain ministry worldwide, such as "The Role of the Evangelical Chaplain in Ministry to the Military Community", "Freedom of Expression in Public Prayer", and "The Centrality of Evangelism in Chaplain Ministry". The board is currently working on a fourth report, "Guidelines for Cooperation with Non-Evangelical Chaplains". We are also actively involved in efforts to strengthen the military chaplaincy by amending Title 10 of the U. S. Code to more accurately describe the ministry of chaplains and provide protections from restrictions in the free exercise of religion. Desert Shield/Storm raised serious questions about the religious free exercise rights of military personnel in the theater of operations. The mistakes and abuses were corrected when a firestorm of objections arose, but the fact that they happened at all is cause for concern. Specific incidents included (1) early exclusion of the Chaplain from the Commander-in-Chief's staff, (2) designation of Chaplains as Morale Officers, (3) prohibition on the wear and display of Chaplain Branch insignia, (4) control and proscription of religious services and rites, and (5) prohibition of religious literature and articles.

The proposed legislation (amending Title 10) would define the duties and responsibilities of the Chief of Chaplains, describe the duties and status of chaplains, particularly during armed conflict, and establish the Deputy Chief of Chaplains position in public law. We need your prayer support.

Again, this past year, as during the past several years, it was my privilege to brief all new endorsers in Washington at the National Conference on Ministry to the Armed Forces. This year NCMAF was most capably addressed by PCA Chaplain (COL) David Peterson! Endorsers were well briefed on the impact of expected cutbacks of some thirty percent by 1997 on our chaplaincy forces. Our President is correct in wanting the fat cut out of the military budget, but we are glad he desires "no hollow Army". Congressionally mandated reductions will bring heavy hearts over coming personnel actions, and as this impacts upon our chaplains, we urge presbyteries to assist

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

in relocation to civilian ministries. However, at the present time, the number of our endorsed active duty chaplains has actually increased. After Desert Storm reserve chaplains called up were released back to reserve duty, the PCA still has some fifty-four active duty military chaplains. We do not see at this time a thirty percent reduction in our PCA chaplain forces. Our chaplains are being promoted in rank and are assuming more key chaplain positions than we have ever enjoyed.

Our East Coast Chaplain Conference was planned for May 5-8 at Patuxent Naval Station with eight hours of dynamic studies from I Timothy 4:16, examining the dangers of ministerial burnout and backsliding, with a strong focus on the preaching ministry, led by Dr. Al Martin, noted Reformed Baptist preacher and conference speaker.

Upon my recommendation a Search Committee has been appointed to find my successor in this rewarding ministry. After thirty-seven years as a chaplain endorser, thirteen endorsing for the PCA, eleven years since J & R, thru my own concluding years as a Navy reserve chaplain, and during my ministry as a church-planter and pastor, it is time to turn over the helm to a younger leader. I am still forty-six years younger than Moses when he turned over the reins to Joshua, so we will continue to serve where needed, as God enables, in this vital ministry.

TE William B. Leonard
Director of Chaplain Ministries, MNA, PCA
Executive Director, Commission on Chaplains

CHAPLAIN ROSTER

ACTIVE DUTY - ARMY

MAJ Russell C. Barrett
ILT Peter Brzezinski
CPT Kenneth W. Bush
MAJ Fred S. Carr
CPT James R. Carter
MAJ David L. Dare
CPT Eric R. Dye
CPT Michael Frazier
CPT R. J. Gore, Jr.
LTC Bill C. Greenwalt
ILT John Griessel
CPT Gary Griffith
MAJ James R. Griffith
MAJ Leslie M. Hardeman
MAJ Douglas E. Lee
LTC Stephen W. Leonard
ILT Steven E. Logan
CPT Jon K. Maas
CPT Thomas A. MacGregor
CPT David McMillan
LTC Charles H. Morrison
COL David P. Peterson

LTC W. Ingram Philips, III
CPT Michael C. Pipkin
MAJ Charles M. Rector
MAJ David F. Roberts
CPT Gary K. Sexton
ILT Peter R. Sniffen
MAJ Robert A. Wildeman, Jr.
CPT Andrew S. Zeller

ACTIVE DUTY - NAVY

CDR Donald W. Aven
CDR Christopher P. Bennett
LT Robert A. Callison
LT Michael R. Craig
LCDR Daniel E. Deaton
CPT J. Robert Fiol
LCDR Peter C. Jensen
LT Sam Larsen
LCDR Duane D. Mallow
LCDR George Ridgeway
LT Douglas E. Rosander
LCDR Timothy D. Rott
LCDR John C. Smith

APPENDICES

ACTIVE DUTY - NAVY (continued)

LT James L. Spiritosanto
LCDR Ronald L. Swafford, Sr.
LT William E. Tilley
LT Michael A. Uhall
LT Jeffrey R. Weir
LT Jan P. Werson
LT Paul Wrigley

ACTIVE DUTY - AIR FORCE

LTC David E. Crocker
MAJ Robert W. Gardner
COL Beryl T. Hubbard
CPT Frederick S. McFarland

RESERVES - ARMY

The Rev. Mr. Hubert R. Baker
The Rev. Mr. Mark Fairbrother
The Rev. Mr. D. Charles Frost, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. Marvin L. Harris
The Rev. Mr. Stevan Horning
The Rev. Mr. F. Douglas Hudson
The Rev. Mr. Edward L. James
The Rev. Mr. John E. Johnston
The Rev. Mr. Philip H. Lancaster
The Rev. Mr. John R. Maphet
The Rev. Mr. Douglas B. McCullough
The Rev. Mr. Douglas D. Mendis
The Rev. Mr. Robert S. Mortenson, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. A. Randy Nabors
The Rev. Mr. Donald H. Post, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. John A. Routzahn
The Rev. Mr. James E. Singleton
The Rev. Mr. David Upchurch

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The Rev. Mr. Richard Anderson
The Rev. Mr. John O. Butler
The Rev. Mr. Gary R. Cox
The Rev. Mr. Lamar Davis
The Rev. Mr. Craig L. DeBenedictis
The Rev. Mr. David Gilleran
The Rev. Mr. William Gleason
The Rev. Mr. Malcolm M. Griffith
The Rev. Mr. Wesley N. Horne, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. James M. Hutchens
The Rev. Mr. Steven A. Jakes
The Rev. Mr. William Manning
The Rev. Mr. James Pakala
The Rev. Mr. Kenneth Ribelin
The Rev. Mr. Daniel J. Ricketts
The Rev. Mr. George Dewey Roberts
The Rev. Mr. Richard H. Rosser
The Rev. Mr. Paul Sagan
The Rev. Mr. Thomas E. Troxell

RESERVES - NAVY

The Rev. Mr. Alan Cochet
The Rev. Mr. David A. Crum
The Rev. Mr. Wayne Good
The Rev. Mr. Arnold C. Johnson
The Rev. Mr. William Mahlow, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. Steven Parker
The Rev. Mr. Larry Ruddell
The Rev. Mr. Fred L. Zoeller, Jr.

RESERVES - AIR FORCE

The Rev. Mr. Robert L. Jarrett
The Rev. Mr. John C. Ropp, Jr.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Rev. Mr. Kenneth R. Elliott
The Rev. Mr. Albert C. Hitchcock

CIVIL AIR PATROL

The Rev. Mr. Daniel Fannon
The Rev. Mr. Paul O. Honomichl
The Rev. Mr. Edward S.S. Huntington
The Rev. Mr. Albert F. Mogninot, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. Roy S. Parker
The Rev. Mr. Henry Thigpen

STATE MILITIA

The Rev. Mr. Raymond G. Cross

VA HOSPITAL - FULL-TIME

The Rev. Mr. Phillip B. Binnie

VA HOSPITAL - PART-TIME

The Rev. Mr. David Dively
The Rev. Mr. Lyle R. Graff
The Rev. Mr. Robert E. Hobson
The Rev. Mr. Ron Morrell
The Rev. Mr. Charles E. Turner

RETIREMENT HOME AND HOSPITAL

CHAPLAINS

The Rev. Mr. Allen M. Baldwin
The Rev. Mr. O. George Billings
The Rev. Mr. John Buswell
The Rev. Mr. Drennon Cottingham
The Rev. Mr. F. Seth Dyrness
The Rev. Mr. Roger W. Hunt
The Rev. Mr. James B. Von Drehle
The Rev. Mr. Paul Walker

AIDS HOSPICE CHAPLAIN

The Rev. Mr. Ken Larter

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

POLICE CHAPLAINS

The Rev. Mr. Charles H. Cobb
The Rev. Mr. John Clark
The Rev. Mr. Gary C. Englestad

MERCHANT MARINE PORT CHAPLAINS

The Rev. Mr. Robert Ackley
The Rev. Mr. James Ransom

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA CHAPLAIN

The Rev. Mr. James A. Jones, Jr.

CAMPGROUND CHAPLAIN

The Rev. Mr. Ted Ragsdale

RETIRED

Dr. A. Kenneth Austin
The Rev. Mr. Robert A. Bonner
The Rev. Mr. R. L. Brinkley, Sr.
The Rev. Mr. Samuel S. Cappel
The Rev. Mr. John P. Clark
The Rev. Mr. Don K. Clements
The Rev. Mr. Howart T. Cross
The Rev. Mr. Edward A. Jussely
The Rev. Mr. William B. Leonard, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. John M. MacGregor
The Rev. Mr. Nelson K. Malkus
The Rev. Mr. James S. Martin
The Rev. Mr. Wilbur A. Siddons
The Rev. Mr. Thomas E. Sidebotham
The Rev. Mr. Frederick D. Thompson, Jr.
The Rev. Mr. E. Lee Trinkle
The Rev. Mr. Leon F. Wardell
The Rev. Mr. Lawrence Withington

ATTACHMENT 5 MERCY MISSIONARIES 1991

Paul Bennett (w-Lianne)
Mercy Missionary Candidate
Covenant Ex-offender Ministries
Chattanooga, TN

Philip Henderson (w-Mimi)
Mercy Missionary Candidate
Missionary at Large
Charlotte, NC

Barry Henning (w-Ann)
Mercy Missionary Candidate
Urban Ministry Discipleship
Chattanooga, TN

Andy Mendonsa (w-Gloria)
Mercy Missionary Candidate
Widow's Ministry
Chattanooga, TN

William Rushbrook (w-Ronnie)
Mercy Missionary Candidate
Disaster Services Coordinator
San Jose, CA

Henry Trigg (w-Brenda)
Mercy Missionary
Haitians in Miami
Miami, FL

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 6

BETHANY CHRISTIAN SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT TO THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

Bethany's partnership with the Presbyterian Church in America began with endorsement by the General Assembly in 1983. Since that time, it has been our privilege to minister to over 25,000 people each year, to do so as your representatives and more importantly, to do so in the name of Jesus.

Bethany's primary mission, particularly in areas of concentrated PCA membership, is the provision of counseling to young people living with unplanned pregnancies, family foster care for children awaiting permanent placement within a family, and counseling assistance to families wishing to adopt.

Bethany is first and foremost a diaconal ministry. It is not unfamiliar to hear criticism toward those who advocate a pro-life position . . . criticism that concern for the child and the young person often terminates at the time of the child's birth. Bethany's commitment sets us apart from such criticism. Not only do we commit to young people that we will provide whatever is needed as encouragement for them to give life to their child, but also we commit ourselves to finding permanent adoptive homes for all children, regardless of their special needs or situation. In 1991, Bethany found adoptive homes for eight-hundred and twenty-two children. Three-hundred and thirty-five of these children presented unusual challenges: children of color, children with unusual medical or emotional challenges, and older children and sibling groups.

In His ministry, Jesus exemplified a committed concern for the poor. Through Bethany's response to all children, to all families and young people, regardless of their needs or ability to pay, Bethany emulates the ministry of our Lord.

Bethany serves as your representative as we reach out to people who are hurting. We now provide our ministry from fifty-nine branch office locations. And we truly are a partnership ministry. We need you to minister with us if we are to be effective in communicating the love of Jesus to those who are in need. The Lord uses members of the PCA in Bethany's ministry: as foster families for children who are awaiting adoptive permanence; as shepherding homes to young, pregnant women; as a special friend to such women; as a transporter; as a prayer partner and as a financial partner.

The challenges are immense. Our workers need divine guidance as they struggle to dissuade a pregnant birth mother from having an abortion. They need your prayers as they struggle with the young person who considers if parenting or adoptive planning is best for them and for their child. They need your prayers as they struggle to find adoptive homes for children who are living with extreme limitations and for whom sometimes it seems there are no families.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

And let me re-emphasize our appreciation for your financial support. This past year Bethany:

Placed 822 children with their adoptive families.

Provided counseling to 3,500 young women who came to us for counseling to help them through the crisis of an unplanned pregnancy.

Responded to 15,000 calls to Bethany LIFELINE . . . calls made by young women who were asking for immediate help dealing with their unplanned pregnancy.

In addition, Bethany provided more extensive family and child welfare services, particularly from our West Michigan office. In total, over 25,000 people received help at Bethany once again in 1991.

Providing this ministry to families and children required a budget of over \$14 million; \$4 million of which was received in gifts from our supporting friends . . . \$798,000 was received from individuals and churches associated with the Presbyterian Church in America.

How are your gifts used?

To support counseling with birth mothers. Bethany provides care to these young people regardless of their ability to cover any of the cost. Our care frequently includes not only counseling, but also medical help, clothing, a place to live, and educational guidance.

To support the adoptive placement of children entrusted to Bethany's care. Since Bethany's beginning in 1944, close to 11,000 children have been placed with Christian families. Every adoptive placement Bethany makes results in a cost of \$10,000. However, the average fee we receive for providing this service is only \$5,000. Bethany is committed to help families adopt regardless of their ability to sustain the cost of adoption. Your gifts are used to make these placements possible.

To support the adoptive placement of special needs children. The cost of finding homes for these children can very quickly and easily double that of placing a "normal", healthy infant. Extended foster care is often required, special recruitment and training of parents is necessary. And, in most cases, no adoptive fee reimbursement is received.

Bethany is grateful for the opportunities presented to us to serve in the name of our Lord. However, we know that serving, and serving to the fullest extent of our abilities, brings challenges. As we have begun 1992, we recognize the following challenges which must be addressed:

APPENDICES

Reaching additional young people who are struggling with unplanned pregnancies. Even though Bethany serves a significant number of these young people, we have only begun to scratch the surface of need.

Encouraging adoption as an alternative. Adoption is a beautiful opportunity for children to become part of a Christian family. Yet, only a small percentage of birth mothers choose adoptive planning for their child.

Developing additional adoptive families for special needs children and children of color. These children are increasingly coming to Bethany's attention.

Considering and responding to the additional needs of children in such areas as foster care, families in crisis, etc.

Jesus refers to the importance of the full body of believers working together to effectively advance His name. Your partnership with Bethany is essential and deeply appreciated in making our ministry possible. Thank you for your continued encouragement, your involvement, and your support.

Richard D. Roeters
Director of Development
Bethany Christian Services

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT K

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON
MISSION TO THE WORLD
TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

The Eighteenth General Assembly in June 1990 approved Vision 2000--Partnering in World Missions as the Ten-Year Plan covering January 1, 1991 through the year 2000. This is the first report of your Committee's progress on the new Ten-Year Plan.

The Purpose Statement as approved by the Eighteenth General Assembly is as follows:

"Mission to the World will advance world evangelization with greater emphasis on developing and strengthening partnerships to plant and build the church. Success will be determined by our faithfulness to God's word and can be measured by the qualitative and quantitative growth of that part of the body of Christ to whom we are ministering."

The report will be divided into four major headings as follows:

1. Progress on the Goals of Vision 2000--Partnering in World Missions
2. Major Developments During 1991
3. Recommendations From Committee on Mission to the World to the General Assembly
4. Reports From the Field

I. PROGRESS ON GOALS--VISION 2000

A.	MISSIONARY REPORT--CAREER PERSONNEL	<u>12/31/90</u>	<u>12/31/91</u>
1.	Urban Ministry Missionary Teams	193	196
2.	Urban Ministry Multi-National Teams	0	25
3.	Hinterland Ministry Teams	0	0
4.	Cooperative Church Nurture	13	8
5.	Church-Planting Partnerships	<u>25</u>	<u>23</u>
	Sub-Total	231	252
6.	Regular Cooperative Agreements	174	176
7.	Church Nurture/Theological Education	<u>72</u>	<u>72</u>
	Sub-Total	<u>246</u>	<u>248</u>
	Total - Career Personnel	<u>477</u>	<u>500</u>
	Included in above:		
1.	Leave of Absence	18	13
2.	Tentmakers	0	0
3.	Lay Men and Women	<u>368</u>	<u>390</u>
	27 Resignations or retirement		
	<u>50</u> New Missionaries		
	23 Net Growth		

APPENDICES

B. MISSIONARY REPORT--MTWIMPACT	<u>12/31/1990</u>	<u>12/31/1991</u>
1. Two-Year Missionaries	57	100
Lay People	51	95
Church Planting	48	82
Volunteers	7	8
Semi-Retired	6	8
Transfer to Career	11	8
Two-Week Summer Workers	1070	1600
Two-Month Workers	65	55
 C. TOTAL, CAREER AND TWO-YEAR MISSIONARIES	 534	 600

D. REPORT ON FINANCES

	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>
GA ASKINGS, calendar year (per person, per year)	65.91	81.23
Income (not net income), calendar year		
1. MTW (in millions)	12,165	14,089
2. MTWIMPACT (in millions)	1,685	1,953
 Administrative Costs (%)	 13.1%	 14.0%
 Administrative transfer from Support accounts (%)	 8.6%	 8.9%

E. REPORT ON CHURCH-PLANTING TEAMS

1. Urban Ministry Missionary Teams

During 1991 the number of urban teams grew from 19 to 23. Teams were added in the cities of Juarez, Mexico; Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan, CIS; Dakar, Senegal; Vina del Mar, Chile; Lima, Peru. Two teams previously in this cate-gory were redesignated as multi-national teams.

Additionally, the following previously reported locations have been activated by assignment of team leader or personnel arriving on site:

Dakar, Senegal	Manila, Philippines
Sensitive Area, restricted access country	Hakka people group
	Taiwan

2. Urban Ministry Multi-National Teams

We now have four multi-national teams. Paris, France; Lisbon, Portugal; Lima, Peru; and "Nineveh Team," a sensitive area, restricted access country.

3. Hinterland Ministry Teams

While we targeted to approve two locations for Hinterland ministry and we are continuing to move ahead with research and identification of locations, as of the year-end we have been unable to finalize details.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

4. **Cooperative Church Planters**
During the year we added five units (couples or singles) to bring the number of missionaries working in cooperation with other organizations for church planting to a total of 16.
5. **Cooperative Church Nurture Ministry**
Four additional units (couples or singles) were assigned to work in ministries to nurture an existing church, bringing our total to 13.

F. REPORT ON PARTNERSHIPS

The following is the definition of partnership approved by the Eighteenth General Assembly:

"Partnership is a broad term encompassing non-compromising working relationships between PCA/MTW and local PCA churches, MTW and U.S. Evangelical organizations, MTW and Two-Thirds World churches, other mission-sending agencies and nationals, engaged in a task of world evangelization and planting churches amongst the worlds' unreached peoples."

During the past year Mission to the World has either established a partnership or intensified its relationships with eight PCA churches, with activities such as summer missions projects, establishing a missions program etc. We have deepened our relationships with five U.S. missionary-training institutions through providing teaching and training resources, linking with the institutions for specialized training of MTW personnel, etc. We have deepened relationships with seven overseas mission agencies and two non-church planting training overseas institutions. We have deepened relationships with two agencies, one for church-planting training and another for technical training in the Two-Thirds World. We have served five organizations in the Two-Thirds World by providing MTW materials and/or training resources.

G. REPORT ON TENTMAKING

During the past year we have moved one step forward toward a Mission to the World tentmaking ministry approved previously by the General Assembly. Frank Finrock has been selected to begin establishing the structure for the ministry. Additionally MTW has facilitated deployment of four PCA professionals into a tentmaking ministry in the Commonwealth of Independent States.

H. REPORT ON TRAINING

1991/92 saw the training of MTW missionaries according to a "systems approach." The fields determine the profile of the missionary, and the recruitment and assessment of candidates are according to biblical requirements and field needs. Candidates are helped with the rigors of itineration at the week-long candidate orientation and kept accountable by the Personnel Department.

APPENDICES

Prior to departure for the field, candidates spend two months in Detroit in the Urban Ethnic Internship learning cross-cultural techniques, language acquisition skills, evangelism training and team-building exercises.

The "MTW Values" of team ministry church planting, administered in a management-by-objective mode, were taught to potential MTW leaders and existing team leaders who had not previously gone through the training at The Leadership Training Conference at Rock Eagle Camp in May. The course was designed and conducted by MTW Senior Staff, coordinated by Oliver Claassen.

To exercise good stewardship and to maintain the "grassroots principle" of administration of MTW, future "MTW Values" training will be conducted by team leaders on the field. The May 1992 Leadership Training Conference at Twin Lakes, Jackson, MS was designed to prepare existing team leaders and future leaders for this policy. Dr. Paul Long ("Spiritual Warfare"), Dr. Doug Kelly ("The Spiritual Walk"), and Dr. Allen Thompson ("Planning for A Church-Planting Movement") prepared materials to add to the MTW Church-Planting Resource Manual (Dr. Oliver Claassen) and other "MTW Values curricula." These materials are now available in both manual and video form.

The next projected Leadership Training Conference will be in 1996.

I. REPORT ON NEW CITIES

During the past year four new cities were approved for MTW church planting as follows: Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan, Commonwealth of Independent States; Prague, The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic; Vina del Mar, Chile; Juarez, Mexico/USA Border.

II. MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS DURING 1991

AFRICA--ABIDJAN, COTE D'IVOIRE

During 1991 we saw the installation of the first two African elders and reception of the first church members. There were approximately 20 professions of faith, roughly half of which have become regularly involved in the church. Three Africans began leading worship for the first time; three Africans began leading Bible studies for the first time and one African began preaching for the first time. A second meeting center was selected with the goal of it becoming our second church, planning to start worship services there by summer of 1992.

AUSTRALIA

January 1991 - The General Synod of Westminster Presbyterian Church met in Queensland under the new Queensland Presbytery's leadership; 17 congregations in two presbyteries and proto-presbyteries in Perth, Brisbane and Sydney/Canberra now function as a result of 21 years of church planting in Australia.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

CENTRAL EUROPE

MTW was invited by Operation Mobilization (OM) to link in partnership with OM evangelistic programs in Central Europe to establish and nurture churches. We are moving ahead with Albania and (East) Berlin, and researching Romania.

INDIA

The non-resident missionary program working through key Indian evangelists has seen an unusual responsiveness in the high-caste Brahman people group. There have been many conversions, and 17 families are preparing for baptism. The leadership is in place to establish several new churches.

JAPAN

The Tokyo/Chiba team saw its first building erected, first baptism and first worship services. The Nagoya team saw its second mission work recognized by the Presbyterian Church in Japan. The Japanese respond increasingly to the gospel.

KAZAKHSTAN, CIS, Alma-Ata

Kazakh-American International Business Institute began its ministry in Alma-Ata November 19, 1991. Four PCA/MTW faculty members were part of the launching of this new ministry. MTW facilitated a consortium of organizations to address the world market economy needs of this ex-Soviet independent state. Involvement has also opened the doors for launching a church-planting ministry.

KOREA

The rural church-planting work started by Hugh Linton, and which has continued under the PCA since 1974, draws to a close. This was a 20-year plan with a goal of 1,183 churches by 1994, and which now stands 90+ percent complete. Betty Linton retired in December 1991 which leaves the Soonchun Clinic and TB work in the hands of Koreans. Missionary training of Koreans continues with MTW oversight.

LATIN AMERICA

On August 2, 1991, the Presbytery of Quito was officially formed. Five churches with national leadership comprise the new presbytery. This action put in place the only Reformed structure in Ecuador. Over 600 people make up these five churches. Three of the churches have both property and buildings, the other two have property. The next step is to send multi-national teams into the other major cities of Ecuador to plant churches and form three more presbyteries.

A number of PCA pastors and ruling elders traveled to Mexico City, Bogota, Colombia, and Quito, Ecuador to see firsthand the work of our MTW missionaries. Their visits were a great encouragement to the missionaries. A bond of appreciation and enthusiasm was established between visitors and missionaries and further trips are planned.

APPENDICES

PORTUGAL--Lisbon

A new denomination was officially formed with the first presbytery in Lisbon, December 1991. The denomination will now go to the government for legalization. Two churches and two missions formed the first presbytery.

PHILIPPINES--Manila

The Manila church-planting team under Paul Taylor was recruited. The Wolfes and O'Connors are itinerating.

SENSITIVE COUNTRY--Central Asia

Continued conversions from Islam has resulted in a Fellowship of 35 to 40 meeting weekly. The first group of baptisms was held during 1991. Intense pressure from the "majority community" has forced restructuring so that now instead of one Fellowship, there are four meeting regularly. All are growing!

TAIWAN

Christ's College completed its comprehensive Long-Term Strategic Plan with considerable input from MTW consultants and staff. Two career missionaries arrived on the field; two *MTWIMPACT* workers arrived on campus. The Hakka church-planting work in San Yi developed into a team of three career MTW missionaries and one Taiwanese. The Shi-Gwang church plant in Taipei was left under local leadership.

SIMA NAME CHANGE AND MINISTRY EXPANSION

The short-term missions arm of MTW changed its name to *MTWIMPACT*. In 1991 approximately 2000 short-term workers impacted 31 different countries around the world. Two new *MTWIMPACT* programs initiated in 1991 were:

1. Pastor's Projects

The Pastor's Projects are intended to enable PCA pastors to be exposed to world missions during two-week trips overseas.

2. Senior IMPACT

Senior IMPACT is designed to mobilize the retirees of the PCA for volunteer missions service from three to fifteen months.

MEMORIAL TO STANLEY R. PETERS

They will come and will declare His righteousness to a people who will be born, that He has performed it. Psalm 22:31

The Committee on Mission to the World wishes to express its sorrow to the wife and family of missionary, Stanley R. Peters, who on October 19, 1991, was taken into the presence of his Heavenly Father. Stan was one of those called by our Sovereign Lord to fulfill the promise of God, given through the Psalmist, an ever present world witness. While not understanding, we accept God's purpose in Stan's homegoing and covenant to pray for his family and for the work in Peru which he loved.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Stan Peters was a servant in the most Biblical sense; truly humble, always ready to carry out his Lord's bidding without complaint. He loved the Peruvian people and gave of himself unselfishly to them. His ministry began with the World Presbyterian Mission in 1980 and subsequently with Mission to the World until his death. His passing has left a large vacancy in the hearts and ministry of the Cusco Team. Stan's consistent testimony before the Peruvian people will long be remembered by those whom he served.

To his wife, Claudia Peters, and their children, the Committee and staff of Mission to the World wish to express our deep sorrow in their loss, which we also experience with them, but also our joy in having served with their loved one. The cause of Christ has been strengthened by the life and leadership of this dear friend.

RETIREMENT OF MR. AND MRS. JAMES (NANCY) THRASHER

Jim and Nan Thrasher were accepted by the Committee on Mission to the World in May 1978 after Jim took early retirement from Monsanto. They wanted to use what active years God had for them in an overseas assignment.

In February 1979 they joined the Wycliffe Branch in Papua New Guinea, taking on management roles. Jim was the first non-aviation man ever to be asked to head up the Aviation Department at Ukarumpa. That was no mean feat. He served in that capacity until he came home this summer.

Nan, among other responsibilities, played a crucial role in the Education Department there at the center.

The retirement of Jim and Nan Thrasher was approved by CMTW effective October 31, 1991, with gratitude to God for the years of service to MTW and with our prayers as He leads them into this new adventure.

MISCELLANEOUS

An Advisory Council on MTW's ministry to the world's Poor was formed in order to develop future strategies in Mexico City, the USA-Mexico Border and Manila.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on Mission to the World makes the following recommendations to the Twentieth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America:

1. That the General Assembly express its gratitude to God for the missionaries and candidates of MTW and that we continue to ask Him to supply their physical, spiritual and emotional needs.
2. That the General Assembly express its appreciation to the members, churches and presbyteries of the PCA for their faithful prayers and financial support for the work and ministry of MTW.

3. The Committee on MTW has reviewed the progress toward the MTW annual and long-range goals, the performance of the coordinator and his staff. With thanksgiving to God, Committee on Mission to the World recommends that the General Assembly express its gratitude to teaching elder, John E. Kyle, for his excellent service as coordinator of Mission to the World and that he be re-elected to the office of coordinator.
4. That the General Assembly express its appreciation for the senior staff of MTW and the Atlanta office personnel for their dedicated service to our church and the cause of missions around the world.
5. That the General Assembly urge the churches to set aside a portion of their giving for the suffering peoples of the world and that, to that end, it be recommended that a special offering for world relief be taken during the Easter season of 1993.
6. That May 16, 1993 be set as the Day of Prayer for World Evangelization and that the General Assembly unite in prayer that God would send many more laborers to His harvest field.
7. That the seminaries and colleges involved in training PCA candidates for ministries and PCA churches be urged to promote the need for both teaching elders and lay people to serve on Mission to the World church-planting teams.
8. That the proposed budgets of MTW and *MTWIMPACT*, as presented through the Administrative Committee, be approved.
9. That the cooperative agreement with the Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf, Inc. be approved.
10. That the cooperative agreement with the Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. be approved.
11. That the cooperative agreement with the International Teams be approved.

CONCLUSION

This report, along with gratitude to God, comes to the General Assembly with the approval of the Committee on Mission to the World currently serving the church.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO THE WORLD

TEACHING ELDERS

Shelton P. Sanford, III, Calvary 1995
Robert Auffarth, Heritage 1994
Jerram Barrs, Missouri
Frank Barker, Evangel 1993
Jack B. Scott, MS Valley
Thomas Cheely, Evangel 1992
Thomas Ramsay, Pacific NW

RULING ELDERS

L. B. (Pete) Austin, TN Valley
James Banks, Jr., W. Carolina
Gerald Sovereign, Gulf Coast
James Wright, Palmetto
Lloyd Strickland, N. Georgia
Donald McKenzie, Philadelphia
Nelson M. Kennedy, Ascension

Alternates

Sanders Willson, Tennessee Valley

Charles Burns, Heritage

MTW/IMPACT SUBCOMMITTEE

Class of 1992

TE Shelton Sanford
RE Scott Seaton
RE Gerald Sovereign
TE John Wood

Class of 1993

TE Hal Farnsworth
RE Philip Gidiere
TE Terry Mercer
RE Jack Yarbrough

Class of 1994

TE William Gleason
RE Jim Jolly
RE Ron Bartlett
TE Leon Lovett

Respectfully submitted,

Rev. Tom Cheely, Chairman
Committee on Mission to the World

IV. REPORTS FROM THE FIELD

AFRICA--Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire

The year 1991 saw a great number of changes in the Abidjan church-planting work. The year began with a very stormy time in the Muslim-convert church influenced significantly by the departure (related to immorality) of the most influential Muslim convert. This had a negative impact on church attendance but through it, the church has matured and I believe that in many ways is stronger than before. After dropping initially, the attendances have been picking up, averaging about 40 adults and 12 children a week.

The Abidjan team has seen great change with the resignation of team leader, one itinerating couple, and another MTW/IMPACT couple shortly after being approved by the MTW Committee. The team now consists of two families in Abidjan, and a third in language study in France. Recruiting is now a major focus and concern.

APPENDICES

AFRICA--Muruu--Tei Wa Yesu Clinic

1991 was a year of transition for the work in North Kitui. With the departure of John and Kathy Lesondak at the end of 1990, there were no team members assigned as pastors, and the phase of direct work in the Africa Evangelical Presbyterian Church (AEPCC) ended. Instead of the AEPCC, the focus of the team became the medical work, and the vision has evolved to each team member working with individuals or groups with whom they can have influence in the areas of discipleship and/or evangelism. The vision statement of the team was revised to show this change and the process of goal-setting under this new direction was begun. Two examples of ministries are a Sunday school/literacy class for adult women at the Gai church begun and led by Greet Rietkerk which has grown from 8-10 to over 40 and a Thursday night Bible study for clinic staff and others led by [REDACTED] with about 30 in attendance. To facilitate ministry, a number of team members also took extended time to study Kikamba, improving their language skills.

The team changed in size as Lois Ooms returned from HMA and Corrie van Galen returned from a leave of absence. Mark and Clarice Mollenkof with their four children and Martin and Marlene Sanderse with their two children arrived on the field bringing the team to its full size of 12 adults and 11 children. Paul Meiners resigned from the team and his position as team leader, [REDACTED] became the new team leader.

At Tei Wa Yesu Family Care Center, the main location of our work, quality medical care was provided and progress was made toward the goals of Kenyanization and of increasing the spiritual impact of the medical work. Work was begun on a constitution for the clinic that would transfer ownership to the AEPCC under a Kenyan Board of Governors. Staff members were sent for additional training to various courses including two in nursing school. Our Kenyan chaplain continued training members of the staff in evangelism methods, and time for putting this to use was made part of the work schedules. Martin Sanderse began to organize the administration of the clinic in a way that would facilitate future management by Kenyans. Additionally, community health work under Lois Ooms was further integrated into the structure of the clinic. A grant was applied for from Compassion of Canada which will allow substantial expansion of this work and its vital impact on the development of local communities. Gary Nabinger continued training maintenance staff; construction of four new houses for staff nurses provided just one of his many opportunities. At the end of 1991 clinic staff numbered 43; seven of these are missionaries.

These statistics give an idea of the number of people whom we have served with health care both at the clinic and the three outclinics:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>TOTAL PATIENTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE/DAY</u>
1989	38,418	153
1990	41,591	165
1991	39,646	158

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>WOMEN DELIVERING</u>
1989	996
1990	824
1991	921

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PATIENTS ADMITTED</u>	<u>INPATIENT DAYS</u>
1991	3,625	12,714

AUSTRALIA--Queensland

The Queensland, Australia Church-Planting Team of Mission to the World has much to give praise and thanks to God for the way in which He has blessed the work in Queensland during the past year, in spite of the fact that the team was actually without career personnel on site for five months.

The absence of any MTW personnel at the Second General Synod of the Westminster Presbyterian Church in January 1991 was a statement of growth and development for the young denomination. A congregation from New Zealand has joined the Queensland Presbytery which has broadened the vision of our work immensely.

The team has a noble vision statement which calls for the establishment of five churches and two mission works by the end of 1994. While this has been jeopardized by a lack of adequate personnel, the Lord is doing His work and allowing us to see the growth of the presbytery. There are three indigenous works in Brisbane, one mission work with hopes of two new works being started in 1992.

The Westminster Theological College of Queensland which was begun by MTW personnel in 1987 has had a very good year with four men seriously pursuing studies for the ministry.

The University work begun by the team is now in the hands of the Aussies and averaging over 100 every Sunday evening at Queensland University.

In late December the Kiewiet family returned to Brisbane and they will also begin another church in 1992, Lord willing.

The Brisbane church-planting team is grateful to God for the prayer and material support of our sending congregations in the Presbyterian Church in America.

AUSTRALIA--Sydney

1991 was marked by distinct progress on our team's Vision and Goal Statements. The three churches originally planted in Sydney were all left to develop further on their own, as MTW personnel either left for HMA or were moved to new project areas. The leadership of the emerging presbytery has done well.

While most of the team was on HMA for all or part of the year, others were preparing for new work. The Campbelltown project, under the leadership of

APPENDICES

Scott Kroeger, has advanced to the stage that all personnel are now located in Campbelltown in accord with their previous demographic survey. The project workers include the Kroegers, the Parkers (*MTWIMPACT*) and the Normans (WPC Presbyterian ordained evangelist).

Our team is committed to three project areas for this phase of our ministry. While continuing to assist the Penrith churches from a distance, Kip Slawter will lead the Hills District Project, Scott Kroeger will lead the Campbelltown Project and Steve Schoof will lead the Canberra Project. By the time of the team's scheduled disengagement, we hope to have a total of nine healthy churches planted in these areas.

CHILE--SANTIAGO

Las Condes

Church attendance at Cristo Rey has reached an average of 80, a 25% increase over last year, over 100 in attendance for Christmas Sunday and 97 Christmas Eve. An Angel Tree project, our first organized outreach to the poor, involved 35 target children and sponsors. Nine men were trained for leadership, three elders and two deacons elected in January 1992. Membership now stands at 36. Seven adult baptisms were celebrated. We have a serious pastoral candidate who seems very capable and fit for the job. The first class of five from Greenhouse graduated in December, a women's Bible study attracted 30 women for the last six months, three marriage groups of 4 to 8 couples have been meeting regularly, and EMEP, Marriage Encounter Presbyterian Expression, has 23 couples certified and ready for a June expression in 1992. Several home Bible studies continue to meet. A new singles ministry is beginning, the youth held a retreat with 30 present in the fall. Several Youth Saturdays with puppets were held for grade school children. We have located a new office one block from the church where we will move at the end of January.

Gracia y Paz, a national Presbyterian Church related to us through Richard Crane, has called a full-time pastor.

Encuentro Con Dios has proved expensive for the production it has given Cristo Rey. While remaining in the program we will look toward implementing a cell group church growth approach which seems to be a much more effective way of reaching our area and will be used on an experimental basis this year.

Work in Lo Prado

From January through April of 1991 we were finishing up our work in Lo Prado-Pudahuel, Santiago. In February of 1991, a Chilean pastor was installed in the Lo Prado Church. Average attendance in the worship service was about 100. One of the men trained for the pastorate has been working under the session of the Lo Prado church in the formation of a daughter church. We believe the church in Lo Prado is well-prepared to function without our support.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Vina del Mar Team

This new church-planting team was initially formed with three missionary families who had been working separately within the structure of the National Presbyterian Church of Chile. These families are: John and Cathy Rug, Rich and Angelica Ramsay, Gary and Phyllis Waldecker. Dan and Robbie Sell, a businessman and his wife from the PCA church in Naples, Florida, will be heading for Chile in May of 1993, after a year of language school in Costa Rica. Mark and Anne Auffarth will be with us for two years, through *MTWIMPACT*, and will be heading up our music and youth programs.

Vina del Mar is within the second largest urban center of Chile, whose population is more than a million. We will be targeting the upper middle class on the northern side of Vina, where 60-70 percent of the city's growth is expected to take place during the next 10-20 years. The initial plan calls for the planting of one church through the establishment of many small groups.

COLOMBIA--Bogota

The year 1991 saw team leader Tim McKeown and family arrive in the city of Bogota in January, team member Dave Strumbeck and family arrived in April and *MTWIMPACT* worker Sarah Lynn Moore arrived in November. Besides the two to three month process of settling into new living situations and getting each person's presence in the country officialized, the team has been able to accomplish some of the first phases of church planting.

The entire city (600+ square miles with 6 to 9 million population) was demographically surveyed. This survey produced 15 potential target areas in which there was little or no evangelical witness. In addition it was determined that there is absolutely no other Biblical and Reformed witness in the entire city. A more in-depth analysis of the 15 most promising potential areas led the team to select one 600 square block area of the city which we believe has the population (presently 400,000+) and growth potential to support at least five congregations spanning the entire socio-economic spectrum of society here. The team then began development of our team planning documents. We believe that a presbytery of at least 15 churches can be started here in the city of Bogota during the next 12 years. A temporary worship service has been meeting in the McKeown's home since June 1991 and attempts are now underway to procure a suitable meeting place within the initial target area. A second highly potential target area is on "hold" for lack of workers to go into the harvest.

Basic networking with other evangelical churches, pastors, and community leaders has been accomplished in these first months. This has aided in the process of developing our outreach and discipleship strategy which should be implemented between March and May of 1992 by which time we also plan to have procured suitable initial meeting and office space within the initially targeted area.

APPENDICES

The team's desire is to eventually create a presbytery covering the entire city of Bogota but will limit their initial area of work until such time as more team members and/or national leadership become available. The team is moving towards the implementation of a strategy to initially reach people through media advertising (primarily radio) and utilizing a modified (Reformed) version of the cell-group approach (Ralph W. Neighbor, Jr., CBC prof.) to forming churches. Contacts generated by media advertising which cannot be handled with our initial limited resources will be channelled to other evangelical churches with whom we are networking.

FRANCE--Marseille

The Marseille Church-Planting Team continued work on its third church throughout 1991. We believe that 1991 marked a turning point in this work as we began to actively seek a French pastor to work on our team, thus beginning a transition phase-out of this work. 1991 was a good year for the team! They have, by God's grace, continued to multiply contacts, develop different kinds of Bible studies and discipleship groups, see the lost found by a loving Savior, and experienced both numerical and spiritual growth in the Plan-de-Cuques Church.

The team received summer workers through *MTWIMPACT's* summer program. These young people pitched in to help as we ran a day camp to attract 11 to 15 year-old young people from outside the church. The follow-up to these summer activities has been the birth of a youth group with monthly activities which was a goal we had set in the spring. We also participated actively in daily street preaching, using summer teams from Youth With a Mission. This included street preaching, street theater, literature distribution and witness. This was the first time that the church had attempted direct evangelism. The result has been a greater awareness of the church in the community, which was our goal.

The team and the church were involved with the Gideons in distributing Bibles to school-age children throughout Marseille. Other evangelistic activities included offering English courses both in small group settings and at local schools. Easter and Christmas programs attracted many contacts enabling us to clearly preach the gospel.

The Marseille Church-Planting Team realized over 500 gospel presentations in 1991. We also actively supported Youth With a Mission's summer work. Over 20,000 gospel presentations were made in a two-week effort. Furthermore, we helped the Gideons in the distribution of over 100,000 New Testaments to school-age children. We saw conversions this past year. The Plan-de-Cuques church has seen two families, eight people, come to Christ through missionary efforts. The summer youth work and street evangelism produced five confessions of faith, only one of which has continued to grow in Christ.

Our average attendance was 30-50 in 1990. In 1991 we saw this increase to 40-60. This is an increase of approximately 20 percent over 1990. We began our first worship services the end of January 1988, we were on average 10 to 15 people our first year.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Marseille team used each member of its team to develop either one-on-one discipling or small group discipling. Each missionary had a minimum of two studies per week. One missionary had five. The total number of people being disciplined varied throughout the year from 10 to 20.

FRANCE--Paris

The Paris Church-Planting Team gives thanks and praise to God for another year of ministry in the midst of constant transition and change due to HMA schedules which always represent a ruffling of the continuity in ministry. This past year team leader [REDACTED] was in the States while Brian Deringer provided on the field leadership. As the Stewarts returned from HMA, the Deringers and Ferrises left the field for their first furlough. Although all this movement is often a source of stress for missionaries it has gone very well. Richard and Elizabeth Crews also were able to move into our target area and are strategically located in the heart of the "New City." We also expect new team members, Mark and Marty Mylin, to be joining us soon.

We want to report with the greatest enthusiasm our thanks to God for our national worker couple, Gerard and Sylvie Bos, who have been beyond what we could have hoped.

Overall morale on the team is good as we see our first church solidifying and members growing in commitment and vision. Our team has made a basic strategy decision to go with the "cell-group church" model and this new direction has provided new incentive and vision for evangelism and growth. This fall the team formed a leadership cell group that bonded our team together more than ever and as of January 1992 the leadership cell has divided up into three new cells that will grow, disciple, and reach out so that in time they too will divide and continue the multiplication. Meanwhile, Sunday morning services have continued and have been an important part of our ministry. The ministry center we rent has been extremely useful and has marked our presence in the area in a very positive way.

The burden of our hearts is that for the present there is not a great harvest going on in France. It seems more to be "seed time" and the ground is often hard or at least complicated. Yet God has called us to this most strategic center of the French-speaking world which represents some 46 countries and over 300 million people. We believe God would have a strong Reformed and Evangelical church in the heart of modern France and that is our vision. Please pray for the harvest to come.

This year our team has also felt a severe financial crunch with large deficits in the support accounts of all our team members. This is due to increases in the cost of living and ministry that were not in view when our new team members were raising support back in 1986. With the weaker U.S. dollar, life in Europe is shockingly expensive. Please pray and stand with us in this urgent area of need.

APPENDICES

With much gratefulness to God for his faithfulness, with sincere appreciation for the fine support work provided by the MTW staff and with heartfelt thanks to all who prayerfully support us.

INDIA--Children Home

In the summer months of 1991 we were able to have camps for about 150 of our young people in different places. With these camps, some witnessing and tract distribution was done. Also, in October when a severe earthquake hit the mountain area north of us we went in teams of relief workers, distributing food and clothing and witnessing.

Our church attendance has stayed around 300 to 400 every Sunday, as it is just our Children's Home students and staff with a few visitors.

We have communicant classes for the young people for Church membership. Also personal counseling of young people is done whenever possible.

Beth Taylor has had daily prayer meetings and bi-weekly ladies' meetings in which some of the illiterate women have learned to read the Bible. Also, we have had a Friday evening Bible study. Our Bible studies have been an effort to feed the existing weak churches, not to start new ones.

One of our long-term goals has been to have another missionary(s) in the work of the Children's Home. This has now been realized in the coming of Mr. Fred Taylor in December, as a voluntary worker under *MTWIMPACT*. He has already filled a great need in counseling of young people and other responsibilities here. He received an entry visa and has now received a Residential Permit like any other regular missionary. We are praising God for this answer to much prayer.

ITALY--MILAN

In 1991 Pope John declared Italy's northern provinces to be "mission fields." 96 percent of Christian workers and 90 percent of evangelicals are in the lesser populated southern half of the country. In the north, we are one missionary for 600,000--less than in the Middle East.

"I am the Lord, the God of all mankind. Is anything too hard for Me?"
JEREMIAH 32:27

Vision is having an acute sense of the possible. When those of similar vision are drawn together, something extra-ordinary happens.

The Milan Team is following a seven-stage plan to see a completely new and indigenous community of believers emerge by 2005. Its members are acting as catalysts to this vision. The team is completing stage two (recruitment and iteration) and moving into stage three (language acquisition and culture adjustment).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Two MTW families and an MTW**IMPACT** assistant on-site seeing God bless, protect and empower them, in the face of intense spiritual opposition. An additional MTW couple are temporary battle casualties and one more MTW**IMPACT** assistant is enroute.

Pray also for me, that whenever I open my mouth, words may be given me so that I will fearlessly make known the mystery of the Gospel."
Eph. 6:19

JAPAN--Nagoya

We see steady progress and evidence of God's watch care over our young inexperienced team with limited language abilities. From a start of zero contacts and no Christians, numbers have grown at a healthy rate and far faster than other preaching points in the denomination. Since the team began its work here, two career units have resigned but with the plans of the Bakelaar family to join us on a career basis, we are only one family short. We also have five two-year MTW**IMPACT** workers and a staff of three energetic and radiant young ladies and one national pastor. Together we minister to over 150 English students, 50 college students and 50 people attending the two worship services on a weekly basis. There continues to be a good working relationship between the presbytery of the Japan Presbyterian Church and we, the MTW church-planting missionaries. We have 20 believers who are disciplined on a weekly basis, last year we had five. We have four men being trained for leadership in the Nagakute Church.

150 individuals were taught the gospel on a weekly basis. Through special outreach programs we have attracted approximately 900 people over the year. There have been seven confessions of faith and four baptisms.

Attendance at the Nagakute Church last year was 30 and this year 40. The second church has remained at 10.

JAPAN--Tokyo/Chiba Team

We are encouraged by the progress made toward our team vision of a thriving presbytery. Team relationships are very good, and many Japanese are exposed to God's Word and God's people daily.

We are ready to start our first church formally in April '92. This began two years ago in target area with an English class of five people. Now there are 112 in classes, 5 Bible studies, informal worship attendance averaging over 40 with children, over 70 adults attending Christmas service, and a core group of five committed Japanese ready to participate with Christ in building a thriving church. There is good momentum for the start, but many obstacles. Dan Iverson will be the organizing pastor. We are looking to start our second congregation in two years after the Pattons return from HMA. We will continue to prepare the soil there with English and other outreach.

APPENDICES

We continue to see God blessing our partnering ministry with three Japanese pastors/church planters in Chiba Prefecture. Their three churches/missions are growing in attendance. Three years ago the collective Christmas attendance was about 100; this Christmas it was over 280 counting our informal service. These pastors are very encouraged with what God is doing, as are we. We have a strong bond for a future presbytery and they are on board with that vision. We are discussing plans to collectively start churches using Japanese church planters. An Australian missionary will work alongside the MTW team in accomplishing the Tokyo/Chiba team goals.

In October '91, the Reids began their four-year commitment to reaching students. Fred Reid has begun research, has met with students on several campuses and plans to kick this off in September 1992 (after completing his intern year). We consider this key for reaching and discipling future church leaders/members during open years before the companies get their vice-grip on them.

KOREA

1991 was a very eventful year for the Korea Mission PCA. The transition of the work from rural church planting toward the areas of home and foreign missions training has continued. This transition process has been accelerated due to Al Sneller's health needs, the retirement of Betty Linton, and the upcoming HMA of the Nantts.

Al Sneller returned to the United States in February and has subsequently received chemotherapy for lymphoma. We praise the Lord that the cancer is in remission and that he is slowly regaining his strength.

During 1991 the sixth and seventh Koshin Missionary Training Institutes were conducted. Rev. John Hunt and Dr. Addison Soltau were the guest lecturers respectively. Rev. Gary Nantt and his wife, Carol, were in charge of the language training program. During the sixth KMTI the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Australia sent personnel to help with the language instruction. This is the denomination that our PCA missionaries in Australia have been working with. There were a total of 82 Korean participants who received training during these two missionary institutes.

Because of the transition of the ministry in Korea as the church-planting work comes to completion, no new works were initiated in villages during 1991. However, we did publish an updated and very detailed unchurched village directory which is being distributed throughout the country and which we pray will encourage our Korean brethren to reach out to the final unchurched villages which remain throughout the country. During the year there was an increase in attendance in some of the village churches and a decrease in others. Overall, the total attendance stayed about the same in the villages that our mission has been involved in. Nevertheless, from the period between 1989 and 1991, our research indicates that there was an overall decrease of 129 unchurched villages throughout the country for which we praise the Lord.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Seven villages which our mission has been involved in were completely turned over to Korean oversight this past year.

During 1991 our missionaries were also involved in leading discipleship groups. There were a total of fourteen people involved in these groups.

We, the members of the Korea Mission PCA, praise the Lord for the opportunities for service which He has given us this past year. The transition of the ministry here, health concerns, and other life-altering events have not been easy. Nevertheless, our God has been faithful. We praise Him that He is Sovereign and that He will continue to cause His perfect will to be done both here in Korea and throughout the ends of the earth.

MEXICO

Mexico City Lomas Team

1991 was a year of many changes for the Mexico City Lomas team. One family started home ministry assignment (HMA) and three new families arrived on the field bringing the number of families presently on the field to six. The team's strategy paper was also approved during this year.

The year was also characterized by the beginning of several new ministries. In cooperation with the Mexico City Pedregal team we had our first semester of theological education. We were also able to begin ministries to junior high and high school students as well as continue to minister to college students. A monthly men's breakfast was begun to reach businessmen and has proved to be useful as several have come to Christ through this ministry. We continued to cooperate with the Pedregal team in the summer SOAR program with over 100 young people participating.

One of our problem areas was resolved as we were able to rent a house on a main thoroughfare for worship, meetings and an office. We continue to work on the formation of our first church as a team and cooperate with a national Presbyterian church to see other churches started.

Mexico City Pedregal Team

The first church, El Shaddai, now has 54 members, 130 in attendance and has its first two Mexican elders. A new mission church is averaging 25 in attendance at its activities. Over 59 Mexicans made professions of faith. Jerry and Peggy Cross are on loan to Principe de Paz, a national Presbyterian church in Mexico City, to assist them in starting new churches.

In 1991 we formalized several partnership relationships with national churches or organizations. The team, in partnership with the other Mission to the World team in Mexico City, began a Leadership Training Center to prepare laymen and pastors (18 students). We are also working with Global Reach to generate Mexican money for the work of church planting. 1992 will find us furthering

APPENDICES

our partnerships with national bodies and a strategy to penetrate the business class of Mexico City.

NINEVEH TEAM

God has blessed a thrust into a Muslim country with both fruit from evangelism and openness and responsiveness to the gospel. There have been 35-40 men meeting weekly to participate in lectures and discussions of the Bible. Quarterly high-profile events with attendance almost exclusively Muslim have been the channel to the weekly Bible discussions.

Recently, there has been infiltration and pressure from the majority community. The well-being and even the lives of our national brothers are being threatened. This has forced a re-evaluation of the strategy and, as a result, there are now three new smaller fellowships functioning as the ministry continues to grow.

PORTUGAL

In 1991 the presbytery met and approved the new statutes which will now go to the government for legalization. Officers were elected. They were: Odilon Salas, Manuel Henrique Luzia, Clay Quarterman, a Carnaxide elder and Paul Long. Odilon Salas was elected president. We have two organized churches, Barreiro and Carnaxide.

The Telheiras team is taking a more aggressive role in setting the ministry pace. The Barreiro Church is suffering the loss of a dentist and his family (who have returned to Brazil). This will leave a gap in the leadership of the church as well as the choir, Sunday School and finances as he gave maybe a quarter of the church's income.

The team is working to target 3-5 sites for Phase II church planting. We continue to see church planting as the most significant ministry need here and the highest single priority.

SPAIN

1991 was the first year for the first member of the new church-planting team in Madrid, Spain to be on site. It was a year filled with much learning, preparation and foundation building for the eventual arrival of the other members of the team. Madrid will prove to be a challenging city in which to extend God's kingdom. But with a solid foundation for team ministry, adaptation and acculturation of the new team members and a comprehensive vision, the expectations for an exciting ministry are falling into place.

The team is beginning its ministry along the northwest corridor of Madrid about twenty miles in length in a rapidly-growing area of the city. This area is presently experiencing massive construction both in new housing and many large office buildings. 15,000 new offices are projected, under construction or already completed. The hope is that this corridor will eventually become the technological business center for the city and perhaps the country. With the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

finalization of the EEC plans for 1992, this new section of Madrid should experience rapid sociological changes and development.

Along with the changes experienced by many people in this upward-bound society will come changes that are not satisfied with more money, another car or a promotion at the office. The Madrid church-planting team hopes to capitalize on these various changes, present the gospel as a strong, viable alternative to a secular, materialistic life style and establish strong, aggressive, evangelical churches.

TANZANIA--Dar es Salaam

By God's grace 1991 was a year of significant progress in establishing a team in Dar es Salaam under the name of Renewal Enterprises, Inc. In March the Talleys arrived in Tanzania. The Wards and McBrides made good progress in support raising and other activities in preparation for departure for Tanzania in the first half of 1992.

Resettling for the Talleys was a long and often discouraging process. From March to July 10 they lived in temporary quarters. By July they had finally secured a house and car and by September they had received and cleared shipments of personal and household effects from the USA and Kenya.

From September to December more attention was turned to team ministry activities including Swahili language study, networking with evangelical leaders and preparations for new team members (e.g., instructions regarding purchases and shipping, applications for work permits, children's schools, and language school). In October Jeff participated in a week-long workshop on outreach to Muslims which resulted in his appointment to a national coordinating committee. Jeff preached several times in the International Church and taught a bi-weekly Bible study for young adults.

TAIWAN - Hakka (San Yi) Church-Planting Work

There has been significant progress in the last six months since Brenda Carter joined the team, as well as Hakka coworker Donna Kao. We have seen a change in attitude of the Hakka people to the gospel, as evidenced by an increased attendance in the home group (25), and at the newly located San Yi Gospel Center. The team has hundreds of contacts and is exceptionally busy.

The San Yi church has been well received in the community. Much of the original stigma which we first encountered in our efforts to rent a place and hold outreaches is now gone. The new location has given good visibility to our group and has resulted in a slight increase in Sunday attendance. Other programs are well attended, and the Center conducted a number of gospel outreaches over the past four months.

The performance of the San Yi church in reaching out to the community has been good, with regular testimonies and witnessing by some of the San Yi

APPENDICES

Christians. We have two baptized Christians who are witnessing with their neighbors and friends regularly. The church was written up in a national Christian newspaper, supported by three other churches who are burdened for our work.

Most satisfying has been the progress experienced by our Wednesday evening Home meeting. Attendance is almost always over 25, and these people have changed dramatically from 1) prejudice against the Bible and Christianity and 2) fear of entering our home and going to church to an enthusiastic attentiveness to the things of God.

There is still an element of resistance and prejudice in homes and families which sometimes surfaces as we work with the youth and others. The weekly work of the Center is extremely taxing to all the members of the team right now. Our hope is that we will have national Christians take over more and more of the work of the church itself, so we can focus attention on the evangelistic and church-planting work.

ATTACHMENT 1

MTW MISSIONARIES

Adams, Rev. & Mrs. A. E. (Earl/Rosie)	Brooks, Mr. & Mrs. David (Gwen)
Adams, Mr. & Mrs. Steven P. (Joyce)	Brown, Mr. & Mrs. Robert D. (Bobby/Mari)
Akovenko, Mr. & Mrs. James S. (Sue)	Bucklen, Dr. & Mrs. Keith (Janet)
Allen, Rev. & Mrs. William (Bill/Sharon)	Buckner, Jr., Rev. & Mrs. James (Bonnie)
Altork, Rev. & Mrs. Richard F. (Barbara)	Burch, Rev. & Mrs. John (Susan)
Anderson, Rev. & Mrs. Sidney B. (Louise)	Cadiente, Miss Nena
Angert, Rev. & Mrs. Charles (Chuck/Barbara)	Camenisch, Rev. & Mrs. Glenn D. (Frances)
Aschmann, Mr. & Mrs. Richard P. (Heidi Marie)	Campbell, Miss Cathy
Austin, Rev. & Mrs. Thomas L. (Ann)	Campbell, Jr., Rev. & Mrs. John (Jack/Sherri)
[REDACTED]	Carney, Mr. & Mrs. G. Morris (Harriet)
Barnett, Miss Ellen S.	Carter, Miss Brenda
Baughman, Mr. & Mrs. Loren (Pam)	Caviness, Rev. & Mrs. Don (Velma)
Baxter, Mr. & Mrs. John (Susan)	Chambers, Mr. & Mrs. Garry (Anita)
Behrend, Miss Brenda	Chaplin, Rev. & Mrs. Carl (Becky)
Bergey, Dr. & Mrs. Ron (Francine)	Clay, Mr. & Mrs. Henry (Wendy)
Bersach, Rev. & Mrs. Manny (Terri)	Cobb, Miss Elyce
Birdsall, Rev. & Mrs. S. Douglas (Doug/Jeanie)	[REDACTED]
Black, Mr. & Mrs. Robb (Patti)	Coleman, Mr. & Mrs. J. Olin (Jean)
Blankenbeckler, Mr. & Mrs. Dennis (Judy)	Collinge, Dr. JoAnne (Jody)
Bloemsma, Mr. & Mrs. Terry (Ruth)	Colson, Mr. Sanders
Bolton, Miss Rosemary	Conroy, Mr. & Mrs. Dennis (Rhonda)
Booth, Mr. & Mrs. Dennis (Natalie)	Coulbourne, Mr. & Mrs. Craig (Ree)
Borden, Mr. & Mrs. Jeffrey A. (Jeff/Patty)	Courtney, Dr. & Mrs. Thomas J. (Tom/Jan)
Box, Mr. & Mrs. Rick (Pam)	Crabb, Mr. & Mrs. Ken (Susan)
Boyer, Rev. & Mrs. R. Eugene (Charlotte)	Crane, Rev. & Mrs. Richard (Robyn)
Brinkerhoff, Miss Jane	Crews, Rev. & Mrs. R. S. (Pete/Elizabeth)
	Cross, Rev. & Mrs. David L. (Barbara)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Cross, III, Rev. & Mrs. Walter G. (Jerry/Peggy)
 Cvelich, Mr. & Mrs. Edward M. (Page)
 Dager, Mr. & Mrs. Tracy (Joy)
 Dance, Mr. & Mrs. Peter E. (Judy)
 Dangler, Miss Sally
 Davidson, Rev. & Mrs. Charles W. (Bonita)
 Day, Mr. & Mrs. William L. (Bill/Sherry)
 DeHoog, Mr. & Mrs. Lee (Emma)
 Deibert, Miss Nancy
 Depue, Mr. & Mrs. Graydon (Greg/Diane)
 Deringer, Rev. & Mrs. Brian (Lorrie)
 DeWitt, Rev. & Mrs. Charles (Carol)
 Diaso, Mr. & Mrs. David (Dawn)
 Dooley, Miss Mari
 Dortzbach, Rev. & Mrs. Karl (Debbie)
 Douglass, III, Mr. & Mrs. Gillis (Gene)
 Durell, Miss Kim Joyce
 Dye, Rev. & Mrs. Richard (Dick/Ann)
 Edwards, Dr. & Mrs. Thomas (Tom/Connie)
 Faber, Rev. & Mrs. Dan (Dale)
 Faires, Rev. & Mrs. William (Will/Martha)
 Farris, Mr. & Mrs. Edwin R. (Ed/Kathryn)
 Ferris, Rev. & Mrs. W. L. (Larry/Lisa)
 Fiol, Dr. & Mrs. David (Eleanor)
 Fleming, Miss Caroline
 Foster, Rev. & Mrs. Warren V. (Lana)
 Frank, Mr. & Mrs. Vernon R. (Bud/Susan)
 Frederick, Dr. & Mrs. John R. (Gail)
 Gahagen, Mr. & Mrs. Craig (Heather)
 Gibson, Mr. & Mrs. Herbert (Bert/Carole)
 Gilley, Dr. Leoma
 Gleason, Mr. & Mrs. W. Daniel (Dan/Bonnie)
 Goodman, Mr. & Mrs. J. William (Bill/Martha)
 Grubb, Mr. & Mrs. Robert G. (Glenn/Sharlene)
 Gutierrez, Mr. & Mrs. Gerardo (Gerry/Ruth)
 Hale, Mr. & Mrs. Robert Sidney (Deborah)
 Harrell, Rev. & Mrs. Joseph R. (Joe/Becky)
 Hatch, Mrs. Alice
 Hatmaker, Miss Charlene
 Helms, Dr. & Mrs. Rob (Marilyn)
 Hendrix, Mr. & Mrs. Richard M. (Rick/Jan)
 Herron, Rev. & Mrs. Dan (Betty)
 Hicks, Miss Eileen
 Hivner, Jr., Mr. & Mrs. Richard (Rick/Clare)
 Hudson, Rev. & Mrs. Thomas (Tom/Carol)
 Huey, Mr. Paul
 Iverson, III, Rev. & Mrs. Daniel (Dan/Carol)
 Jackson, Mr. & Mrs. William (Bill/Jean)
 Jennings, Rev. & Mrs. Nelson (Kathy)
 Jewett, Mr. & Mrs. Melvin (Mel/Charlotte)
 Johnson, Mr. Gary C.
 Johnson, Mr. & Mrs. Ronny (Ron/Lizanne)
 Johnson, Rev. & Mrs. William (Bill/Gale)
 Johnston, Miss Judy
 Jones, Rev. & Mrs. David (Marcia)
 Jones, Mr. & Mrs. Lewis (Betty)
 Jones, Miss Pamela K. (Pam)

Kamer, Miss Linda
 Kiewiet, Rev. & Mrs. David (Jan)
 King, Mr. & Mrs. Bryce (Noreen)
 King, Mr. & Mrs. J. Wayne (Julie)
 Klamer, Miss Lynn Suzanne
 Kobb, Rev. & Mrs. James (Jim/Debra)
 Kolodny, Mr. & Mrs. Alan (Cathy)
 Kroeger, Rev. & Mrs. C. Scott (Nancy)
 Krzymowski, Dr. & Mrs. William (Bill/Susan)
 Kuch, Mr. & Mrs. Lawrence (Larry/Karen)
 Kuykendall, Mrs. Billie
 Kyle, Rev. & Mrs. Jayson D. (Jay/Maureen)
 Kyle, Rev. & Mrs. John (Lois)
 Kyle, Mr. & Mrs. Marc (Beth)

Lane, Mr. & Mrs. Bryan D. (Janet)
 Langford, Mr. Bruce
 Lee, Miss Mayetta

Leonard, Rev. & Mrs. John (Christy)
 Lesondak, Mr. & Mrs. John (Kathy)
 Linton, Mr. & Mrs. Philip (Phil/Janet)
 Lloyd, Mr. & Mrs. Robert (Ann)
 Long, Dr. & Mrs. Paul B. (Mary Jo)
 Long, Rev. & Mrs. Johnny Wade, Jr. (Becky)
 Long, Mr. & Mrs. Steve D. (Eva)
 Lott, Mr. & Mrs. Michael (Mary)
 Lyle, Mr. & Mrs. Joseph (Joe/Ann)
 Maddox, Mr. & Mrs. William Patrick (Pat/Jane)
 Mahaffey, Mr. & Mrs. Robert (Bob/Sue)
 Mailloux, Mr. & Mrs. Marc (Aline)
 Manning, Jr., Rev. & Mrs. Fred (Betty)
 March, Mr. & Mrs. Cary (Charlotte)
 Marshall, Rev. & Mrs. Verne (Alina)
 Mateer, Rev. & Mrs. Samuel (Sam/Lois)
 Mathis, Mr. & Mrs. Edmond (Ed/Sheryl)
 Matlack, The Rev. & Mrs. Kenneth (Ken/Tammie)
 Matsinger, Mr. & Mrs. Jay (Nancy)
 May, Rev. & Mrs. Tom (Linda)

McCoy, Mr. & Mrs. Fam. Cucchi (Charlie/Ilo)
 McKaughan, Rev. & Mrs. Paul (Joanne)
 McKeown, Rev. & Mrs. Timothy A. (Tim/Becky)
 McLean, Miss Julia A. (Julie)
 Meiners, Rev. & Mrs. Paul (Liz)
 Michael, Mr. & Mrs. Ronald (Ron/Mary Jane)

Miley, Miss Gindy
 Miller, Mr. & Mrs. Dan (Debbie)
 Miller, Rev. & Mrs. Douglas H. (Doug/Ann)
 Mitchell, Jr., Mr. & Mrs. Petrie (Ruth)
 Mohrbacher, Mr. & Mrs. Carl (Yvonne)
 Mollenkof, Mr. & Mrs. Mark (Clarice)
 Mylin, Mr. & Mrs. Mark (Martie)
 Nantt, Rev. & Mrs. Gary A. (Carol)
 Newbrander, Mr. & Mrs. Tim (Lyn)

APPENDICES

Newsome, Rev. & Mrs. Wayne (Amy)
 O'Connor, Mr. & Mrs. Kevin (Diana)
 Omerly, III, Rev. & Mrs. George G. (Audrey)
 Ooms, Miss Lois
 Padilla, Mr. & Mrs. Manuel (Tito/Kim)
 Park, Dr. & Mrs. G. Timothy (Tim/Lynn)
 Park, Dr. & Mrs. Hyung Young (Young/Soon Ja)
 Parker, Dr. & Mrs. John (Sue)
 Patterson, Mr. & Mrs. James T. (Jim/Mary Alice)
 Patton, Rev. & Mrs. Tom (Diana)
 Payne, Dr. & Mrs. Michael (Karen)
 Peck, Mr. & Mrs. Andrew E. (Andy/Sue)
 Pelletier, Dr. & Mrs. Allen (Marge)
 Peters, Mrs. Stanley R. (Claudia)
 Pinckney, Rev. & Mrs. Daniel R. (Dan/Iara)
 Popp, Rev. & Mrs. Eric (Joy)
 Porter, Mr. & Mrs. Daniel (Dan/Bonnie)
 Powlison, Rev. & Mrs. Hugh (Berenice)
 Powlison, Mr. & Mrs. Keith (Ruth)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Quarterman, Dr. & Mrs. Clayton E. (Clay/Darlene)
 Ramsay, Rev. & Mrs. Richard (Rich/Angie)
 Rarig, Rev. & Mrs. Stephen (Steve/Berenice)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Reid, Rev. & Mrs. Fred (Mele)
 Rietkerk, Dr. Grietje (Greet)
 Robfogel, Rev. & Mrs. William (Bill/Edna)
 Rollo, Mr. & Mrs. John T. (Claudia)
 Rowan, Mr. & Mrs. Steve (Nancy)
 Rowton, Mr. & Mrs. Dan (Sue)
 Rug, Rev. & Mrs. John (Cathy)
 Rusling, Mr. & Mrs. L. Van (Alice)
 Savage, Mr. & Mrs. Thomas Joel (Tom/Wendy)
 Sawyer, Rev. & Mrs. Charles (Rick/Mindi)
 Scharf, Rev. & Mrs. Russ (Cherrie)
 Schnackenberg, Mr. & Mrs. Robert (Bob/Val)
 Schoof, Rev. & Mrs. Steve (Beth)
 Schorr, Mr. & Mrs. Robert A. (Rod/Sharilyn)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Scott, Rev. & Mrs. Robert D. (Bob/Libby)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Sell, Mr. & Mrs. Daniel Paul (Dan/Robbie)
 Shane, Rev. & Mrs. John J. (Susan)
 Shelby, Mr. & Mrs. Bob (Dana)
 Shelden, Mr. & Mrs. Howard (Deidre)
 Sieben, Rev. & Mrs. Scott (Linda)
 Slawter, Dr. & Mrs. William (Kip/Judy)
 Sledge, Rev. & Mrs. Charles F. (Judy)
 Small, Mr. & Mrs. Herbert H. (Butch/Linda)
 Smalling, Mr. & Mrs. Roger (Dianne)
 Sneller, Rev. & Mrs. Alvin R. (Al/Marilyn)
 Spooner, Dr. & Mrs. Arthur (Ursula)
 Stark, Mr. & Mrs. Jim (Jeanie)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Stevens, Rev. & Mrs. Carl (Irma)
 Stewart, Dr. & Mrs. James H. (Jim/Sue Ann)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Strom, Dr. Priscilla (Pris)
 Strom, Dr. & Mrs. Richard B. (Dick/Donna)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Strumbeck, Rev. & Mrs. David M. (Susan)
 Talley, Rev. & Mrs. Jeffrey (Jeff/Esther)
 Tate, Mr. Jim B.
 Taylor, Rev. & Mrs. Brad (Colleen)
 Taylor, Rev. & Mrs. Gordon (Beth)
 Taylor III, Rev. & Mrs. Paul Woolley (Sarah)
 Terranova, Mr. & Mrs. Russell (Barbara)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Thompson, Rev. & Mrs. Kenneth A. (Ken/Kim)
 Thrasher, Mr. & Mrs. James (Jim/Nan)
 Traub, Rev. & Mrs. William (Will/Judy)
 Travis, Mr. & Mrs. Edgar W. (Ed/Nitya)
 Trotter, Rev. & Mrs. Lawrence (Larry/Sandy)
 Truong, Dr. & Mrs. Hi Phan (Hi/Yen)
 Tucker, Rev. & Mrs. Eric (Conchita)
 Ulrich, Dr. & Mrs. Wesley (Beverly)
 Van Galen, Miss Cornelia (Corrie)
 Vick, Miss Renee
 Villa, Mr. & Mrs. Lorenz (Diane)
 Wagner, Mr. & Mrs. Richard C. (Ramona)
 Waldecker, Rev. & Mrs. Gary (Phyllis)
 Ward, Rev. & Mrs. Herbert (Herb/Kathy)
 Warren, Mr. & Mrs. Andrew (Andy/Bevely)
 Watanabe, Rev. & Mrs. Gary (Lois)
 Weeber, Miss Carol
 Weed, Mr. & Mrs. John (Ruthie)
 Wessel, Rev. & Mrs. Hugh S. (Martine)
 White, Miss Rebecca G. (Becky)
 White, Mr. & Mrs. David M. (Robin)
 Williams, Mr. & Mrs. Donald E. (Don/Terry)
 Williams, Dr. & Mrs. Steven Wilson (Steve/Rita)
 Wilson, Rev. & Mrs. G. Michael (Mick/Michele)
 Wolfe, Mr. & Mrs. Richard (Lori)
 Wood, Mr. & Mrs. Kenton (Karen)
 Wood, Miss Susan
 Wood, Rev. & Mrs. William (Bill/Christel)
 Woodham, Rev. & Mrs. Michael (Debbie)
 Woodson, Rev. & Mrs. Robert C. (Bob/Shirley)
 ██████████ ██████████
 Wroughton, Jr., Rev. & Mrs. James F. (Jim/Ellen)
 Young, Rev. & Mrs. Bruce D. L. (Susan)
 Young, Rev. & Mrs. Daniel James (Dan/Becky)
 Young, Rev. & Mrs. James W. (Jim/Tish)
 Young, Rev. & Mrs. Stephen T. (Steve/Sarah)
 Zapata Ruiz, Moises A. (Lourdes)

These Missionaries were added at the May 5-7, 1992, MTW Committee meeting:
 Durrell, Miss Kim Joyce
 Long, Rev. & Mrs. Johhy Wade, Jr. (Becky)
 Lott, Mr. & Mrs. Michael (Mary)
 Tate, Mr. Jim B.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 2

MTWIMPACT MISSIONARIES

Allison, Miss Brenda
Auffarth, Mr. & Mrs. Mark (Anne)
Bakelaar, Mr. & Mrs. Peter (Diane)
Baumgartner, Lori S.
Baus, Mr. Greg
Becker, Mr. Jeffrey (Jeff)
Blake, Mr. Jack Hickman
[REDACTED]
Brown, Miss Judy
Brown, Miss Roberta Marie
Brown, Mr. W. Larry (Larry)
Carley, Miss Lynn
Carlson, Mr. & Mrs. Maurice D. (Carolyn)
Carr, Mr. & Mrs. Billy (Bill/Susan)
Conkling, Mr. & Mrs. Timothy G. (Tim/Evie)
Cross, The Rev. & Mrs. Ray (Doba)
Dearman, Miss Jan
[REDACTED]
Dryden, Mrs. Shirley Robbins
Durrell, Miss Kim
Dye, Mr. Roger
Egan, Mr. & Mrs. David (Dave/Marti)
Findley, Miss Sandra Denise (Sandy)
Fiol, Mr. Alan F.
[REDACTED]
Fiol, Miss Tina L.
Gilchrist, Mr. Daniel
Goosen, Mr. Gary
Gray, Mr. Rick
Hatch, Mr. Rob
Hebert, Mr. & Mrs. David (Dave/Paula)
Helmly, Mr. Frank
Holman, Miss Beth
Hughey, Mr. & Mrs. Thomas (Joni)
Jakes, Mr. & Mrs. Glenn (Norma)
James, Mr. & Mrs. Guyton (Virginia)
Johnston, Mr. Jed
Keuler, Miss Donna
Kim, Mr. & Mrs. Jae (Margaret)
Kinsman, Miss Robin
Lass, Mr. & Mrs. Paul (Eileen)
McClurken, Rev. & Mrs. Edwin (Ed/Barbara)
McCraw, Miss Katrina
Miller, Mr. Daniel W. (Dan)
Moore, Miss Sarah Lynn
Nabinger, Mr. & Mrs. Gary (Jill)
Owen, Miss Glenna
Park, Miss Laura Rose
Parker, Mr. & Mrs. Joseph (Joe/Alice)
Patteson, Miss Cynthia
Perkins, Miss Sandra (Sandy)
Peterson, Miss Karen
Phillips, Miss Carolyn G.
Pitz, Mr. Daniel
Quillen, Mr. Wallace A. (Wally)
Ranheim, Dr. & Mrs. Phillip D (Karen)
Reichel, Miss Andrea
Richards, Miss Carol
Richie, Miss Merrily Faith
Sanderse, Mr. Martin (Marlene)
Schoene, Carole J.
Seward, Robert D.
Soltis, Miss Tanya M.
Stevens, Miss Carla
Swisher, Mr. & Mrs. LeRoy (Judy)
Tate, Mr. James B. (Jim)
Taylor, Mr. Fred C
Thomas, Mr. & Mrs. Richard (Lisa)
[REDACTED]
Thompson, Mr. Bruce K.
Thompson, Mr. Jeffrey Lee (Jeff)
Timberlake, Miss Mary Elizabeth (Beth)
Walters, Miss Darlene J.
Wessman, Mr. & Mrs. Todd (Sally)
Woodson, Miss Elizabeth (Ellie)
Yates, Mr. & Mrs. Timothy Paul (Tim/Barbara)
Young, Mr. Randall (Randy)
Zuniga, Mr. & Mrs. Manuel A. (Gladys)

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 3

Listed below are the agencies with which Mission to the World has missionaries serving under cooperative agreements.

Africa Evangelical Fellowship
African Bible Colleges
Africa Inland Mission, International
Arab World Ministries
Biblical Education by Extension
Black Forest Academy
Campus Crusade for Christ
*Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf, Inc.
Chinese Church Research Center
Christian Literature Crusade
Church Resource Ministries
Committee on Foreign Missions of Orthodox Presbyterian Church
Daystar
Evangelical Foreign Missions Association
Frontiers
Greater Europe Mission
Hapdong Presbyterian Theological Seminary/Korea
International Discipleship and Evangelization Associates
International Service Fellowship
* International Teams
Language Institute for Evangelism
Liebenzell Mission
Logoi, Inc.
*Lumie're Medical Ministries, Inc.
Mafraq Sanatorium Association
MAP International
Ministries in Action
Navigators
O.C. Ministries, International
Operation Mobilization
Overseas Missionary Fellowship
People International
Presbyterian Association of England
Presbyterian Church of Victoria (Australia)
Project Nehemiah, Inc.
Reformed Theological Seminary (France)
Send, International
SIM International
South America Mission
Vienna Christian School
Westminster Presbyterian Church/Australia
World Harvest Mission
World Mission Prayer League
World Radio Missionary Fellowship (HCJB)
WorldTeam
Wycliffe Bible Translators
Youth for Christ

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 4

MTW/IMPACT COOPERATIVE AGENCIES

Africa Inland Mission
Campus Crusade for Christ
Church Resource Ministries
International Teams
InterVarsity Christian Fellowship
Mission to Unreached Peoples
World Harvest Mission
Wycliffe Bible Translators

*Denotes all cooperative agreement signed since last report.

ATTACHMENT 5

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WHEREBY MISSION TO THE WORLD MISSIONARIES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA WORK WITH CARIBBEAN CHRISTIAN CENTER FOR THE DEAF, INC.

THE TERMS OF THIS AGREEMENT RELATE TO THE CATEGORY OF A MEMBER MISSIONARY RELATIONSHIP.

1. The missionary will have dual membership status with both Mission to the World and Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf.
2. The appointment of the missionary will be subject to the approval of both agencies in accordance with the standards established by each agency.
3. In the event that one agency requests confidential materials gathered by the other, such materials shall be shared with the understanding that the materials shall be kept confidential by that agency.
4. The missionary candidate shall participate in the full candidate and training program of Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf.
5. Time will be allowed for the candidate, if necessary, to do itineration or deputation work under the coordination of Mission to the World within the Presbyterian Church in America churches in order that adequate prayer and financial support can be realized.
6. Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf will supervise the securing of visas and make other arrangements necessary for beginning field work.

APPENDICES

7. Mission to the World will be the sponsoring agency for financial and prayer support of the missionary.
8. Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf shall be the directing agency in relation to missionary activities on the field. Changes in mutually accepted job descriptions should be made in consultation with Mission to the World.
9. Final discipline as relates to theology and morals rests in the proper church court of the Presbyterian Church in America.
10. The Mission to the World missionary will have liberty in the full and free presentation and practice of the whole counsel of God as contained in and understood in the Reformed view, as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechism, recognizing that he must also respect the position of others in an interdenominational setting.
11. While on the field and while traveling to and from the field, the missionary shall be under the jurisdiction of Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf.
12. While on the field, the missionary shall be an integral part of the field staff, sharing equally in privileges and responsibilities as any other member and being subject to the policies and direction of Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf.
13. The missionary's field director will initiate home ministry assignment planning in consultation with Mission to the World and also with Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf.
14. While on home ministry assignment, the missionary shall be under the jurisdiction of Mission to the World. Among the missionary's home ministry assignment responsibilities, consideration will be given by Mission to the World to assignments, projects, additional study or training requested by Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf. Progress and activity information during home ministry assignment will be provided for Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf.
15. While on home ministry assignment, the missionary will be expected by Mission to the World to carry on a deputation ministry for Mission to the World within the constituency of the Presbyterian Church in America congregations. Each agency shall assume the arrangements and expenses of deputation when the member is doing deputation for either agency. Primary home ministry assignment responsibilities will be within the Presbyterian Church in America under Mission to the World coordination.
16. The missionary will not solicit homeland constituencies of either agency for personal funds or field needs without the permission of the respective agency.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

17. The financial relationship of the missionary with Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf will be the same as that for all other members including the assessment and support quotas, except that during any portion of home ministry assignment under Mission to the World, the quota may be set by that agency. Mission to the World will receive and receipt the missionary's funds from the Presbyterian Church in America and transfer them monthly to Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf to be transmitted to the field by that agency. Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf will inform Mission to the World of funds designated for the missionary from other sources.
18. The hospitalization, retirement, and insurance plans provided by Mission to the World will be available to the missionary by mutual agreement of both agencies.

CARIBBEAN CHRISTIAN CENTER FOR THE DEAF, INC.

/s/ Robert L. Alderman _____ Chairman 9-5-91

/s/ Ernest P. Clark _____ Secretary/Treasurer
Title

DATE: /s/ 5 September 1991

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO THE WORLD,
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

/s/ R. Thomas Cheely _____
Chairman Coordinator

DATE: _____

The Caribbean Christian Center for the deaf seeks to reach deaf people on the Mission field with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. In cooperation with individuals & churches who CARE, the gospel can be shared with the deaf through sign language. They can HEAR.

This work is being done in Jamaica and was started in 1958. Today there are over 150 students in our residential school. The deaf have no language, no means of communication. Before we can present the Gospel, our first task is to give them a means of communication using American Sign Language.

APPENDICES

The School

Half of Jamaica's deaf population is under age 18, and the children are willing and eager to learn. They are scattered throughout the country. The only way to get them together in a large enough group to make it feasible to teach them, is to bring them to a residential school.

Our present school in Jamaica is located near the center of the island at Knockpatrick. The Managing Director is Mr. Bruce Mulberry from the United States. The Director of Studies is a very fine Jamaican, Miss Lola Wright. They have had training in deaf education & many years of experience working with the deaf. They are assisted by about 20 Jamaican teachers, trained at our school, several house mothers, kitchen staff, grounds & farm personnel, secretary & registered nurse.

The Children

The children arrive not knowing their names. They have NEVER been able to ask a question- NEVER received an answer, NEVER talked with their parents, NEVER heard their mother say "I love you."

We are teachers, teaching English, Math, Geography, current affairs, how to reason, etc. Before they leave us they can write essays and some do compound fractions..

We are parents, seeking to train & love the children as a parent would like to, but their parents are unable to communicate with them. We endeavor to build character by training them in good manners, courtesy, thought-fulness & Christian values. We pray that EACH child may reach the full potential that God has for him.

We like to accept children at age 4 before they have learned bad habits. Generally we will not accept teenagers. The students graduate at age 16 to 18.

We praise God that about 90% of our children have accepted Him as their Savior.

Our buildings are substantial and attractive, consisting of dormitories, library, chapel, dining room/kitchen and classrooms.

Jamaica Deaf Village

There are over 200 educated deaf adults in Jamaica most of whom do not have a job, do not have a good friend with whom they can communicate, do not have a Pastor or friend who knows sign language. They have no one to turn to, no one to share their needs and burdens, no one to pray with, no hope of getting Christian counsel.

To help meet these needs, God willing in 1990, we will begin to build a Village for the Deaf providing a factory for employment, apartments & houses, and their own church.

We are in the process of leasing 100 acres in Shooters Hill (near Knockpatrick) for 49 years with an option to renew. We also have an American company that wants us to manufacture their product in the village.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

CARIBBEAN CHRISTIAN CENTER FOR THE DEAF, INC.

STATEMENT OF FAITH

We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as divinely inspired and inerrant in the original writings, and that the Bible is the Word of God and of supreme and final authority in faith and practice.

We believe in one God, the Creator of all things and man; eternally existing in three persons, in a threefold relationship, that of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

We believe in the deity of Jesus Christ, that He was begotten of the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, and is God enfleshed, the God-man; we believe in His perfect life, redeeming death, bodily resurrection, heavenly inter-cession, and His personal return.

We believe in the personality of the Holy Spirit, by whose regenerative work sinful man is born again, and by whose indwelling regenerate man is enabled to live a godly life.

We believe in the bodily resurrection of the just and the unjust the ever-lasting blessedness of the saved, and the everlasting punishment of the lost.

We believe in the spiritual unity of all believers as comprising the true Church, the supreme duty of which is to preach the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord to every creature.

/s/ E. P. Clark, Chairman
7 June 1991

CARIBBEAN CHRISTIAN CENTER FOR THE DEAF

6520 Williamson Road, N.W.
P. O. Box 7010
ROANOKE, VIRGINIA 24019
TELEPHONE (703) 366-2431

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Ernest Clark, Chairman
Mrs. Terrie Mulberry, Secretary
Dr. Ainsley Dujon
Dr. Jimmie Johnson
Dr. James Benton
Lew Brammer
Trevor Smith
Mrs. Merle Roper
Mrs. Judy Levy
Herman Conley
Kent Kelso
Miss Lola Wright
Mrs. Lois Dungan
Bruce Mulberry, Managing Director, Jamaica

Richard Roper, Vice-Chairman
Robert Levy, Treasurer
Dr. Robert Alderman
Dr. Tom Lovorn
Dr. William Chapman
Vernon Kennedy
Rev. S. R. Hanson
Bruce Dungan
Carl Garnett
Buford Adams
Jerry Williamson
Mrs. Janie Lovorn

APPENDICES

CCCD USA Board Members

Rev. Buford Adams
Clayton Community Church
5900 Reynolds Road
Morrow, GA 30260

Dr. James Benton
Box 3543
Miami, FL 33169

Mr. Ernest Clark, Secretary-Treasurer
6821 Ardmore Drive
Roanoke, VA 24019

Dr. Jimmie Johnson
Rt. 1, P. O. Box 271
Denton, NC 27239

Dr. Tom Lovorn
Monumental Baptist Church
2925 South Crater Road
P. O. Box 1551
Petersburg, VA 23805

Dr. Robert L. Alderman, Chairman
P.O. Box 7010
Roanoke, VA 24019

Mr. Lew Brammer, Vice-Chairman
P. O. Box 5268
Cleveland, TN 37320

Dr. John Gamble
200 Pennsylvania Avenue
Lynchburg, VA 24502

Mr. Vernon Kennedy
Box 221
Warrenton, MO 63383

Rev. Ed Lyman
3807 Central Avenue
Nashville, TN 37205

ATTACHMENT 6

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WHEREBY MISSION TO THE WORLD MISSIONARIES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA WORK WITH LUMIERE MEDICAL MINISTRIES, INC.

This agreement concerns missionary personnel who are members of the Presbyterian Church in America, as to denomination, but members of both mission organizations.

1. The appointment of the missionary will be subject to the approval of both agencies in accordance with the standards established by each agency.
2. In the event that one agency requests confidential materials gathered by the other, such materials shall be shared with the understanding that the materials shall be kept confidential by that agency.
3. The missionary candidate shall participate in any candidate and training program of Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. as requested in addition to that of Mission to the World.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

4. Mission to the World shall be the primary sponsoring agency for financial and prayer support and will give oversight to all itineration work within the Presbyterian Church in America. Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. will be responsible for all arrangements and expenses of any itineration of the missionary within Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. constituency.
5. Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. will supervise the securing of visas and make other arrangements necessary for beginning field work.
6. Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. shall be the directing agency in relation to missionary activities on the field. Changes in the current job descriptions should be made in consultation with Mission to the World.
7. Final discipline as relates to theology and morals rests in the proper church court of the Presbyterian Church in America. Administrative discipline is the prerogative of Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. but it shall be exercised only after consultation with Mission to the World.
8. The Mission to the World missionary will have liberty in the full and free presentation and practice of the whole counsel of God as contained in and understood in the Reformed view, as contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechism, recognizing that he must also respect the position of others in an interdenominational setting.
9. While on the field and while traveling to and from the field, the missionary shall be under the jurisdiction of Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc.
10. While on the field, the missionary shall be an integral part of the field staff, sharing equally in privileges and responsibilities as any other member and subject to the policies and direction of Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc.
11. Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc., in consultation with Mission to the World, will establish the date of the home ministry assignment (furlough).
12. While on home ministry assignment, the missionary shall be under the jurisdiction of Mission to the World. Among the missionary's home ministry assignment responsibilities, consideration will be given by Mission to the World to assignments and additional study or training requested by Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc.
13. While on home ministry assignment, the missionary will be expected to carry on an itineration ministry for Mission to the World within the constituency of the Presbyterian Church in America congregations.
14. The missionary will not solicit homeland constituencies of either agency for personal funds or field needs without the permission of the respective agencies.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

WHY WE DO IT--

"For as much as ye have done it for the least of these...ye have done it unto me."

What purer motive can be attached to the witness of a national church as it labors among its own, than this? Preach the Gospel, yes, but...

... a cup of cold water

... a heart-felt concern for the physical man's illnesses and need

... living and acting as Jesus did
and *would* even today.

General Information and Geography

Hospital of Light, a general hospital, is located in the mountains of Haiti's Southern Peninsula about midway between the north and south coasts. There are 120 beds with medical, surgical, obstetrical and pediatric services supported by X-ray, laboratory and pharmacy. Endo-scopy and ultrasound are available.

History

The hospital, which began to admit patients in 1977, was a joint effort of MEBSH (a Haitian Protestant denomination) and Worldteam (formerly West Indies Mission). It has played a vital part in presenting the Gospel of Christ to the people of Haiti. With disengagement of Worldteam, Lumiere Medical Ministries, Inc. was formed in 1987 with the purpose of supplying materials, personnel and financial aid to the medical effort already established.

WHAT WE DO--

The services of Lumiere Medical Ministries can be summed up as:

Arranging for visits of North American specialists for sharing their expertise with Haitian medical people in caring for needy persons through:

- Community health education
- Clinics and special types of consultations
- Participation in hospital and surgical care

What We Believe --

We believe that the Holy Scriptures have been given by God Himself, that they are divinely inspired, infallible, without error in the original text, and that they constitute the Supreme Authority in all that concerns the believer's faith and conduct.

APPENDICES

We believe in one God, Holy and Almighty, Eternal and revealed in the Bible: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

We believe that Jesus Christ, God's only Son, is the eternal Word manifested in the flesh, that He was conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary, that He is without sin. We believe in His miracles, accomplished by the power of God, in His atoning death, in His glorious bodily resurrection and in His personal return, visible and pre-millennial.

We believe that man, created by God in His image, is fallen because of disobedience, that he is guilty and absolutely incapable of saving himself. We believe that the sinner, having died in his faults and sins, is saved by grace only, by means of faith in Jesus Christ whose shed blood alone can forgive sins.

We believe in the person of the Holy Spirit, whose ministry is to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ, convict the world of sin, regenerate the believer, abide in him, sanctify him by the truth and permit him to lead a holy life, to witness and work for the Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe in the bodily resurrection of all the dead, believers to eternal happiness with the Lord and unbelievers to judgment, condemnation and eternal punishment.

We believe in the existence of Satan, enemy of God and destroyer of men.

We believe that the church is composed of those who are saved by faith in Jesus Christ.

LUMIERE MEDICAL MINISTRIES BOARD MEMBERS

Dr. Garry Barker
Rte. 2, Box 102
Lebanon, VA 24266

Dr. Barker is a former missionary at the Hospital of light, having spent 4 years on the field. A member of Baptist church in Lebanon, VA

Dr. Robert A. Blake
1119 Queensgate St.
Gastonia, NC 28054

Treasurer of LMM, as an Orthopedic Surgeon and member of Southern Orthopedics of Gastonia. Member of the First Presbyterian Church of Gastonia.

Dr. Frederick G. Brown
6027 N.W. 77th Terrace
Parkland, FL 33067

Surgeon, with 4 years missionary service at the Hospital of Light in Haiti. Attends Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Ft. Lauderdale.

Miss Peggy Crismond
1421 South Main St.
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Lab Technician having spent 10 years at the Hospital of Light. Was responsible for setting up the lab from scratch. Recently a student at Covenant Seminary in St. Louis, member of the Methodist Church in Blacksburg

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Miss Jackie Currie
1000 Surrey Lane
Gastonia, NC 28054

Jackie spent nearly five years as Physical Therapist at the Hospital of Light. She obtained her Master's Physical Therapy in Boston and is presently on the staff of Compleat Rehab Services of Gastonia. She attends the Providence Baptist Church in Gastonia.

Dr. Ernie Fuller
P. O. Box 96
Hospital of Melfort
Sask. SOE 1A0
Canada

Dr. Fuller and his wife, Lori (also M.D. and Anesthesiologist) spent two three-year terms at the Hospital of Light. Members of the Christian & Missionary Alliance Church in Melfort.

Ing. Chavannes Jeune
MEBSH, % MFI,
Box 15665
W. Palm Beach, FL 33406

Chavannes is Coordinator for the Institution of the national church in Haiti and is an official member of the Board of LMM.

Rev. Raphael Lozama
MEBSH
% MFI, Box 15665
W. Palm Beach, FL 33406

Pastor Lozama is at present the President of the MEBSH churches (270 organized congregations) in Haiti and is an official member of the Board.

Dr. Francesca Hyacinthe
Hospital Lumiere-Haiti
% MFI, Box 15665
W. Palm Beach, FL 33406

Haitian Surgeon, head of the Medical Division for the past year. Has now ended her term of service with the Hospital of Light (8 years) and is moving to Port-au-Prince because of the educational needs of her children. Member of the Methodist Church in Port-au-Prince.

Dr. Dudley Nelson
111 Woodland Avenue
Swannanoa, NC 28778

Dr. Nelson spent two 10-year terms of service in the medical work in Haiti with a 9-year interval between. He is Vice President of the Board and a member of the Presbyterian Church in Swannanoa, NC.

Rev. Harry T. Schutte
Holiday Road
Gastonia, NC 28054

Pastor of the First Associate Reformed Presbyterian 520 Church of Gastonia, NC.

Dr. Edward Whitesides
2548 Fairfax Drive
Gastonia, NC 28054

President of the Board, Orthopedic Surgeon and a long-time friend of LMM, having begun his service in the original plans to build the Hospital of Light. A member of the 1st A.R.P. Church of Gastonia.

Dr. John L. Mathews
15 Pinecrest Road
Birmingham, AL 35223

Surgeon and former missionary at the Hospital of Light, seconded to Hospital of Light/Worldteam by Mission to the World. Member of P.C. Church in Birmingham.

APPENDICES

Dr. Robert Pflederer
66 Forestview Road
Morton, IL 61550

Having his specialty in Nephrology, Dr. Pflederer is a sought-after person in Central Illinois. A minister with the Apostolic Christian Church and ardent helper to the medical services in Haiti.

Dr. William Kelly
3529 Country Club Drive
Gastonia, NC 28056

Dr. Kelly is a Dentist, having made several trips to Haiti, he is a member of the First Presbyterian Church of Gastonia.

Mr. Charles Pearson, Jr.
Hospital of Light-Haiti
% MFI, Box 15665
W. Palm Beach, FL 33416

Mr. Pearson serves as Administrator of the Hospital of Light in Haiti. Though not an official Board member, he is an invited observer and liaison person.

Dr. William K. Dunham
52 Medical Park East Dr.
Birmingham, AL 35235

An Orthopedic Surgeon with great involvement in the medical service of the Hospital of Light. Dr. Dunham is a member of the PCA Church in Birmingham.

Dr. Edward B. Miedema
514 Locust Street
Big Rapids, MI 49307

Urologist who has spent 3-1/2 years in Haiti training a Haitian in Urology. Has made several shorter visits, including a six-month tour in the summer of 1990. Dr. Miedema is a member of the Christian Reformed Church in Big Rapids, MI.

Rev. Louis A. Markwood
1005 Woodlark Court
Gastonia, NC 28056

A 47-year veteran missionary with Worldteam in Cuba (19 years) and Haiti (28 years). Catalyst for LMM when Worldteam opted to concentrate exclusively on church planting. He is originally from Denver, CO and has been supported by his boy-hood church, Galilee Baptist, since 1940. At present he is Associate member of the 1st ARP Church of Gastonia, NC.

ATTACHMENT 7

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WHEREBY MISSION TO THE WORLD MISSIONARIES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA WORK WITH INTERNATIONAL TEAMS.

This agreement concerns missionary personnel who are members of the Presbyterian Church in America, as to denomination, but members of both mission organizations.

1. The appointment of the missionary will be subject to the approval of both agencies in accordance with the standards established by each agency.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. In the event that one agency requests confidential materials gathered by the other, such materials shall be shared with the understanding that the materials shall be kept confidential by that agency.
3. The missionary candidate shall participate in any candidate and training program of International Teams as requested in addition to that of Mission to the World.
4. Mission to the World shall be the primary sponsoring agency for financial and prayer support and will give oversight to all itineration work within the Presbyterian Church in America. International Teams will be responsible for all arrangements and expenses of any itineration of the missionary within International Teams constituency.
5. International Teams will supervise the securing of visas and make other arrangements necessary for beginning field work.
6. International Teams shall be the directing agency in relation to missionary activities on the field. Changes in the current job descriptions should be made in consultation with Mission to the World.
7. Final discipline as relates to theology and morals rests in the proper church court of the Presbyterian Church in America. Administrative discipline is the prerogative of International Teams but it shall be exercised only after consultation with Mission to the World.
8. The Mission to the World missionary will have liberty in the full and free presentation and practice of the whole counsel of God as contained in and understood in the Reformed view, as contained in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* and the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms*, recognizing that he must also respect the position of others in an interdenominational setting.
9. While on the field and while traveling to and from the field, the missionary shall be under the jurisdiction of International Teams.
10. While on the field, the missionary shall be an integral part of the field staff, sharing equally in privileges and responsibilities as any other member and subject to the policies and direction of International Teams.
11. International Teams, in consultation with Mission to the World, will establish the date of the home ministry assignment (furlough).
12. While on home ministry assignment, the missionary shall be under the jurisdiction of Mission to the World. Among the missionary's home ministry assignment responsibilities, consideration will be given by Mission to the World to assignments and additional study or training requested by International Teams.

APPENDICES

13. While on home ministry assignment, the missionary will be expected to carry on an itineration ministry for Mission to the World within the constituency of the Presbyterian Church in America congregations.
14. The missionary will not solicit homeland constituencies of either agency for personal funds or field needs without the permission of the respective agencies.
15. The support quota, work budget, etc. of the missionary with International Teams will be established by International Teams. Mission to the World will receive and receipt the missionary's funds from the Presbyterian Church in America and transfer them monthly to International Teams to be transmitted to the field by that agency. International Teams will inform Mission to the World of funds designated for the missionary from other sources.
16. The missionary shall be under the hospitalization, retirement, and insurance plans provided by Mission to the World.

INTERNATIONAL TEAMS

Title
Title

DATE: _____

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO THE WORLD, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

Chairman
Executive Director

DATE: _____

NEUHAUS REFUGEE TEAM MINISTRY OPPORTUNITIES/JOB DESCRIPTION KIM DURRELL

EVANGELISM:

Door-to-Door
Christmas Gift Baskets
Children's Bible Clubs (CEF Material)
Sunday Evangelistic Meeting
Friendship Evangelism
Special Event Outreach
Women's Evangelistic Bible Study

PRACTICAL:

Translation for Non-German Speaking Refugees
Immigration Assistance
Teaching English as a Second Language
American Culture Instruction
Hospital Visitation
Team Administration

DISCIPLESHIP:

Young Girl's Bible Study Group
One-on-One Discipleship
Equipping Refugees to Reach Refugees

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OVERVIEW

International Teams exists to glorify God and to declare His name among the nations. Our primary purpose is to help fulfill the Great Commission by making disciples of Jesus Christ.

International Teams is a missionary organization that gives young adults the opportunity to serve with distinction as foreign missionaries on a short-term or career basis.

We send out young adults, who are dedicated to Christ, because they have the vitality, enthusiasm and physical capacity to adapt to rigorous living conditions and new cultures. They are still flexible and usually fit more easily into a team situation. Given proper training, young adults can, and do, make a valuable contribution to the cause of worldwide evangelism.

At International Teams, the missions orientation program provides four and a half months of preparation that focuses on cross-cultural communications, specific field studies, language, biblical knowledge, interpersonal relations, and missions, as well as methods of evangelism, discipling, church planting, and practical evangelism experience.

Furthermore, the two years of missionary service overseas build practical Christian skills that remain with the team member throughout the years.

MITs are responsible to look to the Lord to provide for all costs involved in their preparation here, the round trip air fare, and their two years of missionary service overseas. They live by faith, trusting God to meet their needs through their home church, friends, and family.

International Teams is a charter member of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability, a charter member of the Canadian Council of Christian Charities, ACCM, and a member of the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association.

The primary goal of most teams is to win people to Christ and integrate them into a local church. This incorporates a variety of evangelistic methods such as: personal witnessing, open-air messages, children's clubs, English lessons, puppetry, audio-visual programs, home Bible studies, and evangelistic meetings, coffee bars and camps.

Interested contacts are encouraged to study the Bible regularly with a team member. As they become believers and grow in Christ, they are brought together for teaching, fellowship, communion and prayer. New converts are taught leadership skills and shown how to win others to the Lord with the aim of beginning new churches.

In situations where the team serves under the leadership of an existing national church, the goal is to encourage national Christians to make disciples of their countrymen, while doing all they can to foster the growth of the church.

APPENDICES

International Teams adheres to the historic fundamentals of the orthodox Christian faith and is committed to the Bible as the infallible, inerrant Word of God. As such, it is the standard for every aspect of faith and practice. Everyone on staff or teams must give evidence of spiritual rebirth through belief in Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior.

We are committed to living by faith and staying out of debt. Our eight acre property with its nine homes and missions building is paid for in full, thanks to the grace of God and generosity of His people.

We are also committed to excellence in all aspects of our ministry for the Lord. We believe in remaining flexible in our methods in order to meet the needs of a changing world, while maintaining intact and undiluted the unchanging message of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. Our greatest desire is that He might have preeminence in all things and be glorified in every phase of our lives and ministry.

Teams focusing on evangelism, discipling and church planting are currently concentrating on Europe and Asia.

International Teams helps mobilize missionaries through four main channels:

- 1. Summer Servants**
Young adults who are only available for a summer program may participate in one of our four or six week overseas ministries.
- 2. Special Assignment**
Some people with special skills (e.g. carpentry, vehicle mechanics, medical skills) give from a few weeks up to 12 months on a Special Assignment, assisting a team with a specific need.
- 3. Two-Year Missions Program**
The Missions Program consists of four and a half months of training and two years overseas. The training includes:

Language study	Cross-cultural communication
Methods of evangelism	Specific culture studies
Church planting	Apologetics
Making disciples	How to Study the Bible
Interpersonal relations	How to Lead a Bible Study
Evangelism Skills	
Music, Drama, Puppetry,	
Sketch Board, Mime	
- 4. Career Missions**
Those who successfully complete the two-year missions program are eligible to become career missionaries. This is limited to certain fields of service and requires a continuing commitment to teamwork.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Each of our opportunities are designed to afford young adults the best possible preparation to assure their effective service for the Lord in another culture. It is training that lasts a lifetime.

REFERENCES

(What Others Are Saying About International Teams)

"I doubt we would now be in full-time service for the Lord if we had not had those two years of preparation. The well-rounded training plus the direction and guidance after we reached the field removed much of the fear of going overseas with a family." (Harvey Rodger, Missionary to Columbia)

"You have one of the finest facilities and programs at International Teams that I've seen any place during my 20 years in Christian higher education. I praise the Lord for the unique ministry He has given you." (Dr. Glenn F. Arnold, Professor, Communications Department, Wheaton College Graduate School)

"I thank God that International Teams provides young people with another option -- that of working with seasoned missionaries and groups on short-term ventures designed to help them make those important decisions concerning service to our Lord Jesus Christ more easily and with greater wisdom. The lessons they learn will serve them, whether they become missionaries abroad, or servants of Jesus Christ in whatever profession He places them in their home country." (Luis Palau, International Evangelist)

"It takes inspiration, education, motivation, mobilization and organization to produce missionaries. International Teams does it as well as any group I know." (D. Stuart Briscoe, Pastor and Author)

"I have personally seen many young people brought to maturity in Jesus Christ through their months of study and two years on a missionary team with International Teams. A unique balance of deep biblical foundations for godly living, combined with communications skills for evangelism, brings this about." (Marie Little, Author and conference Speaker)

"There's nothing quite like learning by doing. International Teams has one of the finest programs available for equipping people for significant cross-cultural ministries. Their hands-on approach is commendable. Their staff, superb. I heartily endorse the ministry of International Teams and would encourage anyone who is seriously considering missions to get acquainted with their 'team'." (Dr. Joseph Aldrich, President, Multnomah School of the Bible)

APPENDICES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. J. Richard Clark, Secretary/Treasurer	Roy Mfg. Co., Inc., Portland, OR
Dr. Kevin G. Dyer, Founder	International Teams
Mr. Mark K. Dyer, President	International Teams
Mr. John Elliot, Manager	Real Estate Department, Commonwealth Edison, Chicago, IL
Mr. Robert Fulton, President	Webb Industries, Inc., Framingham, MA
Mr. Clifford Ice, Associate Pastor	Community Bible Chapel, Atlanta, GA
Mr. Brian McLaren, Pastor	Cedar Ridge Community Church, Riverdale, MD
Mrs. Judy Pollard, Homemaker	Wheaton, IL
Mr. William E. Reed, Jr., President	Tri-City Woodworks, Inc., Lake Park, FL

INTERNATIONAL TEAMS BOARD OF REFERENCE

Dr. Joseph Aldrich -- <i>President, Multnomah School of the Bible</i>
Mr. Jerry Ballard -- <i>Executive Director, World Relief</i>
Dr. Ron Blue -- <i>Chairman of Missions Department, Dallas Theological Seminary</i>
Mr. D. Stuart Briscoe -- <i>Pastor, Elmbrook Church, Milwaukee, WI</i>
Mr. Scott Wesley Brown -- <i>Christian Musician, Nashville, TN</i>
Dr. Henry Budd -- <i>President, Briercrest Bible College</i>
Mr. C. Donald Cole -- <i>Radio Pastor, Moody Radio Network, Moody Bible Institute</i>
Mrs. Muriel Dennis -- <i>President, Good News Publishers</i>
Mr. Peter Deyneka, Jr. -- <i>General Director, Slavic Gospel Association</i>
Dr. John Gration -- <i>Coordinator, Missions/Cross Cultural Communication, Wheaton Graduate School</i>
Dr. John Kyle -- <i>Coordinator, Mission to the World</i>
Dr. Walter Liefeld -- <i>Professor of New Testament, Trinity Evangelical Divinity Seminary</i>
Mrs. Marie Little -- <i>Author</i>
Dr. Luis Palau -- <i>International Evangelist</i>
Mr. Bill Pollard -- <i>President, ServiceMaster Corporation</i>
Mr. Keith Price -- <i>Minister at Large, Evangelical Fellowship of Canada</i>
Mr. Donald Soderquist -- <i>Chief Operating Officer, Wal-Mart Stores</i>
Dr. Terry Winter -- <i>Evangelist, Terry Winter Christian Communications</i>

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATEMENT OF FAITH

1. We believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the inspired Word of God, inerrant in the original documents and of final authority in all matters of faith and practice.
2. We believe in one God, eternally existent in three Persons -- Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.
3. We believe in the full deity and perfect humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in His virgin birth, His impeccability, His representative and substitutionary sacrifice, His bodily resurrection, His ascension to the Father's right hand, His present high priestly ministry, and His personal return in power and glory.
4. We believe that regeneration by the Holy Spirit is absolutely necessary for the salvation of fallen, sinful and lost mankind. Salvation is a free gift of God's grace received by personal faith through Jesus Christ.
5. We believe in the present ministry of the Holy Spirit, by whose indwelling the believer is sealed until the day of redemption and is empowered to live a godly life.
6. We believe the church is composed of all true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. These believers are united to Him and to one another by the indwelling Spirit. The church's chief functions are to glorify God and to witness for Christ until He returns. The local church is composed of a group of believers in a specific locality who gather in Christ's Name for breaking of bread, prayers, fellowship and teaching.
7. We believe in the resurrection of the saved, and of the lost; of the saved, to the resurrection of life, and of the lost to the resurrection of judgment, eternal, and conscious.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX L

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

The General Assembly's Nominating Committee convened in Atlanta, Georgia, on March 31, 1992. Following devotions and prayer, the committee was subdivided into five groups. Their report was then heard and amended by the full committee.

The members present were:

TE Carl Bogue, Ascension, 1992
RE Johnny Armstrong, Calvary, 1994
TE Robert Wilcox, Central Carolina, 1993
TE Neil Gilmour, Central Florida, 1992
RE Neal Ham, Central Georgia, 1993
TE Tom Kay, Jr., Covenant, 1994
RE Chester Morgan, Grace, 1992
RE Jack Vannette, Great Lakes, 1993
RE A. Julian Gibson, Gulf Coast, 1994
TE James Brown, Heritage, 1992
TE Daniel Dermeyer, Illiana, 1992
TE Kerry (Pete) Hurst, James River, 1994
RE Ed Hackenberg, Louisiana, 1992
TE William Swenson, Missouri, 1992
TE F. Allan Story, Jr., New Jersey, 1992
TE William Henderson, Northeast, 1994
RE Earl Witmer, North Georgia, 1992
TE Robert Palmer, North Texas, 1992
TE Mark Fairbrother, No. California, 1992
TE Bruce Stanek, No. Illinois, 1992
RE Robert Taylor, Pacific, 1993
TE John Pickett, Pacific NW, 1993
RE John Harley III, Philadelphia, 1992
TE Herb Ruby III, Potomac, 1992
RE Gerald Harcastle, Rocky Mountain, 1994
RE Meade Guy, SE Alabama, 1993
TE Terry Traylor, South Texas, 1993
RE Blair Littlejohn, Southern Florida, 1994
TE Russell Toms, SW Florida, 1992
TE Donald Hendricks, Southwest, 1992
RE Willard Lutz, Susquehanna Valley, 1992
TE Carl Howell, Jr., Westminster, 1993

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Dr. Paul R. Gilchrist, Stated Clerk of General Assembly, was present and served as a resource person to the committee.

The committee elected RE A. Julian Gibson, as chairman, and TE William S. Henderson, as secretary, for the coming year.

We are attaching the distribution of committee and agency members by presbyteries for your information.

The nominations and summary of biographical forms are attached.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Neil Gilmour
Chairman

II. DISTRIBUTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY PRESBYTERIES April 1992

ASCENSION	MTW, CC, 2-CTS
CALVARY	AC, CE/P, MNA, MTW, 2-CTS, PCAF, RH, CCB,
CENTRAL CAROLINA	CE/P, MNA, CC, IRC, IFBD, RH
CENTRAL FLORIDA	CC, CTS, SJC
CENTRAL GEORGIA	AC, CE/P, MNA, CTS, IAR, IRC, IFBD, PCAF, RH, CCB, TH EX, SJC
COVENANT	CE/P, MNA, CC, CTS, IAR, PCAF, TH EX, SJC
EASTERN CANADA	
EASTERN CAROLINA	CE/P, RH
EVANGEL	CE/P, 2-MTW, 3-CTS, IFBD, CCB, SJC
GRACE	AC, CE/P, IAR, PCAF, IRC, RH, CCB
GREAT LAKES	CC, CTS, IAR, CCB, SJC
GULF COAST	AC, MTW, RH, 2-SJC
HEARTLAND	
HERITAGE	AC, MNA, MTW, CC, TH EX
ILLIANA	AC
JAMES RIVER	CC, SJC
KOREAN CENTRAL	
KOREAN EASTERN	
KOREAN SOUTHERN	
KOREAN SOUTHEASTERN	

APPENDICES

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS BY PRESBYTERIES -
continued

KOREAN SOUTHWEST	IAR, MNA
LOUISIANA	AC, IAR
MID-AMERICA	AC, CE/P, MNA, MTW, CC, TH EX, SJC
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY	AC, MNA, MTW, CC, 3-CTS, IRC, SJC
MISSOURI	AC, MNA, IAR, TH EX, CCB, SJC
NEW JERSEY	CC
NEW RIVER	AC, MNA, MTW, CC, CTS, 2-RH, SJC
NORTH GEORGIA	CC, IAR, CCB, SJC
NORTH TEXAS	CC, IRC
NORTHEAST	MNA
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	CE/P, CCB, SJC
NORTHERN ILLINOIS	MNA, 2-IFBD, SJC
PACIFIC	MTW, CC
PACIFIC NORTHWEST	2-CE/P, MTW, CC, IAR, RH, SJC
PALMETTO	MNA, MTW, CC, CTS, IRC, TH EX, CCB
PHILADELPHIA	AC, 2-CC, 2-CTS, IRC, IFBD
POTOMAC	IAR
ROCKY MOUNTAIN	
SIouxLANDS	
SOUTH COAST	CTS, SJC
SOUTH TEXAS	2-CE/P, MNA, CC, CTS, IFBD, IRC, PCAF,
SOUTHEAST ALABAMA	TH EX, SJC
SOUTHERN FLORIDA	CC, IAR, IFBD, 2-PCAF, TH EX, CCB,
	2-SJC
SOUTHWEST	SJC
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA	MNA, CTS, PCAF
SUSQUEHANNA VALLEY	CTS, SJC
TENNESSEE VALLEY	AC, MNA, 2-MTW, 4-CC, IAR, SJC
WARRIOR	CC, CTS, SJC
WESTERN CAROLINA	MTW, CC, RH, SJC
WESTMINSTER	CCB

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

A. Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

L. Roy Taylor, Grace

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Harold E. Whitlock, Heritage
William Bonner, New Jersey

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

William C. Hughes, MS Valley Donald J. MacNair, Missouri	Class of 1994	David S. Huggins, Jr., TN Valley
William A. Fox, Jr., Calvary	Class of 1993	William A. Rocap, Jr., C. Carolina
Grady Love, N. Georgia	Class of 1992	Richard Herbert, Mid-America Scott T. Levy, Illiana
Robert S. Hornick, Gulf Coast	Alternates	William (Bingy) Moore, IV, Potomac

Chairman of Committee or Board or his designate

B. To Be Elected:

TWO TEs	Class of 1996	ONE RE
ONE TE	Alternates	ONE RE

C. Nominations:

	Class of 1996	
TE William S. Henderson, Northeast		RE William (Bingy) Moore IV, Potomac
TE Robert S. Hornick, Gulf Coast		
	Alternates	
TE T. M. Duncan, Louisiana		RE William F. Joseph, Jr., SE Alabama

D. Biographical Sketches:

- TE T. M. Duncan: Louisiana. Pastor of Westminster PCA of Opelousas, LA. Desires to keep the PCA decentralized yet efficient. Has served on Com. of Comm. three times at GA. Has served on Presbytery MTW committees and other committees.
- TE William S. Henderson: Northeast. Senior Pastor of Hope Church of Ballston Spa, NY. Demonstrated gifts of leadership and administration both in Presbytery and in GA. Has served on numerous committees and commissions of Northeast Presbytery and is now Moderator of Northeast Presbytery. Has previously served as Chairman of Administrative Committee of GA.
- TE Robert S. Hornick: Gulf Coast. Pastor of Warrington PCA. Has the gift of administration, is Stated Clerk of Presbytery, and has served on the Presbytery Examinations Committee 82-85. Currently an Alternate on AC of GA.
- RE William F. Joseph, Jr.: Southeast Alabama. Structural Architect and County Commissioner. His gifts are in administration. Served as Moderator of the GA in 1979. Serves as County Commission Chairman in a large urban county. 28 years experience on governing bodies, both civil and ecclesiastical, dealing with

APPENDICES

multi-million budgets each year. Served on Committee on Administration and IAR.

RE William H. (Bingy) Moors, IV: Potomac. Owner of Moore Security, Inc. Active RE in Presbytery and GA. Currently Alternate on AC. Has capably served as chairman of budget subcommittee. Served on Review of Presbytery Records Committee 83-84. Was Moderator of Potomac Presbytery.

COMMITTEE FOR CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND PUBLICATIONS

A: Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

J. Alan Carter, Evangel

Paul Settle, Calvary
Robert Smallman, N. Illinois

David Bowen, E. Carolina
John R. Riddle, Palmetto

Ronald L. Shaw, Palmetto
James L. Shull, MS Valley

vacant

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Rodney A. Andrews, SE Alabama
Ralph Mittendorff, S. Florida

Class of 1994

Julian Davis, C. Georgia
Steve Fox, SE Alabama

Class of 1993

vacant

Class of 1992

Phil Johnson, Covenant
Barrett Mosbacker, C. Carolina

Alternates

vacant

Advisory Members
Director of Ridge Haven
Frank Brock, President of Covenant College
Paul Kooistra, President of Covenant Theological Seminary

B. To Be Elected:

TWO TEs

Class or 1996

TWO REs

Class of 1993

ONE RE

Alternates

ONE TE

ONE RE

C. Nominations:

TE Arthur Ames, Rky Mountain
TE James R. McKee, Potomac

Class of 1996

RE Marvin Padget, TN Valley
RE Nelson Perret, Louisiana

Class of 1993

RE John Van Voorhis, Calvary

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Alternates

TE P. Legree Finch, So. Texas

RE George Harris, Philadelphia

D. Biographical Sketches:

TE Arthur Ames: Rocky Mountain. Associate Pastor for CE of Village Seven PCA, Colorado Springs, CO. Has done D. Min. in the area of CE. Group leadership in Vacation Bible School and Sunday School programs. Administration of large SS and CE program, as well as responsible for the WIC program. Extensive experience with Great Commissions materials.

TE P. Legree Finch: South Texas. Associate Pastor of Westminster PCA of Bryan, TX. Extensive leadership roles in various education functions, camps, organizing CE & P seminars. Chairman of Presbytery CE Committee. Has produced *Adult Nurture Resource Guide* as reference tool. Very much involved in Presbytery work.

RE George Harris: Philadelphia. Semi-retired pharmaceutical technician. Currently involved with youth services in his county. Has served on various Com. of Comm. for GA and is very much involved in Philadelphia Presbytery serving on three committees.

TE James R. McKee: Potomac. Executive Pastor of Chapelgate PCA. Demonstrated outstanding organizational gifts in 20 years specializing in Christian Education. Proven leadership in camp ministry, conferences, small group development, leadership training, and seminary education. Has taught at Birmingham Theological Seminary and Covenant Theological Seminary. Active in Presbytery committees.

RE Marvin Padgett: Tennessee Valley. Christian bookstore owner. Has gift of teaching and experience. Administrator in education. Served as Budget Director of a county board of education. Founder and current Board Chairman of Christ Presbyterian Academy (grades K-12). Board member of Good News/Crossway Publishers. Board member of Francis A. Schaeffer Foundation.

RE Nelson Perret: Louisiana. MD in General Practice. Chairman of the CE Committee on the local level. Strong desire to see adults and children become grounded in the Scriptures and develop a distinctly biblical world and life view.

RE John Van Voorhis: Calvary. Federal administrative law judge serving in the Social Security Administration. Has served as Moderator of his Presbytery and numerous committees in the OPC, RPCES, and PCA. Has served as Sunday School Superintendent in three different congregations.

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA

A. Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

Kenneth A. Smith, New Jersey
Lewis Ruff, N. California

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Eugene Betts, Philadelphia

Class of 1994

Harry Reeder, C. Carolina
W. Wilson Benton, Missouri

John White, Jr., N. Georgia
John Wheeler, Calvary

APPENDICES

Cortez A. Cooper, SE Alabama
Class of 1993
R. Arthur Williams, SW. Florida
James C. Turner, C. Georgia

William N. Whitwer, MS Valley
Gerald G. Morgan, TN Valley
Class of 1992
John Jardine, Jr., Heritage
Authur Rogers, Covenant

Andrew Silman, Louisiana
Alternates
James Hanemaayer, Pacific

B. To Be Elected:

TWO TEs
Class of 1996
TWO REs

ONE TE
Alternates
ONE RE

RE John Jardine is eligible for re-election.

C. Nominations:

TE James C. Bland, S. Texas
TE Andrew Silman, Louisiana
Class of 1996
RE James Hanemaayer, Pacific
RE John Jardine, Heritage

TE David Clelland, No. Texas
Alternates
RE Tim Gleeson, E. Canada

D. Biographical Sketches:

TE James C. Bland, III: South Texas. Pastor of Bay Area PCA of Seabrook, TX. Gifts of vision, planning, and organizing. Was involved in organizing Redlands Community PCA in Miami, Bay Area Church in Houston, TX, Kingwood Forest PCA in Houston. Has conducted seminars and consulted in areas of church growth and assimilation. Has been actively involved in GA committees and Presbytery committees.

TE David Clelland: North Texas. Pastor of Town North PCA of Dallas, TX. Outstanding gift in administration, leadership, and organization. Aware of the problems in starting new churches. Involved in the new Park Cities PCA in Dallas becoming PCA. Gifted in administration, planning, and leadership. Very active in Presbytery committees and served on the Board of Directors of Covenant College 82-85.

RE Tim Gleeson: Eastern Canada. Investment Manager, McKinsey Financial, Toronto. Has been involved in starting two new congregations in province of Ontario. Has planning, proven vision, strategizing, analyzing. Has great insight into the Canadian church context.

RE James Hanemaayer: Pacific. Radio broadcaster for Major Market Stations, Inc. (KWRM Radio). Very active in Presbytery. Especially involved in work of missions. Has served on various civic projects and state-wide projects in California. Member of the California Chamber of Commerce and various broadcasting associations.

RE John W. Jardine, Jr.: Heritage. Chairman of the Board of Chesapeake Utilities Corp. Presbytery Church Planting Committee 90-92. Grasp of demographics,

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

leadership, organization, interpersonal skills. Has served 1 year on MNA of GA.

TE Andrew Silman: Louisiana. Pastor of Plains PCA of Zachery. Gifts of faith, vision, and administration. Has served well on Presbytery committees and served MNA for 1 year as an Alternate. Has had church planting experience as well as involvement in church renewal and church growth.

COMMITTEE ON MISSION TO THE WORLD

A. Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

Shelton Sanford, Calvary

Robert F. Auffarth, Heritage
Jerram Barrs, Missouri

Frank M. Barker, Evangel
Jack B. Scott, MS Valley

R. Thomas Cheely, Evangel
Thomas E. Ramsay, Pacific NW

Sanders L. Willson, TN Valley

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Pete Austin, TN Valley
James Banks, W. Carolina

Class of 1994

Gerald Sovereign, Gulf Coast
James Wright, Palmetto

Class of 1993

Loyd Strickland, N. Georgia

Class of 1992

Donald MacKenzie, Philadelphia
Nelson M. Kennedy, Ascension

Alternates

Charles W. Burns, Heritage

B. To Be Elected:

TWO TEs

ONE TE

Class of 1996

Alternates

TWO REs

ONE RE

C. Nominations:

TE James A. Jones, Westminster
TE John W. P. Oliver, C. Georgia

TE R. Lynn Downing, S. Florida

Class of 1996

RE Charles W. Burns, Heritage
RE Don W. Cole, No. Texas

Alternates

RE John B. Noble, SE Alabama

APPENDICES

D. Biographical Sketches:

- RE Charles W. Burns: Heritage. Retired business executive. Strong demonstrated burden for missions. Has led his church in increased missions awareness and giving. Has served as MTW Alternate 91-92. Strong gifts in organization and administration. Actively participates in Presbytery committees.
- RE Don W. Cole: North Texas. Computer Consultant. Owner of Office Automation Resources, Inc. Excels in administration. Has served the Presbytery MTW committee for 12 years. Deep concern for Third World. Considerable experience in analyzing business situation and needs.
- TE R. Lynn Downing: Southern Florida. Senior Pastor of Lake Osborne PCA of Lake Worth, FL. Has traveled extensively to various fields to minister to missionaries and pastors. Great interest in missions. Has been deeply involved in Presbytery committees of MNA and MTW. Has served on MNA committee 86-89.
- TE James A. Jones, Jr.: Westminster. Pastor of Dickenson First PCA of Haysi, VA. Served for a term as missionary in France. Spearheaded missions awareness in Westminster Presbytery. Good administrator. Chairman of Presbytery's MTW committee 81-86 and 88-90. Has served on Com. of Comm. of GA.
- RE John B. Noble: Southeast Alabama. General Contracting and Real Estate Development for Noble Enterprises. Vitally interest in foreign mission work, having developed an outstanding program at Trinity Church, Montgomery. Served on Com. of Comm. for MTW.
- TE John W. P. Oliver: Central Georgia. Pastor of First PCA of Augusta, GA. Has actively served CE & P Committee, MTW 83-89. Was principal and Chairman of the SIMA/IMPACT program 87-89. Pastor of strong missionary supporting and sending congregation. Giving has increased 1,500% and support from 1 missionary to 90 missionaries. Serves on the Board of Trustees of Columbia Bible College. Has visited and ministered in mission stations around the world.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT COLLEGE

A: Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

Arthur C. Broadwick, Ascension
William S. Barker, Philadelphia
Robert S. Rayburn, Pacific NW

Lonnie Barnes, New River
Thomas G. Kay, Warrior
C. Al Lutz, Great Lakes

Allen Mawhinney, C. Florida
J. Render Caines, TN Valley
Whaley Barton, Palmetto
Mark Van Gilst, Heritage
J. Robert Fiol, James River

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Hugh O. Maclellan, Sr. TN Valley
Robert A. Watts, Northeast
Robert G. Avis, Missouri
Dwight L. Allen, N. Georgia

Class of 1994

Richard C. Chewning, North Texas
C. H. Crews, Jr., Calvary
Robert L. Frederick, TN Valley
Donald E. Rittler, Potomac

Class of 1993

Charles E. Carraher, S. Florida
John C. Wright, SE Alabama

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Class of 1992

Frederick Marsh, MS Valley
John S. McNicoll, W. Carolina
Lane G. Adams, Potomac
Robert W. Bowman, C. Georgia

Kenneth E. Avis, Covenant
G. Richard Hostetter, TN Valley
James Roberts, SW Florida

B. To Be Elected:

Class of 1996

Seven Members (Teaching or Ruling Elders)
One may be from other NAPARC denominations
(See Bylaws VI.2, para. 3)
All 7 members of Class of 1992 are eligible for re-election.

C. Nominations:

Class of 1996

TE Lane G. Adams, Potomac
TE Dan Kim, No. Georgia
TE Bill Hawk, No. California

RE Joel Belz, W. Carolina
RE Charles Bryant, Gulf Coast
RE David Edling, So. Coast
RE James Roberts, SW Florida

D. Biographical Sketches:

- TE Lane G. Adams: Potomac. HR. Interim Pastor at Christ EPC of Houston, TX. Has served on Covenant College board. Eligible for re-election. He served as Associate Evangelist, Billy Graham Evangelistic Association 64-73. Pastored Chapelgate PCA, Ellicot City, MD. Has served as Vice-President and Executive Director of the Lloyd Olgilvie Ministries 89-90.
- RE Joel Belz: Western Carolina. Editor and Publisher of God's World Publications. Had served in the past on the board, and specifically, as Chairman of the board at Covenant College. Demonstrated commitment to Christian higher education. Served as headmaster and high school teacher in a Christian school. Formerly taught at the college level. Understands the administration and responsibilities of a trustee.
- RE Charles E. Bryant: Gulf Coast. Adjunct Professor of Gulf Coast Community College. Former college president. Sincere interest in private and church-sponsored education. Has a knowledge of fund raising.
- RE David Edling: South Coast. Serves on the staff of New Life PCA of Escondido, CA. Responsible for evangelism and discipleship. Experience as a corporate lawyer specializing in contracts and procurement. Two children at Covenant College. Gifted in administration, education, and legal work.
- TE Bill Hawk: Northern California. Owner of private school and part-time pastor. Has personally owned and operated two Christian pre-schools as well as organizing two PCA churches. Gifted in finance. As a parent of a Covenant College student, interested in promoting and supporting the quality of education at Covenant.
- TE Dan Kim: North Georgia. Coordinator of Korean ministries for MNA. Many contacts with Korean Americans who might be interested in Covenant College. Interested in promoting Covenant College among PCA Korean churches, Presbyteries, and lay people.
- RE James Roberts: Southwest Florida. President of Corporate Communications Consulting Firm. Has currently served one year on Covenant College board. Experience in management, marketing, and directing not-for-profits and institutions of higher education. Extensive background in managing

APPENDICES

philanthropic programs. Knowledge of charitable foundations. Strong commitment to Christian higher education.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A. Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

Hudson T. Armerding, Susq. Valley
David Alexander, Calvary

Michael N. Malone, C. Florida
James Reynolds, Missouri

Richard W. Tyson, Philadelphia
William Spink, Jr., Covenant

Charles B. Holliday, Ascension
Stephen Smallman, Potomac
James D. Hatch, N. Georgia
Rodney D. Stortz, Missouri
John W. Robertson, Warrior

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1995

Robert P. Burrows III, Ascension
Art Stoll, N. Illinois
Robert E. Morrison, Potomac
John J. Reed, Missouri

Class of 1994

Richard P. Ellingsworth, Potomac
Bill Hay, Evangel
Vernon Pierce, SW Florida
James B. Orders, Jr., Calvary

Class of 1993

Edward S. Harris, Great Lakes
G. Paul Jones, C. Georgia
Robert B. Hezlep, Jr., Evangel
Allen L. Knox, Jr. SE Alabama

Class of 1992

John E. Spencer, Evangel

B. To Be Elected:

Class of 1996

Six Members (Teaching or Ruling Elders)
One may be from other NAPARC denominations
(See Bylaws VI.2, para. 3)

The following members of Class of 1992 are eligible for re-election:
TE Smallman and TE Robertson

C. Nominations:

TE Stephen Smallman, Potomac
TE Stephen Bostrom, E. Carolina

TE Charles Green, C. Florida

Class of 1996

RE Rudolph Schmidt, TN Valley
RE Samuel Bartholomew,
W. Carolina
TE Paul Alexander, Evangel

D. Biographical Sketches:

TE Paul Alexander: Evangel. Senior Pastor of Westminster PCA of Huntsville, AL.
Has served in the past very capably CTS board as a principal. Vitaly interested

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

in Christian education. Active in Presbytery committees. Has served as Moderator of his Presbytery.

- RE Samuel Bartholomew: Western Carolina. Investment Banker for 25 years. Currently operates sales and distribution business. Has served as principal and Chairman of PCA Foundation. Has proven to be gifted and responsible in discernment and ability to reach positive resolutions.
- TE Stephen Bostrom: Eastern Carolina. Senior Pastor of Peace PCA of Cary, NC. 1977 graduate of Covenant Seminary. Understands the purpose of the seminary. Has had experience in church planting. Excellent organizational leadership skills.
- TE H. Charles Green, Jr.: Central Florida. Senior Pastor of Orangewood PCA of Orlando, FL. Has been instrumental in assisting the development of a seminary in Orlando. Actively involved with seminary students. Has served actively on various Presbytery committees as well as being Moderator of the Presbytery several times.
- RE Rudolph Schmidt: Tennessee Valley. Retired Dean of Records at Covenant College. 36 years of administrative experience in higher education. Keen interest in the seminary. Faithfully served on various committees of Presbytery.
- TE Stephen Smallman: Potomac. Senior Pastor of McLean PCA. Currently on board and eligible for re-election. Demonstrated the gifts of discernment, wisdom, administration, and pastoring. His previous experience as a graduate of the institution and member of the board would serve him well.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSURANCE, ANNUITY, AND RELIEF FUNDS

A. Present Personnel:

Class of 1995
Denny Carew, Rocky Mountain
Ronald W. Horgan, Mid-America
John Mardirosian, New Jersey

Class of 1994
James E. Shipley, C. Georgia
Dudley M. Barnes, Covenant
William T. Clarke, Louisiana

Class of 1993
Earle Morris, Jr., Palmetto
Gordon W. Frost, S. Florida
Thomas J. Stein, Great Lakes

Class of 1992
David Jussely, Grace
Ralph Paden, TN Valley
J. Allen Wright, N. Georgia

Advisory Member: Paul Gilchrist, Stated Clerk

APPENDICES

B. To Be Elected:

Class of 1996
Three Members (Teaching or Ruling Elders or Deacons)
All 3 members of Class of 1992 are eligible for re-election.

C. Nominations:

Class of 1996
RE J. Allen Wright, No. Georgia
TE Bruce B. Howes, Heritage
RE Ralph S. Paden, TN Valley

D. Biographical Sketches:

TE Bruce B. Howes: Heritage. Pastor of Heritage PCA of Newcastle, DE. Gifts in administration, close attention to details while keeping big picture in focus. Served as Presbytery Stated Clerk for 5 years. Has served as informal consultant to area pastors seeking advice on insurance and retirement questions. Has served on Com. of Comm. for IAR several times. Has served on various Presbytery committees.

RE Ralph S. Paden: Tennessee Valley. Health care consultant. Former Vice-President in Group, Life, and Health Department, Provident Life and Accident Insurance Company. Served as Chairman of the Insurance Committee of IAR for the past 2 years.

RE J. Allen Wright: North Georgia. Investment Consultant. Vice-President, Kidder, Peabody, and Company. Currently serving as Chairman of the Investment Committee of IAR. Specializes in asset-management consulting.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE INVESTOR'S FUND FOR BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT

A: Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders

Taylor McGown, C. Carolina

Ruling Elders

Class of 1995

Ben Coombs, Pacific

Class of 1994

Charles E. Simpson, C. Georgia
Irv Wicker, SE Alabama

Class of 1993

Manuel Salabarría, S. Florida

Neil Adams, Pacific

Class of 1992

E. Lee Trinkle III, Evangel

Conley Moffett, Potomac

B. To Be Elected:

Class of 1996
Two Members (Teaching or Ruling Elders)

C. Nominations:

Class of 1996
RE Henry Darden, SW Florida
RE Mark Thompson, Louisiana

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

D. Biographical Sketches:

- RE Henry R. Darden: Southwest Florida. Financial and income tax consultant for Brandon Accounting Consultants. Very active participant in Session and Presbytery.
- RE Mark Thompson: Louisiana. Bank Vice-President, Bank of Zachary. Great wisdom in the area of financial markets and investments. Gift of administration as well and experience in investments. Serves as manager of the bank's employee annuity fund.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA FOUNDATION

A. Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders

Loren V. Watson, Tn Valley

Randy H. Kimbrough, Grace

Thomas G. Kay, Jr., Covenant

Ruling Elders

Class of 1995
John N. Albritton, SE Alabama
Jean Owens, SW Florida

Class of 1994
David B. Sincere, S. Florida

Class of 1993
Robert C. Eberst, S. Florida

Class of 1992
Robert C. ("Neal") Ham, C. Georgia

Advisory Member
Paul R. Gilchrist, Stated Clerk

B. To Be Elected:

Class of 1996
Two Members (Teaching or Ruling Elders or Deacons)
At least two of the total membership are to be TEs.

C. Nominations:

Class of 1996
RE Wallace M. Campbell, Northeast RE Harry S. Morris, Louisiana

D. Biographical Sketches:

- RE Wallace M. Campbell: Northeast. Banker, retired Vice-Chairman, Board of Directors, Northeast Savings, Schenectady, NY. Has served as Chairman of the Board of Union College, Ellis Hospital, Albany Bible Institute, YMCA, Schenectady Chamber of Commerce, and Salvation Army. Proven financial background of 33 years. Knowledge in mortgages, investments, saving program, and IRA accounts. Familiar with handling investments for individuals and familiar with inheritance taxes at state and federal level. Serves as Treasurer of his Presbytery.

APPENDICES

RE Harry S. Morris: Louisiana. President, Bank of Zachary. 20 years of experience in banking. Great degree of wise stewardship. Brings a biblical perspective of economics and money.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF RIDGE HAVEN

A. Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

Robert F. Brunson, Grace

Richard O. Smith, N. Georgia

J. Allen Herrington, E. Carolina

Malcolm M. Griffith, Gulf Coast

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1996

C. Gene Parks, Sr., C. Carolina

Class of 1995

Howard Hokrein, C. Georgia

Class of 1994

Newton Brooks, Gulf Coast
Don L. Lloyd, W. Carolina

Class of 1993

Lindsey Tippins, N. Georgia

Class of 1992

Royce C. Waites, Palmetto

Advisory Member
Charles H. Dunahoo, Coordinator
Christian Education and Publications

B. To Be Elected:

Class of 1997
Two Members (Teaching or Ruling Elders)
TE Griffith is eligible for re-election.

C. Nominations:

Class of 1997
TE John Love, Calvary
TE Robert Cameron, New Jersey

D. Biographical Sketches:

TE Robert Cameron: New Jersey. Pastor of Mount Carmel PCA of Somerset, NJ. Promotes Ridge Haven in Presbytery. Has vacationed at Ridge Haven. Is excited about the conference program. Has done conference speaking at camps. Experience in trucking business for 15 years.

TE John D. Love: Calvary. Has devoted his life work to camps and retreats. Could make a valid contribution to the work of Ridge Haven. D. Min. program on camp conference and retreat programs in the life and ministry of the church.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY THEOLOGICAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE

A: Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

D. Clair Davis, Philadelphia

Robert Reymond, S. Florida

Douglas F. Kelly, MS Valley

R. Laird Harris, Heritage

Ruling Elders:

Class of 1994

Roy Gamble, SE Alabama

Class of 1993

Bruce Kitchens, C. Georgia

Class of 1992

Alternates

David Miner, New Jersey

B. To Be Elected:

ONE TE

Class of 1995

ONE RE

ONE TE

Alternates

ONE RE

C. Nominations:

TE R. Laird Harris, Heritage

Class of 1995

RE Roger D. Schultz, Westminster

TE Wayne Herring, Covenant

Alternates

RE David Miner, New Jersey

D. Biographical Sketches:

TE R. Laird Harris: Heritage. Emeritus Professor of Old Testament, Covenant Theological Seminary. Very active in Presbytery causes and in teaching in theological seminaries in the USA and overseas. A moderating voice on the theological spectrum. Served as Moderator of the GA in 1982 and on other committees of GA and Presbytery.

TE Wayne Herring: Covenant. Gifted pastor and teacher. Theologically astute in both practical and theoretical problems. Balanced view of reformed theology coupled with knowledge of the issues pastors face. Strong desire to preserve our doctrinal heritage. Has served on several committees of Presbytery.

RE David Miner: New Jersey. Carpenter. Moderator of Presbytery. Has served as professor in systematic theology at Columbia School of Biblical Education. Very practical. Interest in theology, education, and philosophy.

RE Roger D. Schultz: Westminster. Professor at Virginia Intermont College, Bristol area. An excellent working knowledge of constitutional standards of our church. Knowledge of Scriptures is superb. Ph.D. in American Religious History, focused on the theological development in the Presbyterian church.

APPENDICES

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS

A: Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

Ruling Elders:

Craig Childs, Evangel	Class of 1995	Daniel Domin, S. Florida
Roland Barnes, C. Georgia	Class of 1994	Richard Springer, New Jersey
E. Crowell Cooley, N. Illinois	Class of 1993	David C. Lachman, Philadelphia
Rod S. Mays, Calvary	Class of 1992	Granville Dutton, North Texas
Danny Levi, Grace	Alternates	S. A. Miller, Westminster

B. To Be Elected:

ONE TE	Class of 1996	ONE RE
ONE TE	Alternates	ONE RE

C. Nominations:

TE Paul Zetterholm, MS Valley	Class of 1996	RE S. A. Miller, Westminster
TE Frank J. Smith, Northeast	Alternates	RE Samuel J. Duncan, Grace

D. Biographical Sketches:

RE Samuel J. Duncan: Grace. Attorney in law firm in Hattiesburg, MS. Has special interest and expertise in the *BCO*. Frequently called upon for advice on constitutional procedures. Fair minded, basing opinions on biblical principles and constitutional grounds.

RE S. A. Miller: Westminster. Retired Organic Chemist. Served on various Presbytery committees. Served as Moderator of Westminster Presbytery.

TE Frank J. Smith: Northeast. Pastor of Affirmation PCA. Vast knowledge of the PCA. Lawyer-like mind. Has taught at college and seminary level.

TE Paul Zetterholm: Mississippi Valley. Pastor of Tchula PCA. Data base analyst for the State of Mississippi. Has served on numerous Presbytery committees. Was Chairman of Review and Control 87-88. Great interest in constitutional matters.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE ON INTERCHURCH RELATIONS

A: Present Personnel:

Teaching Elders:

Ruling Elders:

Henry L. Smith, SE Alabama	Class of 1994	George H. Gulley, Jr., Grace
Robert Vasholz, Missouri	Class of 1993	Jack Merry, Northeast
K. Eric Perrin, Palmetto	Class of 1992	Michael L. Frey, Philadelphia
Tim Fortner, Covenant	Alternates	Wilson Barbee, C. Carolina
	Ex-Officio	
	Paul R. Gilchrist, TN Valley, Stated Clerk	
	Carl Wilhelm, North Georgia, MTW	

B. To Be Elected:

ONE TE	Class of 1995	ONE RE
ONE TE	Alternates	ONE RE

Both members of Class of 1992 are eligible for re-election.

C. Nominations:

TE Tim Fortner, Covenant	Class of 1995	RE Wilson Barbee, C. Carolina
TE Don Codling, E. Canada	Alternates	RE David Wyatt, So. Florida

D. Biographical Sketches:

RE Wilson Barbee: Central Carolina. Real Estate Agent. Local city council for 10 years. Served on the board of realtors. Stanley Medical Center, Stanley County Board of Adjustment, Economic Development Board. Has served on GA AC 84-88. Has faithfully participated as an Alternate on Interchurch Relations Committee.

TE Don Codling: Eastern Canada. Pastor of Bedford PCA of Bedford, Nova Scotia. Through studies in the Netherlands understands the Dutch denominations. Has a keen interest in developing cordial relations between Reformed denominations in the US and Canada. Has actively served on GA Com. of Comm. and served as principal for 2 years on Standing Judicial Commission. He serves as Stated Clerk of Eastern Canada Presbytery as well as on other committees of the Presbytery, including Ministerial and Fraternal Relations Committee.

APPENDICES

TE Tim Fortner: Covenant. Pastor of Lawndale PCA of Tupelo, MS. Prior service on Interchurch Relations Committee 73-77. Chairman 74-77. Currently serves as Alternate. Has represented the PCA in the Interim Council of NAPARC 74-77. Served on joint subcommittee of PCA/OPC Interchurch Relations to work out final draft of "Guiding Principles for Ecumenical Relations."

RE David S. Wyatt: South Florida. Self-employed, committed ruling elder in Coral Ridge PCA. Has served on Presbytery committees of MNA and MTW. Would greatly assist the IRC.

STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION

A. Present Personnel:

Teaching Elder

Michael D. Bolus, C. Georgia
John Sartelle, Covenant
Paul Kooistra, Warrior

Dewey Roberts, Gulf Coast
LeRoy Ferguson III, Palmetto
Robert Stuart, Southwest

Robert M. Ferguson, Pacific
Dominic A. Aquila, S. Florida
John S. Ragland, South Texas

David W. Hall, TN Valley
John Montgomery, S. Florida
Morton H. Smith, W. Carolina

Ruling Elder

Class of 1995

Mark Belz, Missouri
W. Jack Williamson, SE Alabama
Gerald Sovereign, Gulf Coast

Class of 1994

Harrison Brown, Susq. Valley
Frank Horton, MS Valley
John B. White, Jr., N. Georgia

Class of 1993

John E. Spencer, Evangel
John W. Lane, New Jersey
William N. Brown, North Texas

Class of 1992

Roy E. Allen, Great Lakes
Stanley D. Wells, Southwest
Eugene Friedline, James River

B. To Be Elected:

THREE TEs

Class of 1996

THREE REs

All members of Class of 1992 are eligible for re-election.

C. Nominations:

TE David W. Hall, TN Valley
TE Brent Bradley, Westminster
TE T. David Gordon, Northeast

Class of 1996

RE Eugene Friedline, James River
RE Dale Peacock, Louisiana
RE George Caler, Ascension

D. Biographical Sketches:

TE Brent Bradley: Westminster. Pastor of Westminster PCA of Blountville, TN. Has served on several judicial commissions of GA. Well versed in the constitutional standard. Has served on several committees of Presbytery and as Moderator of Westminster Presbytery.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- RE George Caler: Ascension. Accountant. Eager to apply the rules of discipline described by *BCO*. Has served on GA Nominating Committee and on judicial commissions of Presbytery. Has served on several committees of his Presbytery.
- RE Eugene Friedline: James River. Retired after 30 years with Reynolds Metals Company. Serves as Stated Clerk of James River Presbytery. Has 3 years' experience on the SJC of GA.
- TE T. David Cordon: Northeast. Pastor of Christ PCA of Nashua, NH. Associate Professor, Gordon Conwell Seminary. Teaches courses on Presbyterian polity. Has served as Chairman of Presbytery Commission on Judicial Business and as Moderator of Presbytery. Has served on Com. of Comm. for GA.
- TE David W. Hall: Tennessee Valley. Pastor of Covenant PCA of Oak Ridge, TN. Has served on SJC of GA for 3 years. Involved with developing the SJC Manual. Has served on Review of Presbytery Records Committee and on several Com. of Comm. at GA. Active participant in Presbytery committees. Brings experience and maturity to the commission.
- RE M. Dale Peacock: Louisiana. Attorney. Served on SJC 89-91. Served as Moderator of Louisiana Presbytery. Brings keen attention to detail, sharp understanding of PCA procedures. Has served on Com. of Comm. for GA.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

I. Minutes of the Nominating Committee:

Chairman TE Neil Gilmour opened with prayer at 5:40 p.m. on June 15, 1992, in Parlor B of the Exhibit Hall at the Civic Center, Roanoke, VA.

Committee members present were:

Presbytery

Ascension
Calvary
Central Carolina
Central Florida
Gulf Coast
Illiana
Louisiana
New Jersey
North Georgia
Northeast
No. Illinois
Pacific
Philadelphia
Potomac
South Texas
SE Alabama

Commissioners

TE Carl Bogue
RE Johnny Armstrong
TE Bob Wilcox
TE Neil Gilmour, Chairman
RE Julian Gibson
TE Daniel Dermeyer
RE Ed Hakenberg
TE Allan Story, Secretary
RE Earl Witmer
TE William Henderson
TE Bruce Stanek
RE Robert Taylor
RE John Hurley III
TE Herb Ruby, III
TE Terry Traylor
RE Meade Guy

APPENDICES

Southern Florida
SW Florida
Susquehanna Valley
Warrior
Westminster

RE Blair Littlejohn
TE Russell Toms
RE Willard Lutz
TE Billy Joseph
TE Carl Howell

II. Changes to original report, Committee for CE&P:

TE P. Legree Finch, South Texas, is moved from nominee as Alternate TE to TE Nominee for Class of 1993 because of resignation of TE David E. Bowen, Eastern Carolina Presbytery, from the Class of 1993.

TE L. Byron Snapp is nominated as Alternate TE.

Biographical Sketch:

TE L. Byron Snapp: Westminster. Administrator of Covenant Christian School and Assistant Pastor at Covenant PCA, Cedar Bluff, VA, since 1984. Several years pastoral experience before that. Active at General Assembly and in Presbytery. Strong commitment to Christian education and doctrinal integrity. Regularly does book reviews and writes a newspaper column addressing current issues from a Biblical perspective.

III. Nominations from the Floor

The following nominations were found in order:

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

In opposition to TE T. M. Duncan, TE Alternate:

TE John Yenchko, Philadelphia
TE Richard C. Trucks, Evangel

Biographical Sketches for Nominees from the Floor:

TE Richard C. Trucks: Evangel. Pastor of Third PCA, Birmingham, AL, for 14 years. Professor at Birmingham Theological Seminary. Has served on GA Nominating Co. and Presbytery Nominating Committee and been chairman of Presbytery MTW and Ministerial Candidate Committee.

TE John Yenchko: Philadelphia. Pastor of New Life PCA, Glenside, PA, mother church of New Life movement. Gifted Administrator.

MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA

In opposition to TE David Clelland, TE Alternate:

TE Philip Douglass, Missouri

Biographical Sketch for Nominees from the Floor:

TE Philip Douglass: Missouri. 6 PCA churches. Has served as Presbytery MNA chairman. Currently serving on Missouri MNA. Teaches church planting and renewal at CTS.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MISSION TO THE WORLD

In opposition to TE James A. Jones, Class of 1996:
TE Dominic Aquila, Southern Florida
TE Sanders Willson, Tennessee Valley

Biographical Sketches for Nominees from the Floor:

TE Dominic Aquila: Southern Florida, Pastor of Kendall PCA, Miami, FL. Has served on the Board of CC 9 years. Served on Presbytery Mission Committees. Has travelled to many countries to visit and encourage missionaries. Is instrumental in developing a mission plan for Miami and Latin America.

TE Sanders Willson: Tennessee Valley. Has served capably as an alternate on MTW Committee. Senior Pastor of Lookout Mountain PCA. Has a keen interest in missions. The church he serves is very involved in and supportive of missions.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT COLLEGE

In opposition to TE Bill Hawk, Class of 1996:
RE Richard Hostetter, Tennessee Valley

In opposition to RE Charles Bryant, Class of 1996:
RE Kenneth Avis, Covenant

Biographical sketches for Nominees from the floor:

RE Kenneth Avis: Covenant. Emeritus Professor of Pharmaceutics at Memphis State University. Just completed 4 years term as a valued trustee and chairman of Trustees Affairs Committee and Executive Committee. Strong commitment to Christian Education. Was instrumental in establishing Evangelical Christian School in Memphis and chaired its' Board for 10 years. On Covenant College Board, is in the midst of steering his committee through a trustee assessment and is needed.

RE Richard Hostetter: Tennessee Valley. Valued trustee. Just completed first term. Member of Board's Executive Committee and Academic Affairs Committee. On both Committees his advice is often sought and greatly esteemed. On boards of Ligonier Ministries and the McClellan Foundation. President and General Counsel of an industrial development and management firm in Chattanooga.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

In opposition to TE Paul Alexander, Class of 1996:
RE Lanny Moore, Southwest Florida.

[STATED CLERK'S NOTE: Mr. Alexander requested i a written note that his name be removed. Consequently, Mr. Moore was elected under the omnibus motion.]

APPENDICES

Biographical Sketch for Nominee from the floor:

RE Lanny Moore: Southwest Florida. Served Board in past with great personal sacrifice. Chairman for 12 years. Sought for participation on Development Committee. On Session of Cape Coral Presbyterian Church. He and his wife are active with Bethany in Southwest Florida and have strong Christian witness through their business.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF RIDGE HAVEN

In opposition to TE John Love, Class of 1997:
TE Malcolm Griffith, Gulf Coast.

In opposition to TE Robert Cameron, Class of 1997:
TE F. Rhett Sanders, Western Carolina

Biographical Sketches for Nominees from the floor:

TE Malcolm Griffith: Gulf Coast. Committed to the ministry of Ridge Haven. Formerly served on the Board of Trustees of Ridge Haven during critical development. Was responsible to organize many of the conferences held at Ridge Haven. For years organized Pensacola Theological Institute and Pensacola Youth Institute, and so has great experience in setting up camps and conferences.

TE F. Rhett Sanders: Western Carolina. Ran his own Christian Camp for 16 years. Served on original Ridge Haven Committee and then on Board as Secretary. Served as Program Director of Ridge Haven. Chaired Christian Education Committee of Calvary Presbytery. Served on faculty of Covenant Bible College. Pastors a PCA church at nearby Brevard. Speaks frequently at Ridge Haven.

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS

In opposition to TE Paul Zetterholm, Class of 1996:
TE Ron E. Steel, Potomac

In opposition to TE Frank J. Smith, Alternate:
TE Bryan Chapell, Illiana
TE Frederic Mau, Warrior

Biographical Sketches for Nominees from the floor:

TE Ron E. Steel: Potomac. Associate Pastor for 8 years. Moderator of Evangel Presbytery. Involved several years in Theological Examining Committee of Presbytery. Taught Systematic Theology at Birmingham Theological Seminary for 8 years. Pastor of Chapelgate PCA in Marriottsville, MD for two and half years. Knowledgeable in the constitution of the church.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TE Bryan Chapell: Illiana. Dean at Covenant Seminary. Author. Very much a leader in his presbytery and knowledgeable of the constitution of the church. Experienced pastor.

TE Frederic Mau: Warrior. Former moderator of Warrior Presbytery. Committee of Commissioners for Administration, B & O, MNA, Ridge Haven. Presbytery MNA Committee, MTW Committee. Warrior Presbytery's nominee to this committee this year. Academic degrees from Covenant College (BA), Westminster Theological Seminary California (M.Div.), and Reformed Theological Seminary (D.Min.).

COMMITTEE ON INTERCHURCH RELATIONS

In opposition to TE Don Codling, Alternate:
TE Eric Perrin, Palmetto

Biographical Sketch for Nominee from the floor:

TE Eric Perrin: Palmetto. Pastor, Cornerstone PCA, Columbia, S.C. Charter member of Ascension Presbytery. Active in interchurch ministries including city-wide evangelism, Chairman of Board of Chesapeake Seminary and NAPARC representative. Chaired sub-committee under WEF and will represent PCA at WEF General Assembly in Manila. Concluding 1 term on Interchurch Relations Committee.

STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION

In opposition to TE Brant Bradley, Class of 1996:
TE Roy Taylor, Grace
TE Lawrence Lunceford, Heartland

In opposition to TE T. David Gordon, Class of 1996:
TE John Montgomery, Central Florida

In opposition to RE Dale Peacock, Class of 1996:
RE John Barnes, Calvary

In opposition to RE George Caler, Class of 1996:
RE Ed Roberson, Western Carolina

Biographical Sketches for Nominees from the floor:

RE John Barnes: Calvary. Session, Westminster Church, Rock Hill, S.C. for 30 plus years. A founding father of PCA who served on organizing committee which recommended original *BCO*. Chaired Judicial Business Committee. Faithful to church and presbytery. Familiar with intentions of founders in language of *BCO*.

APPENDICES

- TE Lawrence Lunceford: Heartland. Pastor of Ascension Presbyterian Church of Kansas City, MO. Stated Clerk of Heartland Presbytery. Heartland Presbytery has no representatives on General Assembly committees.
- TE John Montgomery: Central Florida. Served as Senior Pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Atlanta for 15 years and served as a wise Presbyter. Chairman of Presbytery MNA Committee. Served on numerous commissions of Presbytery dealing with difficult issues. Served 1 year on Standing Judicial Committee. Currently organizing pastor of River Oaks Presbyterian Church in Orlando area.
- RE Ed Robeson: Western Carolina. Retired Executive Director of Ridge Haven during initial years of development and growth. On Session of Brevard Church. Active in Presbytery, serving on various committees. Known as a wise, level-headed and fair senior elder in PCA.
- TE L. Roy Taylor: Grace. PCA minister since PCA's inception in 1973. Currently Senior Pastor of First PCA, Hattisburg, MS. Former RTS faculty. Former moderator of Grace Presbytery and Chairman of Ministers and Candidates Committee in Evangel Presbytery. Grace Presbytery Chairman of Examination Committee. Chaired Judicial/Administration Committee in both Evangel and Grace Presbyteries. Experienced in judicial procedures and *BCO*.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

APPENDIX M

REPORT OF THE PCA FOUNDATION, INC. TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

Fathers and Brothers:

I am very pleased to be able to report to you another year of solid growth for the PCA Foundation.

In 1991 the Foundation received new gifts totaling \$1,778,387 from God's people. Since J&R that amount is \$19,680,242.

Distributions in 1991 were \$2,283,902. Since J&R we have distributed \$12,354,544. (See attachments 1 & 2)

During this period, RE Doug Haskew and his wife, Neal, completed their first full year, serving as part-time Planned Giving Representatives in Alabama. They have primarily worked in Birmingham, where Doug is a ruling elder at Briarwood Presbyterian Church.

We are still seeking two other couples to serve in the same part-time capacity. One couple for the Maryland/Delaware/Pennsylvania/Virginia area and another for Florida.

These are part-time positions and can afford a wonderful ministry opportunity to retired couples.

Two very key board members come to the end of their term of service with this General Assembly.

RE Robert C. "Neal" Ham, Central Georgia Presbytery and TE Thomas G. Kay, Jr., Covenant Presbytery. I well remember that during their very first board meeting they were elected to serve as Vice Chairman and Secretary respectively! During their 4 years of outstanding service both have served on the Finance Committee and the Executive Committee. For the last two years, Neal served as Chairman of the Board and Tom chaired the Finance Committee. These two men have made an outstanding contribution to the ministry of the Foundation and they will be greatly missed.

Our major problem continues to be effectively reaching down to the "grass roots" in our local churches to those individuals who need to understand and utilize the ministry of our Foundation. In a denomination of our size promotion through education is vital.

APPENDICES

The *MESSENGER* continues to be our most effective tool, but its low number of subscriptions hurts this effort.

Our recommendations to the General Assembly are as follows:

1. The two regular vacancies on the board be filled with quality men gifted to lead our ministry.
2. Approval of our Proposed 1993 Budget.
3. Each local church be encouraged to consider the various ways the Foundation can serve them. Seminars and literature are available to be used to better inform the people regarding more effective management of God's assets.
4. Each church be encouraged to take full advantage of the Memorial Gift Program offered by the Foundation.
5. The Amendment to the Articles of Incorporation of the Presbyterian Church in America Foundation, Inc. be approved as submitted. (See attachment 3)
6. The Amended and Restated Bylaws of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc. be approved as submitted. (See attachment 4)
7. The Corporate Bylaws of Presbyterian Church in America (A Corporation) be amended as per Article IX. The amendment being made to Article VI, Section 6. as follows:

The Board of Trustees of the Presbyterian Church in America Foundation, Inc. shall be comprised of four classes of three men each who may be Teaching Elders or Ruling Elders of the Presbyterian Church in America. At least one-fourth of the Directors shall be Teaching Elders and at least one-half of the Directors shall be Ruling Elders.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John W. S. Hudson
Director
PCA Foundation, Inc.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ATTACHMENT 1

PLANNED GIVING REPORT (January 1, 1991 through December 31, 1991)

New Gifts "IN"		\$1,778,387
NOTE: \$165,437 generated by Doug Haskew		
Total Distributions Made		\$2,283,903
Operating Expenses		\$ 320,138
(18% of new gifts)		
Distributions Made:		
Total C & A	\$ 915,948	(40%)
PCA Churches	<u>619,069</u>	(27%)
TOTAL PCA	\$1,535,017	(67%)
Other Christian	<u>\$ 748,886</u>	(33%)
TOTAL 1991	\$2,283,903	

ATTACHMENT 2

PLANNED GIVING REPORT (Pre J & R through December 1991)

New Gifts "IN"		\$19,775,228
NOTE: \$165,437 generated by Doug Haskew		
Total Distributions Made		\$12,449,530
Operating Expenses		\$ 1,615,079
Distributions Made:		
Total C & A	\$ 7,321,483	
PCA Churches	<u>2,514,307</u>	
TOTAL PCA	\$ 9,835,790	
Other Christian	<u>\$ 2,613,740</u>	
TOTAL Pre J&R-Dec.'91	\$12,449,530	

APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 3

THIS AMENDMENT TO THE ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF
THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA FOUNDATION, INC.
WAS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AT THEIR
AUGUST 24 MEETING.

AMENDMENT

XI

No director shall have any personal liability to the Corporation for monetary damages for breach of duty of care or other duty as a director, by reason of any act or omission occurring on or subsequent to the date when this provision becomes effective, except that this provision shall not eliminate or limit the liability of a director for (a) any appropriation, in violation of his duties, of any business opportunity of the Corporation; (b) acts or omissions which involve intentional misconduct or a knowing violation of law; (c) the types of liability set forth in Sections 14-3-860 through 14-3-864 of the Georgia Nonprofit Corporation Code; or (d) any transaction from which the director received an improper personal benefit.

ATTACHMENT 4

AMENDED AND RESTATED BYLAWS OF
THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA FOUNDATION, INC.

The attached Amended and Restated Bylaws were reviewed and approved by the full Board of the Presbyterian Church in America Foundation, Inc. via a Resolution by Written Consent with one exception. RE Robert C. Eberst registered his negative vote regarding the last sentence in Article IV, Section 4.11.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

AMENDED AND RESTATED

BYLAWS

OF

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA FOUNDATION, INC.

ARTICLE I. OFFICES

Section 1.01 Registered Office and Agent. The address of the registered office of the corporation is Suite 700, 1275 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia 30309, and the name of the registered agent at this address is Terrill A. Parker.

Section 1.02 Other Offices. The corporation may have offices at such place or places within or without the State of Georgia as the Board of Directors (the "Board") may from time to time appoint or as the business of the corporation may require or make desirable.

ARTICLE II. DIRECTORS

Section 2.01 Powers. The property and business of the corporation shall be managed by the Board. All corporate powers shall be exercised by or under the authority of the Board. In addition to the powers and authority expressly conferred on it by these Amended and Restated Bylaws, the Board may exercise all such powers of the corporation and do all such lawful acts and things as are not prohibited by law, by the Articles of Incorporation, or by these Amended and Restated Bylaws.

Section 2.02 Number; Qualifications. The Board shall consist of that number of natural persons as determined from time to time by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc. (the "General Assembly"). Directors need not be residents of the State of Georgia. Each member of the Board must be a Teaching Elder or Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc. At least one-fourth of the Directors shall be Teaching Elders, and at least one-half of the Directors shall be Ruling Elders.

Section 2.03 Election and Term. The Board shall be divided into four Classes, as nearly equal in number as possible, with respect to the times for which they shall severally hold office. At each annual meeting of the General Assembly, the successors to the Class of Directors whose terms shall expire at that time shall be elected to hold office until the fourth (4th) succeeding annual meeting of the General Assembly after their election, so that the term of office of one Class of Directors shall expire in each year. Each Director elected shall hold office until his successor shall be elected and shall qualify, or until his earlier resignation, death or removal. Directors

APPENDICES

shall be eligible for reelection without limitation on the number of terms served, except that no Director who has served a full term of four (4) years shall be eligible for reelection to the Board until one (1) year after his term expires. The President of the corporation shall serve as an advisory, nonvoting member of the Board, and shall serve as a member of the Board at the pleasure of the Board. Election of Directors for positions for which terms have expired or will expire (including positions for which vacancies were filled) shall occur by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly for each position to be filled, in accordance with the Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc. Nominations for election to the Board shall be presented to the General Assembly by the nominating committee of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc.

Section 2.04 No Compensation. The Directors shall serve without compensation for their service to the corporation in their capacities as Directors, but Directors shall be reimbursed for all reasonable costs of attending the meetings of the Board.

Section 2.05 Regular Meetings. Regular meetings of the Board shall be held without notice at such times as the Board shall from time to time designate, and an annual meeting of the Board shall be held without notice within three (3) months after the close of the corporation's yearly accounting period.

Section 2.06 Special Meetings. Special meetings may be held if called pursuant to Section 2.08 herein with at least ten (10) days' notice by telephone, personal delivery or first class mail, of the date, time and place of the meeting to each Director.

Section 2.07 Calling Meetings. Special meetings of the Board may be called by the Chairman of the Board (the "Chairman"), by any three (3) Directors, or by the General Assembly.

Section 2.08 Place of Meetings. All meetings may be held at the principal office of the corporation, or at any place within or without the State of Georgia as determined by the Board or the General Assembly by resolution as designated in the notice of any meeting.

Section 2.09 Waiver of Notice. Notice of a meeting of the Board need not be given in any event to any Director who signs and delivers to the corporation a waiver of notice either before or after the meeting. Attendance or participation of a Director at a meeting shall constitute a waiver of notice of such meeting and waiver of any and all objections to the place of the meeting, the time of the meeting, or the manner in which it has been called or convened, unless the Director states, at the beginning of the meeting, or promptly upon his arrival, any such objection or objections to the transaction of business.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Section 2.10 Contents of Notice. The business to be transacted at, and the purpose of, any regular or special meeting of the Board need not be specified in the notice or waiver of notice of such meeting.

Section 2.11 Quorum. At all meetings of the Board, the presence of a majority of the Directors shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. In the absence of a quorum, a majority of the Directors present at any meeting may adjourn the meeting from time to time until a quorum is obtained.

Section 2.12 Voting. The affirmative vote of a majority of the Directors present at any meeting at which there is a quorum present when a vote is taken shall be the act of the Board, except as may be otherwise specifically provided by law, by the Articles of Incorporation, or by these Amended and Restated Bylaws. A Director who is present at a meeting of the Board shall be presumed to have concurred in any action taken at the meeting, unless (a) he objects at the beginning of the meeting, or promptly upon his arrival, to the holding of the meeting or the transacting of business at the meeting, (b) his dissent or abstention to such action shall be entered in the minutes of the meeting or (c) he shall submit his written dissent or abstention to the person acting as the presiding officer of the meeting before the adjournment of the meeting, or shall forward such dissent by registered or certified mail to the Secretary of the corporation within twenty-four (24) hours after adjournment of the meeting. Such right to dissent shall not apply to a Director who, being present at the meeting, voted in favor of the action taken.

Section 2.13 Conduct of Meetings. The Chairman, or in his absence the Vice Chairman of the Board (the "Vice Chairman"), if any, elected by the Board, shall preside at meetings of the Board. The Secretary of the corporation, or in the Secretary's absence any person appointed by the presiding officer, shall act as Secretary for meetings of the Board.

Section 2.14 Telephone Participation. Directors may participate in meetings of the Board through use of conference telephone or similar communications equipment, so long as all Directors participating in the meeting can hear one another. Such participation shall constitute personal presence at the meeting, and consequently shall be counted toward the required quorum and in any vote.

Section 2.15 Written Consent. Any action required or permitted to be taken at any meeting of the Board or of any committee thereof may be taken without a meeting if a written consent, setting forth the action so taken, is signed by at least a majority of the Board, and not less than that number of members of the Board or of such committee otherwise required to vote in favor of such action to approve such action at such meeting. Such written consent shall be filed with the minutes of the proceedings of the Board or committee.

APPENDICES

Section 2.16 Adjournment. A majority of the Directors present, whether or not a quorum exists, may adjourn any meeting of the Board to another time and place. Notice of any such adjourned meeting shall be given to the Directors who were not present at the time of the adjournment and, unless the time and place of the adjourned meeting are announced at the time of the adjournment, to the other Directors, with at least two (2) days' notice by telephone or personal delivery, or five (5) days' notice by first class mail, of the time and place of the meeting.

Section 2.17 Removal. The General Assembly may declare the position of a Director vacant, and may remove such Director, with or without cause, by the vote of a majority of the members of the General Assembly. Prior to such removal, the Board may declare the position of a Director suspended, and may suspend such Director for cause, by a vote of two-thirds of those Directors present at a meeting of the Board called for such purpose, if, in the judgment of the Board, the Director's past or present behavior is or was unbecoming, reflects or reflected poorly on the Christian witness of the corporation and the Presbyterian Church of America, Inc., or otherwise in any manner appears or appeared to evidence impropriety or a lack of moral judgment. Such suspension shall expire and terminate upon the vote of the General Assembly not to remove such Director or upon the vote, the Directors to terminate the suspension. Election or appointment of a Director shall not of itself create any contract rights.

Section 2.18 Resignation. Any Director may resign at any time by giving written notice to the Board, the Chairman, or the Secretary. The resignation shall be effective on receipt, unless the notice specifies a later time for the effective date of such resignation. If the resignation is effective at a future time, a successor may be elected before that time to take office when the resignation becomes effective.

Section 2.19 Vacancies. A vacancy on the Board shall exist on the death, resignation or removal of any Director; whenever the number of Directors authorized is increased; and on failure of the General Assembly to elect the full number of Directors authorized. Such vacancies shall be filled for the remainder of the terms by a majority vote at the next subsequent meeting of the General Assembly.

ARTICLE III. COMMITTEES

Section 3.01 Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman and the Secretary, and shall be authorized to exercise all powers and authority of the Board unless specified otherwise from time to time by the Board, subject to ratification thereafter by the Board. The Board's failure to ratify any action of the Executive Committee shall render such action void. Ratification shall not, however, be required as to any actions previously and specifically delegated by the Board to the Executive Committee. Minutes of each meeting of the Executive Committee shall be taken describing all actions approved thereby, for purposes of ratification thereafter by the full Board. The Executive Committee shall act by majority

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

vote and shall have a quorum of one-half of the member Directors. The Board may designate one or more Directors as alternative members of the Executive Committee, who may act in the place of any absent member or members at any meeting of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall be governed by those rules herein governing the Board that concern regular meetings, special meetings, calling meetings, waiver of notice, contents of notice, telephone participation, written consent and adjournment.

Section 3.02 Other Committees. Other Committees may be established by the Board from time to time; shall consist of that number of Directors provided by the Board; and shall be authorized to exercise the authority of the Board to the extent provided in the resolution creating any such committee. Any such committee shall act by majority vote and shall have a quorum of one-half of the member Directors.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

Section 4.01 Election. The Board at its annual meeting immediately preceding the annual meeting of the General Assembly shall elect a Chairman, a President and a Secretary, and may elect a Vice Chairman, a Treasurer and one or more Vice Presidents.

Section 4.02 Other Officers. The Board at any time and from time to time may elect such other Officers as it shall deem necessary, who shall hold their offices for such terms as shall be determined by the Board and shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as shall be determined from time to time by the Board.

Section 4.03 Multiple Offices. The same individual may simultaneously hold more than one office in the corporation.

Section 4.04 Compensation. The salary of the President of the corporation shall be recommended by the Board to the General Assembly for approval. No other Officer shall receive compensation for his services as an Officer.

Section 4.05 Term. Each Officer of the corporation, except for the President, shall hold office for a term of one year and until his successor is chosen or until his earlier resignation, death or removal. The President of the corporation shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board of Directors. No Officer other than the President may serve in the same office for more than two (2) consecutive years.

Section 4.06 Chairman. The Chairman shall preside at all meetings of the members of the Board; except for the Executive Committee, shall appoint the members of all committees and be an ex officio member of all committees; shall sign such papers as may be required by his office or as may be directed by the Board; shall make such reports and recommendations to the Board of the corporation at any regular or special

APPENDICES

meetings concerning the work and affairs of the corporation as in his judgment may be necessary for their information and guidance; may require such reports from the President, Secretary and Treasurer as in his judgment are necessary; and shall perform such other duties as may be incidental to the office.

Section 4.07 Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in the event of the absence, resignation, refusal to act or inability to act of the Chairman.

Section 4.08 President. The President shall manage the affairs and direct the work and employees of the corporation, subject to and in accordance with the directions of the Board and the Chairman; shall prepare annual budgets and additional budgets as needed for the approval of the Board; shall be authorized to incur expenses in accordance with the approved budget, or as directed by the Board; shall attend all meetings of the Board unless otherwise directed by the Board; shall be an ex officio member of all committees; shall also from time to time make reports of the work and affairs of the corporation to the Chairman and the Board at their annual and other meetings; and shall perform such other duties as may be incidental to the office.

Section 4.09 Vice Presidents. The Vice Presidents, in the order named by the Board, shall perform the duties of the President in event of the absence, resignation, refusal to act or inability to act of the President.

Section 4.10 Secretary. The Secretary shall issue in writing all notices of meetings; shall notify individuals elected to office and to the Board; shall keep complete records and minutes of meetings of the Board; shall furnish the Board with a list of officers, members of the Board, and members of committees whose terms shall expire at the next annual meeting; shall mail such other notices as may be directed by the Board; shall be custodian of all records of the corporation, except such records and papers as shall be kept by the Treasurer as herein provided; shall sign such papers as may be required by his office or as directed by the Board; and shall perform such other duties as may be incidental to the office.

Section 4.11 Treasurer. If a Treasurer is elected, the Treasurer shall receive all monies of the corporation and have custody thereof; shall deposit the funds of the corporation in one or more banks selected by the Board; shall disburse funds in accordance with the directions of and upon the signatures of persons designated by the Board; shall keep a full account of all monies received and paid out and shall make such reports thereof to the Chairman, the President and the Board as they may require; shall receive and have custody of all deeds, securities, notes, contracts and other financial papers of the corporation and shall place them for safekeeping in the safe deposit vaults of a bank designated by the Board and under such rules as to access as the Board shall determine; shall keep full account of all deeds, securities, notes and financial papers of the corporation and shall make such accountings and reports thereof to the Chairman, President and Board as they may require; shall cause the books of account of the

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

corporation to be reviewed at least once annually by a public accountant approved by the Board; shall cause to be prepared and shall present at each annual meeting of the Directors a comprehensive financial statement, including the report of the accountant; shall sign such papers as may be required by his office or as may be directed by the Board; and shall perform such other duties as may be incidental to the office. He shall not be required to give any bonds, unless the Board provide otherwise and in the amounts as they shall determine, for the faithful performance of his duties. The said books of account shall be open at any time during regular business hours to inspections by any Director, the Chairman, the President and the Secretary. If a Treasurer is not elected, the President shall perform the duties described in this Section 4.11.

Section 4.12 Contracts. Unless otherwise restricted in a particular instance by the Board by a resolution, the Officers of the Corporation shall always have the authority to (a) bind the Corporation by any contract or (b) render the Corporation liable pecuniarily, in connection with the performance by the Corporation of its exempt activities and other activities in the ordinary course of its business, including, but not limited to, the execution, delivery and performance by the Corporation of annuity contracts, trust agreements, advise and consult fund agreements, and all expenses incurred by the Corporation related thereto. Notwithstanding the above, unless authorized in a particular instance by the Board by resolution, no Officer, employee or agent shall have the authority to bind the Corporation by any contract, to pledge its assets or credit, or to render it liable pecuniarily, respecting or in any manner related to any unbudgeted operating expense of the Corporation, if the amount involved in such contract, pledge or obligation exceeds \$1,000. If so authorized or if less than \$1,000, any of the foregoing Officers singly may execute contracts or deliver instruments on behalf of the Corporation, pledge its assets or credit, or render it liable pecuniarily, with respect to such unbudgeted operating expenses.

Section 4.13 Removal. The Board may remove any Officer at any time with or without cause, by a majority vote of the Board in the manner set forth in Article 2.

Section 4.14 Resignation. Any Officer may resign at any time by delivering written notice to the corporation, to take effect immediately unless a future effective date is specified, without prejudice to any rights of the corporation under any contract to which the Officer is a party.

Section 4.15 Vacancies. A vacancy in any Office shall exist on the death, resignation or removal of any Officer. In case of a vacancy, the Board may elect a new Officer. In case of the absence of any Officer of the corporation, or for any other reason that the Board may deem sufficient, the Board may delegate, for the time being, any or all of the powers or duties of such Officer to any Officer or to any Director.

Section 4.16 Contract Rights. Election or appointment of an Officer or other agent shall not of itself create contract rights.

ARTICLE V. INDEMNIFICATION

Section 5.01 Conditional Indemnification. Under the circumstances prescribed in this Section 5.01, the corporation shall indemnify and hold harmless any individual made a party to any threatened, pending or completed action, suit or proceeding, whether civil, criminal, administrative, or investigative, and whether formal or informal (a "Proceeding"), because the individual is or was a Director, Officer, employee or agent of the corporation, or, while a Director, Officer, employee or agent of the corporation, is or was serving at the request of the corporation as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee or agent of another foreign or domestic business or nonprofit corporation, partnership, joint venture, trust, employee benefit plan or other enterprise, against any obligation to pay a judgment, settlement, penalty, fine or reasonable expenses (including counsel fees) actually incurred by him with respect to such Proceeding (collectively a "Liability"), but only if the individual acted in a manner he believed in good faith to be in or not opposed to the best interests of the corporation, and, in the case of any criminal Proceeding, the individual had no reasonable cause to believe his conduct was unlawful. Notwithstanding the above, the indemnification permitted hereunder in connection with a Proceeding by or in the right of the corporation is limited to reasonable expenses (including counsel fees) incurred in connection with the Proceeding. The termination of a Proceeding by judgment, order, settlement, conviction or upon a plea of nolo contendere or its equivalent shall not, of itself, be determinative that the individual did not meet the standard of conduct set forth in this Section 5.01. Notwithstanding the above, the corporation shall not indemnify any Director, Officer, employee or agent in connection with any Proceeding (i) by or in the right of the corporation in which the individual was adjudged liable to the corporation, or (ii) in which he was adjudged liable on the basis that personal benefit was improperly received by him.

Section 5.02 Mandatory Indemnification. To the extent that a Director, Officer, employee or agent has been successful, on the merits or otherwise, in the defense of any Proceeding to which he was a party, or in the defense of any claim, issue or matter therein, because he is or was a Director, Officer, employee or agent of the corporation, the corporation shall indemnify him against reasonable expenses (including counsel fees) actually incurred by him in connection therewith.

Section 5.03 Advance or Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses. The corporation shall pay for or reimburse the reasonable expenses (including counsel fees) incurred by a Director, Officer, employee or agent who is a party to a Proceeding in advance of final disposition of the Proceeding if: (i) The Director, Officer, employee or agent furnishes the corporation a written affirmation of his good faith belief that he has met the standard of conduct described in Section 5.01 above; and (ii) the Director, Officer, employee or agent furnishes the corporation a written undertaking, executed personally or on his behalf, to repay the advance if it is ultimately determined that he is not entitled to indemnification under this Article V.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Section 5.04 Procedure. Except as provided in Section 5.02, and except as may be ordered by a court pursuant to Section 14-3-854 of the Georgia Nonprofit Corporation Code, as amended (the "Code"), the corporation shall not indemnify any Director, Officer, employee or agent unless authorized hereunder and a determination has been made that indemnification is proper in the circumstances because such individual has met the applicable standard of conduct set forth in Section 5.01. Such determination shall be made in accordance with Section 14-3-855 of the Code, except that, in addition to those parties entitled to make such a determination under Section 14-3-855(b), the members of the General Assembly, by majority vote of a quorum of those members not parties to such Proceeding, may also make such determination.

Section 5.05 Nonexclusivity. The indemnification provided by this Article V shall not be deemed exclusive of any other right to which the persons indemnified hereunder shall be entitled, including any right pursuant to Section 14-3-854 of the Code, and shall inure to the benefit of the heirs, executors or administrators of such persons.

Section 5.06 Insurance. The corporation shall provide insurance on behalf of any person who is or was a Director or Officer of the corporation or who, while a Director or Officer, is or was serving at the request of the corporation as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee or agent of another foreign or domestic business or nonprofit corporation, partnership, joint venture, trust, employee benefit plan or other enterprise, against any Liability asserted against him and incurred by him in any such capacity, or arising out of his status as such, whether or not the corporation would have the power to indemnify him against such Liability under the provisions of this Article V.

ARTICLE VI. CONFLICTING INTEREST TRANSACTIONS.

Section 6.01 Definitions. As used in this Article VI, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

- (a) "Conflicting Interest" means the interest a Director of the corporation has respecting a transaction effected or proposed to be effected by the corporation if, to the knowledge of the Director at the Time of Commitment, any of the following persons is either a party to the transaction or has a beneficial financial interest in or so closely linked to the transaction, and of such financial significance to that person, that it would reasonably be expected to exert an influence on the Director's judgment if the Director were called upon to vote on the transaction:
- (1) the Director;
 - (2) a Related Person;
 - (3) an entity (other than the corporation) of which the Director is a director, general partner, agent or employee;

APPENDICES

- (4) a person that controls one or more of the entities specified in Section 6.01(a)(3), or an entity that is controlled by, or is under common control with, one or more of the entities specified in Section 6.01(a)(3); or
 - (5) an individual who is a general partner, principal or employer of the Director.
- (b) "Director's Conflicting Interest Transaction" with respect to the corporation means a transaction effected or proposed to be effected by the corporation respecting which a Director of the corporation has a Conflicting Interest.
- (c) "Qualified Director" means, with respect to a Director's Conflicting Interest Transaction, any Director who does not have either:
- (1) a Conflicting Interest respecting the transaction; or
 - (2) a familial, financial, professional or employment relationship with a second Director who does have a Conflicting Interest respecting the transaction, which relationship would, in the circumstances, reasonably be expected to exert an influence on the first Director's judgment when voting on the transaction.
- (d) "Related Person" of a Director means:
- (1) the spouse (or a parent or sibling thereof) of the Director or a child, grandchild, sibling, parent (or spouse of any thereof), or an individual having the same home as the Director, or a trust or estate of which an individual specified in this subparagraph is a substantial beneficiary; or
 - (2) a trust, estate, incompetent, conservatee or minor of which the Director is a fiduciary.
- (e) "Time of Commitment" respecting a transaction means the time when the transaction is consummated or, if made pursuant to contract, the time when the corporation becomes contractually obligated so that its unilateral withdrawal from the transaction would entail significant loss, liability or other damage.

Section 6.02 Disclosure of Conflicting Interest. Prior to the Time of Commitment of any Director's Conflicting Interest Transaction, the Director who has a Conflicting Interest must disclose to the Board:

- (a) the existence and nature of the Director's Conflicting Interest; and
- (b) all facts known to the Director respecting the subject matter of the transaction that an ordinarily prudent person would reasonably believe to be material to a judgment as to whether or not to proceed with the transaction.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

If a Director has a Conflicting Interest respecting a transaction, but neither he nor a Related Person described in Section 6.01(d)(1) is a party thereto, and if the Director has a duty under law or professional canon, or a duty of confidentiality to another person, respecting information relating to the transaction such that the Director cannot, consistent with that duty, make the disclosure contemplated by Section 6.02(b) above, then disclosure is sufficient, for purposes of this Section 6.02 and Section 6.03, if the Director:

- (1) discloses to the Directors voting on the transaction the existence and nature of his Conflicting Interest and informs them of the character of and limitations imposed by that duty prior to their vote on the transaction; and
- (2) plays no part, directly or indirectly, in their deliberations or vote.

Section 6.03 Approval of Director's Conflicting Interest Transactions.

Directors' action respecting a Director's Conflicting Interest Transaction shall only be effective and shall only bind the Corporation if the transaction receives the affirmative vote of a majority (but not less than two) of those Qualified Directors on the Board or on a duly empowered committee thereof who voted on the transaction after receiving the required disclosure described in Section 6.02 by the Director who has a Conflicting Interest respecting the transaction. A majority (but not less than two) of all the Qualified Directors on the Board, or on the committee, constitutes a quorum for purposes of action that complies with this Section 6.03. Directors' action that otherwise complies with this Section 6.03 shall not be adversely affected by the presence or vote of a Director who is not a Qualified Director.

ARTICLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 7.01 Amendment. As provided in Section 14-3-1030 of the Code, the General Assembly shall have the exclusive power to adopt and amend these Amended and Restated Bylaws in any way not inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation, these Amended and Restated Bylaws, or the laws of the State of Georgia or the United States.

Section 7.02 Ecclesiastical Matters. Pursuant to Section 14-3-180 of the Code, to the extent required by the Constitution of the United States of America or the Constitution of the State of Georgia, or both, the Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc., comprised of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms as adopted by the General Assembly, and the Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc., shall control as to any provisions of the Code, the Articles of Incorporation, or these Amended and Restated Bylaws, that are in conflict or inconsistent with the provisions of such Ecclesiastical Constitution.

APPENDICES

I HEREBY CERTIFY that these Amended and Restated Bylaws were duly approved and adopted by the Board of Directors of Presbyterian Church in America Foundation, Inc., on March ____, 1992, and by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, Inc., on _____, 1992.

_____, Secretary
Presbyterian Church in America
Foundation, Inc.

[CORPORATE SEAL]

03/12/92

APPENDIX N

**REPORT OF RIDGE HAVEN CONFERENCE CENTER
To the Twentieth General Assembly
Presbyterian Church in America**

The Ridge Haven Conference center exists to glorify God by providing a controlled atmosphere in a natural environment where the primary goals of a Christian and Reformed ministry can be communicated and realized.

At Ridge Haven we desire to equip God's people to show forth His praises to His glory through the sound teaching and application of His Word, fervent prayer, whole-hearted worship, purposeful fellowship, practical training, and wholesome recreation. The aim is Christ-likeness: all of life lived under the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

We plan and conduct conferences, camps, retreats and other events for the people of the Presbyterian Church in America and other Christian persons or groups.

We recruit speakers, leaders, musicians and workers who are evangelical Christians with an informed commitment to the Reformed Faith as it is expressed in the Westminster standards.

We maintain the facilities and grounds in such a way that they glorify the God who loves beauty and order and wills the well-being of all His people.

We utilize Ridge Haven's beautiful natural setting as fully as possible to increase every participant's appreciation of the God of creation.

We conduct the business affairs of the Center in such a way as to glorify the God who does all things decently and in order.

We hold regular and frequent worship services on the campus.

We annually evaluate all aspects of the Center's activities to determine if the staff is planning and conducting camps and conferences in strictest conformity with the approved stated purposes and goals of the Center and of the Presbyterian Church in America.

APPENDICES

NEWS . . .

"And do not forget to share with others."

-- Hebrews 13:15

CONFERENCES

In 1991, almost 6,000 people enjoyed challenging Bible studies, strong preaching, earnest fellowship, stimulating recreation, and hearty meals -- all in Ridge Haven's beautiful mountain setting. Because of growing interest in all our adult events, we scheduled many conferences for two consecutive weeks. The Springtimers conference, the Bible Conference, and the Keenagers fall conference were "doubled up" in this way. In 1992, we expect both weeks for each event to be full.

CAMPS

What a great summer we had at Ridge Haven! 1700* young people attended the ten camps for juniors, junior highs and senior highs. Again, because of the demand, we had to "double up". We conducted two camps each week, simultaneously! We couldn't have done it without fine guest leaders and the splendid young men and women who served all summer as counselors. Scores of youngsters prayed to receive Christ, and numbers of others testified to the powerful impact of the truth on their walk with Christ.

[* This number also includes the young people who attended the various church conferences and retreats.]

CAMPUS

You've just got to see the "new" Ridge Haven! Bedrooms shine with new paint, new bedspreads, curtains, pictures, lamps, and, in many rooms, new furniture. Building interiors sport new coats of paint. Lush flowers and ferns hang in baskets on motel porches. Fresh wildflowers, sprouting from quaint handmade flower vases, adorn cafeteria tables. The administration area has been completely remodeled and now boasts clean, spacious new offices, restrooms, and a library. The front entrance is marked by a handsome new sign and inviting landscaping. If you haven't been here for a while, you won't know the place! Come, see for yourself!

DR. POTEET'S RESIGNATION

The staff and Board of Directors greatly regretted the resignation of Administrator James Poteet, effective December 31, 1991. Though we appreciated the Poteets' desire to be active again in church planting ministries, we hated to see them go! Jim and Peggy Poteet brought a remarkable enthusiasm and energy to their labors for

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Ridge Haven. With great vision and tireless labor they made many improvements, both to the ministry and to the facilities and grounds.

Upon Dr. Poteet's resignation, the Board of Directors appointed three members to an Ad Interim Committee on Administration that was charged with oversight of administrative details in the interim between administrators. The Board also erected a Search Committee to begin the task of finding a new Administrator.

GIFTS

"They gave themselves first to the Lord and then to us . . ."

-- II Corinthians 8:5

We are grateful for the hundreds of persons and churches who regularly include the ministry of Ridge Haven in their prayers and in their giving.

To date, nearly \$200,000 has been contributed towards the desperately needed Averett Building, which will provide 24 private rooms with baths, as well as additional dormitory space for conference goers. This lovely edifice is named in memory of Mrs. Clara Averett, mother of Austin Robeson, whose husband Ed was Ridge Haven's first administrator, now retired.

We give thanks also that more than \$17,000 has been received for the proposed Chapel.

1991 was one of Ridge Haven's best ever, in many ways. Donations were sufficient to enable us to end the year with a healthy balance, and many hours of volunteer labor were given by dedicated friends which made it possible for numerous maintenance and landscaping projects to be completed at a minimum of cost. We praise God for the hundreds of friends of Ridge Haven who faithfully pray, give, and work for His ministry here!

Respectfully submitted,

Malcolm M. Griffith, Secretary
Ridge Haven Conference Center

APPENDICES

APPENDIX O

AD INTERIM COMMITTEE ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

INTRODUCTION

Due to the need for guidance regarding pastoral care of persons affected by divorce or severe marital crisis, the 16th General Assembly appointed the Ad Interim Committee to prepare a report which would include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a) A re-examination of biblical teaching concerning grounds for divorce and remarriage. The committee shall ask whether the Westminster Confession Chapter 24.6 is more lax or more restrictive than Scripture, and shall suggest any revisions to that article of the Confession it deems appropriate. In particular, the committee shall address the question, whether a Christian may have other legitimate grounds for divorce, besides desertion by an unbelieving spouse, or adultery (for example, inveterate physical abuse, marital rape or other sexual abuse, attempted murder, or equally serious violations of the marriage covenant).
- b) Recommend guidelines and resources for pastoral care and counsel of couples with marital difficulties, persons considering divorce or remarriage after divorce, divorced persons, and children and other family members affected by divorce." (1988 General Assembly, Overture #12)

This report represents the findings of the Committee. Having considered carefully the request of the General Assembly, the Committee divided its research into three parts. First, it was asked to consider whether the Confession is more lax or more restrictive than Scripture, and whether any revisions to the Confession would be appropriate at this time. Chapter 1, Historical Perspective on Divorce and Remarriage, focuses on the conclusions reached by the Westminster Divines and the diversity of views present in that day. Most of the issues debated today were debated then with a broad range of answers, and the writings of the Puritan and Continental Divines provide an interesting parallel to today's breadth of views in the PCA.

Second, the Committee was asked to consider whether there could be other legitimate grounds for divorce besides "desertion by an unbelieving spouse" or "adultery," namely, such harmful actions as inveterate physical abuse, attempted murder, etc. Chapter 2, Scriptural Perspective on Divorce and Remarriage, seeks to

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

address this issue by reexamining those passages of Scripture that deal with divorce and remarriage. In the past, countless such studies have been made. There are no new scriptures to which we may appeal for answers. Whatever answers there are in Scripture will be based on those passages already studied by so many, and especially on the interpretation of two major passages, Matthew 19:9 with its "exception clause," and I Corinthians 7:10-15 with its details regarding "desertion." This is the heart of the debate. Can the "sexual immorality" (*porneia*) of Matthew 19:9 be understood to include a variety of forms of sexual sin, or must it be limited only to one sexual offense? Can "desertion" of I Corinthians 7 be understood to include such harmful actions as physical abuse and attempted murder, or must it be limited only to an unbelieving spouse leaving the house of a believer?

Actually, the Committee was not totally pleased with the wording of the request, "whether a Christian may have other legitimate grounds for divorce..," as though the task of the committee would be to find if there were other legal ways out of a marriage. It is better to view Matthew 19:9 not as providing a ground for divorce but rather an exception to the principle of the permanence of marriage. Also, as the report will show, the "desertion" of I Corinthians 7 was not a ground for divorce, but rather an actual incidence of divorce. Considerable thought has been given to the meaning of "sexual immorality" and "desertion," and the findings of the Committee need to be pondered carefully in the light of the entire chapter on Scripture.

Third, the Committee was asked to provide guidelines and resources for the PCA in its pastoral care and counsel of all parties affected by marital difficulties, divorce, or remarriage. Ruling and teaching elders will find this third chapter very helpful as they seek to minister to people in these situations, and as they establish policy and procedures for the churches. Many excellent insights and suggestions are given to help in this most difficult pastoral task.

The Committee appreciates that pastors and sessions will adopt, modify, or ignore the guidelines and resources as the case may be. In the Church, there are significant differences of opinion regarding approaches to pastoral counseling. The Committee will not recommend that the General Assembly adopt these guidelines, only that they be made available for consideration. In this regard, let no one mistake the attention we pay both to historical data and pastoral guidelines in chapters one and three. We understand that Holy Scripture is, as our Confession says, "the supreme authority" in this as in all matters of faith and practice. Our Confession, as a subordinate standard, is a faithful effort to reproduce the Scripture's teaching.

In the process of preparing this report, the Committee received numerous suggestions for improving the report. The Committee considered every suggestion, whether it was from a presbytery, a session, or a particular elder. All were considered, and some significant changes have been made as a result.

The format of the report is a basic one. The initial Outline serves as a summary of the content of the report, and as an aid in finding the Committee's statements on specific issues. Please be careful to read the Committee's specific statements in the context of the whole report. Then three chapters follow dealing with the three parts of the report.

APPENDICES

Finally, in the Conclusion, a summary of our findings is stated, and it is followed by a series of specific recommendations to the General Assembly. We have sought to make the report readable and usable for all members of the PCA, and trust that it will bring glory to God.

Committee Members

TE Andrew Boswell
South Florida Presbytery

TE Paul B. Fowler, **Chairman**
South Florida Presbytery

RE Joe Breese Johnson
TN Valley Presbytery

RE Terry Jones
Missouri Presbytery

TE George Knight
South Florida Presbytery

Dr. Diane Langberg, Advisor
Philadelphia Presbytery

TE Robert Rayburn
Pacific NW Presbytery

TE Robert Stuart
South Florida Presbytery

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S REPORT ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

OUTLINE

CHAPTER 1 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

- I. The Westminster Confession on Divorce and Remarriage
- II. The Witness of the Early Church
- III. The Original Intent of the Confession
- IV. The Views of Three Prominent Puritan Divines
 - A. William Perkins (1558-1602)
 - B. William Gouge (1575-1653)
 - C. William Ames (1576-1633)
- V. The Conclusion of the Westminster Divines
- VI. The Views of Two Prominent Continental Divines
 - A. Theodore Beza (1519-1605)
 - B. Samuel Maresius (1599-1673)
- VII. Conclusion

CHAPTER 2 SCRIPTURAL PERSPECTIVE ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

- I. Issues Concerning Divorce and Remarriage
 - A. What our denominational heritage has said about marriage
 - B. What our denominational heritage has said about divorce and remarriage
 - C. What views may be found today within the evangelical-reformed community regarding divorce and remarriage
 - 1. No divorce, no remarriage
 - 2. Strictly limited grounds for divorce, and for remarriage
 - 3. Broader ground for divorce, and for remarriage
 - D. Are we to understand that Scripture indeed allows for divorce?
 - 1. Divorce was permitted in Scripture
 - 2. Divorce dissolved a marriage in Scripture
 - E. Does the evidence that divorce ends marriage mean that God looks favorably at divorce? Malachi 2:13-16

APPENDICES

- II. Consideration of Major Scripture Passages
 - A. Deuteronomy 24:1-4
 - 1. Is Moses giving a command to divorce?
 - 2. What does the phrase "some indecency" mean?
 - 3. Modern interpreters differ
 - 4. Proceeding to the New Testament passages
 - B. Matthew 5:31-32
 - 1. The rabbinic perversion of Deuteronomy 24
 - 2. Jesus' correction of the rabbinic perversion
 - 3. Interpretations influenced by the context of Matthew 5, the Sermon on the Mount
 - C. Luke 16:17-18
 - D. Matthew 19:3-9 [Mark 10:2-11]
 - 1. The context of Matthew 19:3-8
 - 2. Divorce and remarriage in Matthew 19:9
 - 3. The exception clause of Matthew 19:9
 - a. The authenticity of Jesus' words
 - b. The scope of the exception clause
 - c. The meaning of *porneia*
 - d. Is *porneia* ever used with an even broader meaning?
 - e. What are the current interpretations of *porneia*?
 - View #1: *porneia* refers to sexual unfaithfulness before marriage
 - View #2: *porneia* refers to unfaithfulness in marriage, not restricted to sexual sin
 - View #3: *porneia* refers to sexual unfaithfulness in marriage
 - f. Guidelines for applying the meaning of *porneia*
 - E. I Corinthians 7:10-15
 - 1. Instruction to spouses both of whom are believers, verses 10-11
 - 2. Important insights into verses 10-11
 - 3. Instruction to a spouse married to an unbeliever, verses 12-15
 - 4. Applying Paul's instruction about desertion today
 - 5. Some concluding thoughts about remarriage, I Corinthians 7:39

CHAPTER 3

PASTORAL PERSPECTIVE ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

- I. Prevention of Marital Problems
 - A. Statement of prevention rationale
 - B. Guidelines for prevention
 - C. Suggested outline for pre-marital counseling
 - D. Resources
- II. Pastoral Care and Counsel of Couples with Marital Difficulties
 - A. Understanding the couple
 - B. Guidelines for marital counseling

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- C. Practical considerations
 - D. Resources
- III. Discipline As It Pertains to Couples Considering Divorce
- A. Guidelines for discipline issues
 1. The local church's responsibility to become involved
 2. How does the local church become involved?
 3. What if both spouses will talk with an elder?
 4. What if one spouse refuses to talk with an elder?
 - a. For the spouse who will talk with an elder
 - b. For the spouse who will not talk with an elder
 5. What if the elders pursue formal discipline?
 - B. Resources
- IV. Pastoral Care and Counsel of Those Seeking Remarriage
- A. Understanding the person seeking remarriage
 - B. Guidelines for remarriage
 - C. Concerns of those in the congregation who have been divorced
 - D. Practical considerations for ministering to those contemplating remarriage
 - E. Resources
- V. Pastoral Care and Counsel of the Children of Divorced Parents
- A. Understanding the child of divorced parents
 - B. Practical considerations for ministering to those contemplating remarriage when children are involved
 - C. Resources
 - D. Addendum: "Ceremony for Recognition of Children at Remarriage"
- VI. The Church's Ministry to the Separated and Divorced
- A. Understanding the separated and divorced
 - B. Guidelines for ministry
 - C. Resources

APPENDICES

- I. "The Westminster Divines on Divorce for Physical Abuse"
- II. "Divorce Reconsidered"

CONCLUSION

- I. A Summary of the Findings of the Committee
- II. Recommendations to the 20th General Assembly of the PCA

APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

I. The Westminster Confession on Divorce and Remarriage

The 16th General Assembly (1988) of the Presbyterian Church in America appointed a study committee to reexamine the biblical teaching on divorce and remarriage and to ask whether the Westminster Confession of Faith is more lax or more strict than Scripture on this issue and to propose any revisions deemed appropriate.¹

The assertions of the Confession to be queried are the following:

In the case of adultery after marriage, it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce: and after the divorce to marry another, as if the offending party were dead. (24.5)

Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage, yet, nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the church, or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage. (24.6)

It is not the first time in this century that the teaching of the Confession on divorce has been reviewed by an American Presbyterian church body. The Presbyterian Church in the U.S. A. in 1953 adopted a revised chapter on marriage and divorce, and the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. followed with a revision of its own in 1959. The latter was subsequently adopted by the Evangelical Presbyterian Church in 1984; it is currently being reviewed by that church's standing committee on theology at the request of the 9th General Assembly (1989).

Is the Confession too strict or too lax? Or is it just right? The mid-century studies cited above apparently found it too strict, but more recently it has come under attack by some evangelicals for being too lax. William Heth and Gordon Wenham in particular are critical of the Westminster position, which they call "the Erasmian view" inasmuch as "the exegetical tradition started by Erasmus and amplified by Luther and the other Reformers was confirmed by the above sections [24.5-6] in this Confession of Faith."²

¹ *Minutes of the Sixteenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America*, 1988, p. 41.

² William A. Heth and Gordon J. Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce: The Problem with the Evangelical Consensus*, Nashville, 1984, p. 83. The Westminster position is also implicitly criticized by J. Carl Laney in *The Divorce Myth: A Biblical Examination of Divorce and Remarriage*, Minneapolis, 1981.

II. The Witness of the Early Church

The Heth-Wenham thesis is that Erasmus departed from the uniform teaching of the early church that remarriage following divorce for any reason was adulterous, a view which they defend as exegetically sound. It may be noted here that what they call "the early church view" is more accurately "the final Augustinian view". As late as 413 Augustine wrote: "Nor is it clear from Scripture whether a man who has left his wife because of adultery, which he is certainly permitted to do, is himself an adulterer if he marries again. And if he should, I do not think that he would commit a grave sin." ³ Augustine's definitive position according to which such a man would be an adulterer appears six years later in *DE Conjugliis adulterinis*. ⁴

It is by no means certain that Heth and Wenham adequately represent the teaching of the early church. According to Jesuit scholar Theodore Mackin in his massive *Divorce and Remarriage*, "Christian writers on the subject of adultery, divorce and remarriage, beginning in the middle of the second century and continuing at least until Augustine...never call the following persons adulterers: (1) A husband who remarries after dismissing an adulterous wife. (2) A husband who remarries after being abandoned by his wife. (3) A woman who marries a man in either of these two cases." ⁵

Moreover, the Augustinian view was never adopted by the Eastern churches, all of which permitted divorce and remarriage. Mackin summarizes the discipline of the Byzantine Church in the thirteenth century as follows:

When a marriage is indissoluble this comes of its being a sacramental marriage of two Christians. But even this indissolubility yields to divine dispensation as this was expressed by Christ in the exceptive clause recorded in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9...In the circumstances envisioned by the Matthean passages the Church was thought to be authorized to separate the spouses, to dissolve their marriage in the name of and by the authority of God . . . *Porneia* in the exceptive clause was taken to designate adultery; dismissal was taken to designate the dissolution of the marriage.

But the adultery warranting dismissal and dissolution was understood to be not the only cause, but to be only a sample and a point of departure for other and equivalent causes. It was taken as self-evident that other crimes are possible to spouses that injure their marriages with equal or greater severity. Abortion and attempted murder of the spouse were only two of these. ⁶

³ Augustine, *On Faith and Works*, trans. Gregory J. Lombardo, New York, 1988, ch. 19 (35) p. 43.

⁴ *Ibid*, note 198, p. 98.

⁵ Theodore Mackin, *Divorce and Remarriage*, New York, 1984, p. 172

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 373.

APPENDICES

The historic difference between the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox churches on the doctrine of divorce persists down to the present day.⁷ Thus, while Erasmus should be given his due for his exegetical contribution to the discussion, to label the view which permits remarriage following divorce for just cause "Erasmian" is misleading.

In any case, of more immediate concern than the question of historical antecedents is the question of what the Confession actually teaches, especially with respect to "desertion" as a second ground for divorce alongside adultery. To judge whether the Westminster position is too strict or too lax, we must first determine what it is. This may not be entirely simple.

III. The Original Intent of the Confession

It is a sound principle that constitutional documents should be interpreted according to their original intent. For creeds and confessions to function as subordinate norms, they must be read according to the grammatico-historical method of interpretation. Confessional subscription is not to anything the words can be taken to mean, but rather to the *discourse meaning* of the text.⁸

The Westminster divines took up the question of marriage and divorce in 1646, the year the Confession was completed (apart from the proof texts requested by Parliament). The minutes record the following actions. The committee assignment was made February 23. The report on marriage was presented June 17 and debated August 3-4. The report on divorce was presented August 10 and debated September 10-11. The proposed chapter "Of Marriage and Divorce" as a whole was debated November 9, and the section on wilful desertion was recommitted. The committee reported back the next day, and, following further debate on wilful desertion, the Assembly on November 11 adopted the chapter "Of Marriage and Divorce" as we now know it.⁹

It is of interest that none of the antecedent Reformed confessions in the British Isles -- neither the Scots Confession (1560) nor the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (1563) nor the Irish Articles of Religion (1615) - include a statement on

⁷ Cf. Gregor Larentzakis, "Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage in the Orthodox Church," *Theology Digest* 26 (1978) pp. 232-234. The *discipline* of the Roman Catholic church is another matter. See Joseph P. Zwack, *Annulment Your Chance to Remarry within the Catholic Church*, New York, 1983.

⁸ The term *discourse meaning* points us back to the event of the utterance or act of writing which is contextually informed and determinative for meaning". Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1989, p. 69.

⁹ *Minutes of the Session of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, ed. Alexander F. Mitchell and John Struthers, Edinburgh, 1976, pp. 190, 244, 262-264, 266, 279-280, 299, 300. Unfortunately, George Gillespie's fuller *Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines and Other Commissioners at Westminster*, Edinburgh, 1846, records only from February 1644 to January 1645. Similarly, John Lightfoot's *Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines* is limited to the calendar years 1643-1644.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

divorce, and the articles on marriage in the latter two documents focus narrowly on the question of a celibate clergy. According to the Thirty-Nine Articles:

Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God's law either to vow the estate of single life or to abstain from marriage. Therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness. (32)

The parallel affirmation in the Irish Articles of Religion is only slightly broader.

For the preservation of the chastity of men's persons, wedlock is commanded unto all men that stand in need thereof. Neither is there any prohibition by the Word of God but that the ministers of the Church may enter into the state of matrimony: they being nowhere commanded by God's law ...[remainder repeats the Thirty-Nine Articles verbatim]. (64)

Taking into account also the Reformed confessions on the continent, the only Reformed creed to contain any reference to divorce prior to the Westminster Confession is the First Helvetic Confession (1536), which in its teaching on marriage includes a word for the civil government:

We contend that marriage has been instituted and prescribed by God for all men who are qualified and fit for it and who have not otherwise been called by God to live a chaste life outside marriage. No order or state is so holy and honorable that marriage would be opposed to it and should be forbidden. Since such marriages should be confirmed in the presence of the Church by a public exhortation and vow in keeping with its dignity, the *government* should also respect it and see to it that a marriage is legally and decently entered into and given legal and honorable recognition, *and is not lightly dissolved without serious and legitimate grounds* (27); emphasis added.¹⁰

Although the Westminster articles on divorce are without confessional precedent in the Reformed churches, they are understandable given the historical circumstances of the Westminster Assembly. By the Solemn League and Covenant (1643) both Assembly and Parliament were sworn to preserve and extend "the reformed religion" and to "endeavor to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms [Scotland, England, and Ireland] to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in [that] religion" (1st vow). As its dual title indicates, the Solemn League and Covenant was a political instrument as well as a religious commitment. At its heart lay "the conviction that the unity of a society inheres in its religion and church."¹¹

¹⁰ The Second Helvetic Confession (1566), although silent on divorce, is unique in making this proposal: "Let lawful courts be established in the Church, and holy judges who may care for marriages, and may repress all unchastity and shamefulness, and before whom matrimonial disputes may be settled." (29)

¹¹ John H. Leith, *Assembly at Westminster: Reformed Theology in the Making*, Richmond, 1973, p. 59.

Given the conception of a religiously unified society and the intimate connection between church and state that obtains under such circumstances, it is not surprising to find the social institution of marriage among the articles of religion addressed by the Westminster Confession. The Assembly no doubt judged that the unity of both church and society would be well-served by a confessional exposition of the doctrine of marriage, including the biblical grounds for its dissolution, a controversial issue in 17th century Britain.¹² The Scottish Parliament, already in 1573, had enacted legislation which allowed divorce for desertion.¹³ With Anglo-catholics, on the one hand, still arguing that marriage was indissoluble, and Milton, on the other, lobbying for divorce on grounds of incompatibility, the question could hardly be ignored as it was bound to have an effect on the civil law.¹⁴

As it turned out, Parliament did not take the "humble advice" of its assembled divines on this issue but omitted the paragraphs on divorce in its authorized edition of the Confession published in 1648. The Savoy Declaration (1658) also chose to do without them, so it has fallen to the Presbyterian churches to wrestle with their confessional status.

Between the rigorous Anglican view and the relaxed view of Milton the Westminster position on divorce might seem to be a golden mean, but it was not adopted for any reason other than that it was believed to be biblical.

IV. The Views of Three Prominent Puritan Divines

A. William Perkins (1558-1602)

Remarriage following divorce for adultery had long been permitted by English Puritan divines. The exegesis of the exceptive clause in Matthew given by William Perkins (1558-1602) is typical:

By *fornication*, Christ meaneth not every sin of that kind, but only the sin of *adultery*; or that which is greater in that kind, namely *incest*... The exception belongs to the whole answer of our savior Christ, denying

¹² Cf. James Turner Johnson, *A Society Ordained by God: English Puritan Marriage Doctrine in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century*, Nashville, 1970. A useful discussion, but unaccountably it does not include the Westminster Confession.

¹³ *Marriage and Divorce: A Report of the Study Panel of the Free Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1988, p. 28. "These two causes for the termination of marriage [adultery and desertion] ... remained the only two grounds for divorce in Scotland until 1938 when cruelty, incurable insanity, sodomy and bestiality were added by Act of Parliament" (p. 28). More radical legislation was enacted in 1976 and 1977 (p. 5).

¹⁴ John Milton, *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce: Restor'd to the Good of Both Sexes from the Bondage of Canon Law and Other Mistakes ... to the Parliament of England with the [Westminster] Assembly*, 2nd ed., London, 1644. The 1st edition was published in 1643; both editions, along with Milton's other divorce tracts, are included in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, vol. 2, 1643-1648, ed. Ernest Sirluck, New Haven, 1959.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

divorce, save only for adultery; and permitting no marriage after divorcement, save only where divorce is for adultery. ¹⁵

Although he is expounding the Sermon on the Mount, Perkins brings in I Corinthians 7:15. Desertion of a believer by an unbeliever is not viewed as a second *ground* for divorce, but it is nevertheless another circumstance which results in the dissolution of the marriage.

The malicious or wilfull departing of the unbeliever, doth dissolve the marriage; but that is no cause of giving a bill of divorce: only adultery causeth that. Here the believer is a mere patient, and the divorce is made by the unbeliever, who unjustly forsaketh, and so puts away the other. ¹⁶

With respect to I Corinthians 7:10-11, where both marriage partners are believers, Perkins says: "The Apostle speaketh of departure, and putting away, for other causes than adultery; as for hatred, dislike, etc., which indeed are not sufficient causes of divorce, and therefore they that separate thereupon, ought not to marry."¹⁷

Perkins' *definitive* treatment of desertion is found in his *Christian Oeconomie*. He begins with a definition: "Desertion is when one of the married folks upon a wilful and obstinate mind of their own head departeth from the other without a just and necessary cause." ¹⁸ He then discusses "sundry cases".

Case 1: "Suppose that an husband which is an unbeliever or a heretic in the foundation, of his own accord, upon detestation of true religion, quite forsakes the believing wife, and denies any more to dwell with her: what is to be done?" The answer is relatively straightforward: "All good means must be used to bring the infected [sic] party to repentance; and when none will succeed, but the case remaineth desperate, then marriage is dissolved on his part, and the believing wife is free to marry another." ¹⁹

Case 2: "What if there fall out a desertion between two married folks, which are both believers?" The answer here is more complicated:

The faulty person, who is the cause of his desertion, is to be forced by course of civil, and ecclesiastical censure to perform his, or her duty. Upon which

¹⁵ William Perkins, *A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christ's Sermon on the Mount: Preached in Cambridge by that Reverend and Judicious Divine M. William Perkins. Workes*, Cambridge, 1618, vol. 3, p. 69. Perkins specifically rejects contagious and incurable disease and attempted murder as grounds for divorce.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.

¹⁸ William Perkins, *Christian Oeconomie: Or, A Short Survey of the Right Manner of Erecting and Ordering a Family According to the Scriptures*, trans. Thomas Pickering. *Workes*, Cambridge, 1618, vol. 3, p. 687.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

proceeding if he remain obstinate and perverse in will; the other must in patience, and earnest prayer unto God, wait the time, until his mind may be changed, and he be made to relent by the order of the Magistrate. But if one of them, by just occasion of fear, be compelled to depart from the other: and cannot return again without apparent danger of life; in this case they are not bound to return; but the delinquent party is to remain solitary, till they be instructed and made willing to do their duties: and in the meanwhile, the party innocent must be resolved that God hath called him or her to a single life.

Again, be it that the one is resolutely unwilling to dwell with the other, and thereupon flies away without any fault of the other: if the thing after a long space be sufficiently known before-hand, and all probable means have been used, to reclaim the guilty person; yea, being called he doth not personally appear before the judge, to yield a reason of the fact; after public and solemn declarations made, *the Minister upon such desertion may pronounce the marriage to be dissolved.* For he that upon malice flieth away from his mate, is to be holden in the same terms as with an unbeliever, who departs upon detestation of religion, and the service of God, I Timothy 5:8.²⁰

Although the deserting partner in this instance is a professed believer, his or her malicious abandonment of a Christian marriage puts the deserter in the category of an unbeliever so far as the question of dissolution is concerned. Perkins does not say that a sentence of excommunication must precede the pronouncement of dissolution, though such apparently was required by an Act of the Scottish Parliament in 1573 allowing divorce on grounds of desertion.²¹

Perkins next takes up "malicious dealing" as a sub-category of desertion. Although it follows Case 2 (Christian marriages), it is actually a refinement of Case 1 (mixed marriages). Once again he begins with a definition:

Like unto *desertion* is malicious and spiteful dealing of married folks one with the other. *Malicious dealing* is, when dwelling together, they require of each other intolerable conditions ... Here it may be demanded, what a believer should do, who is in certain and imminent danger, either of loss of life, or breach of conscience, if they both abide together.

If [this danger is] from a stranger, then the husband either takes upon him the defence of his believing wife, or not; if he doth, then she ought to abide with him. If not, she may depart and provide for her own safety. Again, if the husband

²⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 687-688; emphasis added.

²¹ According to the study panel of the Free Church of Scotland cited earlier: "The procedure required by the Act was surprisingly elaborate: the civil authorities were to make every effort to apprehend the deserter and oblige him to return to his wife and home; if they failed, they were to declare him an outlaw. They were then to notify the ecclesiastical authorities who, if also unsuccessful, were to excommunicate him. The marriage could be ended by divorce provided the deserted spouse had always shown willingness 'to adhere' ... i.e. to have the deserter back and to continue the marriage." *Marriage and Divorce*, p. 39.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

threateneth hurt, the believing wife may flie in this case; and it is all one, as if the unbelieving man should depart. For to depart from one, and drive one away by threat, are equipollent.²²

Perkins is aware that this goes beyond the strict terms of I Corinthians 7:15 and anticipates an objection: "It is alleged, that if this be so, then the believing wife forsakes the unbelieving husband, which she may not do." He answers: "She forsakes him not finally, but leaves him for a time. Again, the desertion is not made by the person, which giveth place for the time, but by him in whom is the cause of the desertion."²³

By introducing the category of "malicious dealing" Perkins shows his willingness to draw inferences from the biblical text in order to make application to additional circumstances not directly addressed in Scripture. In this instance, however, he appears to have fallen short of drawing out the full implications of this position. Although "malicious dealing" is like wilful desertion to the point of being "equipollent", it nevertheless justifies only temporary separation of a believer from an unbeliever, not full divorce. The remaining question is whether Perkins would countenance divorce by the innocent party should the malicious dealing continue and the temporary separation, of necessity, continue indefinitely.²⁴

²² *Christian Oeconomie*, p. 688. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines 'equipollent' as follows: "A. adj. 3. c. propositions which express the same thing, notwithstanding formal diversity . . . B. an equivalent."

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ J. I. Packer judges Perkins to have permitted divorce *and* remarriage to the innocent spouse in the case of desertion and that desertion was understood by him 'to cover all behavior that nullified the matrimonial relationship in practice', such as the imposition of intolerable conditions. He further links Perkins' view with that already developed by some of the continental reformers and suggests that 'most' Puritans followed Perkins in these opinions. *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life*, Wheaton, 1990, p. 269.

This interpretation of Perkins has been sharply criticized by D. Lachman in "Divorce Reconsidered," *The Presbyterian Advocate*, vol. 1., No. 5 (May-June 1991) pp. 1, 17-20). Dr. Lachman understands Perkins to mean that only actual physical abandonment of house and home constitutes such desertion as may justify the eventual dissolution of a marriage. Separations necessary to ensure the safety of a victimized spouse, contrarily, are of a different kind and never justify such a dissolution, even if the spouses never again cohabit. This reading of Perkins is possible, but the committee is not persuaded that this is certainly his meaning. In speaking of such desertions Perkins does indeed say that 'in the meanwhile, the party innocent must be resolved that God hath called him or her to a single life.' But he then immediately proceeds to say that if the deserter proves 'resolutely unwilling' after all means have been exhausted, the marriage may be dissolved. The question is whether, in the last instance, Perkins is speaking only of a departing spouse or also of an abusive one. The committee wonders whether Dr. Lachman has given sufficient weight to Perkins' acknowledgment that 'to depart from one, and drive away by threats, are equipollent.' If an abusive spouse is thus a deserter, has not the way been opened to consider unremedied physical cruelty as a form of desertion with 'equipollent' consequences. Dr. Lachman also cites Andrew Willet. While Willet does not deal specifically with the question here at issue, he does, in a section not cited in Dr. Lachman's article, claim general agreement with Beza who, as we note below, takes the position Dr. Lachman is here rejecting.

APPENDICES

Case 3: "When the husband is perpetually absent from the wife, what is to be done?" Wilful absenteeism, which is often the modern meaning of "desertion" in marriage contexts, is placed under the principles already discussed by Perkins. This is another example of this esteemed Puritan theologian's ability to apply the Word of God as circumstances require.

B. William Gouge (1575-1653)

Of the Westminster divines who published works on marriage, the most important is William Gouge who chaired the Assembly's committee on divorce. Gouge's *Domesticall Duties* first appeared in 1622; a second and third edition followed in 1626 and 1634. His position on grounds for divorce is succinctly stated in opposition to "the error of the papists": "Concerning *adultery*, we deny not, but that it giveth just cause of divorce: but withall we say (as we have good warrant from Christ's words) that it is the only cause of just divorce".²⁵

Although adultery provides just cause for divorce, it does not in itself dissolve the marriage. On the question of pardoning adultery upon repentance of the guilty party Gouge counsels, "Though it be not meet in this case to impose it as an inviolable law upon the innocent party to retain the delinquent because of repentance (for we have no direct and strict warrant for it) yet I doubt not but they may so do, if they will, and that without just exception to the contrary they ought so to do."²⁶

The second treatise devotes a section to desertion, which begins with a rather wordy definition:

The vice contrary to matrimonial unity is *desertion*, when one of the married couple through indignation of the true religion, and utter detestation thereof, or some other cause, shall apparently renounce all matrimonial unity, and withdraw him or herself from all society with the other, and live among infidels, idolaters, heretics, or other such persecutors, as a faithful Christian with safety of life, or a good conscience, cannot abide among, and though all good means that can be thought to be used to reclaim the party so departed, yet nothing will prevail, but obstinately persisteth in renouncing all matrimonial fellowship.²⁷

This does not mean, as Perkins taught, that the innocent party is free to remarry. Citing I Corinthians 7:15 ("A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases") Gouge comments, "By bondage he meaneth matrimonial subjection (by reason whereof neither of the married persons have power of their own body, but one of the others)." In other words, the innocent party is free from the obligation of conjugal relations and need not seek after the delinquent party; yet the marriage is not wholly dissolved.

²⁵ William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties Eight Treatises*, 3rd ed., London, 1634, vol II, ii, P. 16.

²⁶ *Ibid*, p. 6.

²⁷ *Ibid*, p. 3.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Gouge is aware of other Reformed interpretations of the Pauline release, but he does not feel it is incumbent upon him to deal with the exegesis because the problem is remote.

In many reformed Churches beyond the seas desertion is accounted so far to dissolve the very bond of marriage, as liberty is given to the party forsaken to marry another; and it is also applied to other cases than that which is above mentioned: as when an infidel, idolater, or heretic shall depart from one of the true religion for other causes than hatred of religion: or when both man and wife having lived [sic] as idolaters among idolaters, one of them being converted to the true faith, leaveth his abode among idolaters, and goeth to the professors of the true faith, but can by no means get the other party to remove: or where one of the true religion shall depart from another of the same profession, and will by no means be brought to live with the party so left, but openly manifesteth peremptory obstancy [sic]; the matter being heard and adjudged by the magistrate, the marriage bond may be broken; and liberty given to the party forsaken to marry another. *But because our church hath no such customs, nor our law determined such cases, I leave them to the custom of other churches.*²⁸

One could wish that Gouge had published a post-Assembly volume on *How My Mind Has Changed*. Perhaps the Scottish commissioners pointed out that divorce for desertion not only had the approval of Reformed churches beyond the seas but also parliamentary authorization (since 1573) in one of the three island kingdoms now in solemn league and covenant.

C. William Ames (1576-1633)

Further it is of considerable importance to note that among other English Puritans not only could support be found for the opinion that divorce for desertion conferred the right of remarriage upon the innocent party, but apparently also for the opinion that this desertion could occur as well by the imposition of intolerable conditions as by actual departure. William Ames, certainly a representative Puritan Divine (one English edition of his celebrated *Marrow of Divinity* was printed 'by order from the honorable House of Commons'), speaks to the question in his *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof*.²⁹ After first affirming the indissolubility of marriage, he begins his discussion of divorce.

A.3. Neverthelesse, it is not so indissoluble, but that upon such cause, as God approveth to bee just it may be dissolved. For that indissolubility was not instituted for the punishment, but the comfort of the innocent and doth admit some exception, in which God ceaseth to joyne them. Matthew 19:6, 9.

A.4. "There is not any just cause of making, a divorce approved in Scriptures, besides adultery and the like horrid impurities, whereby it comes to passe, that two

²⁸ *Ibid*; emphasis added.

²⁹ ET: 1639, pp. 208-209.

APPENDICES

remaine no longer one flesh but divided; and so the faith of Wedlock, is directly violated; Matthew 5:31 and 19:9.

After ruling out contagious disease as a ground of divorce in the following paragraph, he takes up desertion.

A.6. 'An obstinate desertion, although in the party deserting, it containeth no just cause of making a divorce, yet it makes a faire cause for the party deserted, after the triall of all other meanes in vaine, to suffer a divorce, I Corinthians 7:15.

A.7. 'A voluntary and spontaneous absence, if it bee beyond the time appointed and continued by deceit, is of the same nature, with a professed desertion.

A.8. 'The great danger, which one party may bee in by the cruelty of the other, or by any other manifest meanes of cohabitation [sive aliunde manifesto emineat ex cohabitatione], may bee just cause of retiring for a time, so to provide for his owne safety and security, but not for an absolute desertion, unlesse first hee bee deserted. For if one party drive away the other with great fierceness and cruelty, there is cause of desertion, and hee is to bee reputed the deserter. But if hee obstinately neglect, that necessary departure of the other avoyding the eminent danger, hee himselfe in that playeth the deserter.'³⁰

The passage is not a model of clarity in either its original Latin or English translation, but, taking the words in their simple sense, Ames seems to be acknowledging that such a desertion as can absolve the innocent partner of any remaining obligation to the marriage can consist of the imposition of intolerable conditions threatening physical safety and security as well as of physical departure *per se*. This interpretation gathers strength from the fact, to be elaborated below, that such a point of view was well established among reformed authorities on the continent where Ames' professional career was largely spent.

V. The Conclusion of the Westminster Divines

It may be fairly assumed that the works of Perkins, Ames, and Gouge were widely known by the Westminster divines. It is by no means an easy thing to determine whose opinion would have carried a greater weight with the 'typical' delegate to the Assembly.

³⁰ It is interesting that in his Marrow, dating from nearly the same period as his Conscience, Ames says only this on divorce [ET: 1968, p. 320]: 'Adultery is most truly and essentially opposed to marriage, for by its very nature it breaks the bond and covenant of marriage. It is the proper and just cause of divorce, which cannot be said of any other sins although they be more grievous. A just divorce dissolves the very bond of marriage.' Ames is not excluding desertion here. Rather, in all likelihood, with many other reformed authorities, he is distinguishing between adultery as the sole legitimate 'ground' of divorce and desertion in which the innocent party is the passive victim, the one who is divorced. A comparison of the two passages may suggest that the precise construction of desertion was considered a detail of the doctrine and ethics of divorce and, therefore, would be omitted in briefer accounts. The larger consensus, primarily negative on divorce and adamant as to the general indissolubility of the marriage vows, could be simply stated with an appeal to the dominical statement.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

It is therefore not at all clear how the divines as a whole may have understood desertion or, for example, whether they would have regarded unremedied physical abuse as tantamount to desertion, as justification for divorce, and, if so, for remarriage.

As it is, no record of the substance of the Assembly's debate on desertion is extant. The official minutes record the original resolutions and their disposition by the Assembly. With respect to adultery, the Assembly debated the divorce and remarriage clauses separately and adopted both. The resolutions on desertion proved to be more controversial.

If either of the married persons forsake their yokefellow, and by no means that can be used by the party forsaken, or friends, or magistrate, will be reduced[i.e., brought back or restored], after sufficient time set down by the magistrate, and made known to the party that so desireth, it is lawful for the innocent party to marry another.

Wilful and obstinate desertion of one married party giveth just cause to the other, after all means used to reduce [i.e., to bring back or restore] the offending person, to sue out a divorce and for liberty to marry another.³¹

When the report was debated on September 10-11, the first of these paragraphs was waived and the second adopted, along with the statement, "Other causes of divorce between two parties lawfully married besides these the Scriptures do nowhere allow." But when the chapter as a whole came before the Assembly on November 9, the second paragraph was recommitted. According to a familiar pattern, the committee was "the brethren that did except against that clause".³² The brethren are not named, but the final recension (24.6) is thought to reflect Scottish influence in particular.³³

The Confession, as finally adopted, does not explicitly restrict desertion as just cause for divorce to mixed marriages, a point observed at some length by John Murray in his widely-circulated *Divorce*.³⁴ This may or may not have been intentional.

VI. The Views of Two Prominent Continental Divines

The larger Reformed Church shared the Westminster Assembly's general conclusions touching marriage and divorce, though, no doubt, many would have stated

³¹ *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly*, p. 280.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 299.

³³ *Marriage and Divorce*, pp. 39-40.

³⁴ John Murray, *Divorce*, Philadelphia, 1953, pp. 76-77. Originally published in the *Westminster Theological Journal*, 1946-49; reprinted by Presbyterian and Reformed, 1961. Murray concluded that "the proposition respecting wilful desertion in the Confession is not sufficiently guarded and delimited so as to confine itself to the teaching of the apostle in this passage."

the general consensus to suit a broader or more strict construction of it. W. Geesink³⁵ offers this summary from his Dutch Reformed perspective:

'The Reformed recognize only two grounds of divorce, namely adultery and desertio malitiosa religionis causa (I Corinthians 7:15), which then is expanded to desertion in a broader sense. Concerning the ground of adultery they were all in agreement. Regarding desertio malitiosa one finds only here and there a wavering.'

A. Theodore Beza (1519-1605)

Geesink refers to Beza as a representative of this consensus. Beza himself, whom Milton characterized as 'one of the strictest against divorce'³⁶ devoted a separate treatise to the subject.³⁷ Concerning desertion, once having established that the innocent party may remarry (Beza also solves the difficulty of reconciling I Corinthians 7 with Matthew 19 by maintaining that only adultery is a 'ground' of divorce, Paul's remarks regarding desertion dealing instead with the case of the innocent party who is the passive victim of another's unjustified divorce), he considers 'desertion in the broader sense'.

'... we know him also to be a deserter who does not refuse cohabitation, but obstinately demands impious conditions.' [p. 94]

It is asked whether the faithful in turn may desert the unfaithful? ... in no way is that to be permitted ... (he refers again to Paul's argument in I Corinthians 7 and to the fact that the faithful spouse sanctifies the unfaithful). But, I repeat what I said shortly before, namely that he appears the deserter not only who positively refuses a mutual living together, but also who demands intolerable conditions from the faithful [spouse], such as if the unfaithful spouse absolutely compels the faithful to attend the abominable Mass, in a word any doing or enduring of something altogether against the obligation of piety. From this, therefore, another question occurs: what should the faithful [spouse] do when indeed cohabitation is not denied, but either hazard of life is incurred or something is either to be done or endured against the true religion. I respond that these two distinctions are to be observed. First, either the unfaithful [spouse], whether intentionally or unwittingly, persecutes the faithful spouse, or the persecution arises from some other direction. If the former, the faithful spouse really has a suitable excuse for shunning her domestic enemy for no other reason than that she should consider her life and conscience, and I would decide in this case nothing other than if the unfaithful spouse himself had departed for another. To depart from someone and

³⁵ *Gereformeerde Ethiek*, vol. 2, Kampen, 1931, p. 284.

³⁶ *Tetrachordon: Expositions upon the four chief places in Scripture, which treat of Mariage, or nilities in Mariage*, (1645) *Complete Prose Works*, vol. 2, p. 227.

³⁷ *De Repudiis et Divortiis, Tractationes Theologiae*, vol. 2, Geneve, 1582. The section of the essay devoted to divorce is pp. 83-109. For John Calvin's viewpoint see footnote 41 *infra* and pp. 2394 ff of the paper by W. S. Barker in the appendix to this report.

to drive the other away by threats or force are the same thing. But if such persecution should assail [the faithful spouse] from some other direction, the faithful spouse should act at length more moderately than if she should cherish an enemy in her home and bosom. Nor is it to be doubted that if the unfaithful spouse should attend the faithful with conjugal love, should provide for her life in every way, in this case the faithful spouse rather should bear whatever you will than that is should be her duty to abandon the unfaithful spouse. But if the unfaithful spouse does not care as is right that the faithful spouse is in peril, no one does not see, I think, not only that he is a deserter, but also that he may be shunned with a good conscience as a traitor.' [pp. 96-97]³⁸

B. Samuel Maresius (1599-1673)

Samuel Maresius,³⁹ certainly a representative reformed divine from the general period of the Westminster Assembly, provides a summation which includes the broader construction of desertion and that without any indication that this was particularly controversial.

'The legitimacy of divorce is established, such that the offended party acquires the right to make new [marriage] vows, for only two causes in the new covenant, even if civil laws and some erudite today think it right to allow more, namely Adultery, as Christ says ... Matthew 5:32; 19:9 and Malitiosa Desertio ... (the brother or sister is not bound in such a case, viz. that he should remain unmarried) I Corinthians 7:15. But such desertion is taken to be not only a determined and permanent withdrawal from the marital home and companionship, but an obstinate denial of the obligations of marriage, by intolerable cruelty putting life at hazard for the present, or from either treacherous or naked force, by the acceptance of a mistress, and whatever, by analogy, is equivalent to or greater than this desertion. If, however, a spouse ... should only go over to the enemies (i.e. religious?) or desert the true religion, he is not by this to be considered guilty of this malicious desertion which severs the bond of marriage, if only the other spouse is able to cohabit with him with a clear conscience.'

³⁸ Bullinger speaks similarly in the final chapter of his *The Christian State of Matrimonye*, trans. Miles Coverdale, 1541. After speaking to the Lord's permission of divorce, of the duty of married persons to 'diligently eschew all occasions of divorce' and to 'know that they must prove a painful medicine if they will have divorce to be their comfort,' of the many cases which are no justification for divorce, of the importance of not leaving the issue to the private judgment of the individuals involved, of the importance of not acting quickly but of attempting 'all manner of reconciliation' and deferring the divorce' while there is hope of amendment and unity, and of the right of lawfully divorced people to remarry, he directs his attention to what constitutes a 'right occasion of divorce.' Regarding Christ's naming adultery he writes: 'With the which no doubt he hath not excepted like and greater occasions but understood and comprehended them therein. For the holy Apostle also did leave infidelity as an occasion of divorce.' Referring to the Roman emperors Constantine and Justinian, who allowed divorce for such things as murder and poisoning, he continues: 'Every reasonable man then confides that God did ordain wedlock for the honesty and wealth of man and not for his main and destruction.'

³⁹ *Systema Breve Universae Theologiae*, 1659, pp. 631-632.

VII. Conclusion

It is by no means an easy task to determine the extent to which these continental opinions would have been regarded as similar to or distinct from that of English Puritanism in general. Beza was widely read and appreciated in the period before the Westminster Assembly. Plainly, Beza and Maresius go beyond Gouge and perhaps somewhat beyond Perkins (cf. footnote 24). The extent to which, if any, their viewpoint differed from that of Ames is more difficult to determine.⁴⁰ There is certainly reason to believe that the divines at Westminster would not have been unappreciative of the reputation which the Genevan Consistory had gained in defense of betrothed and married women.⁴¹

In summary, it is difficult to state with absolute confidence the extent of the latitude which may have existed within the Puritan consensus on divorce and remarriage, the importance which may or may not have been attached to differences of interpretation such as in the application of the Pauline privilege to other cases, or the extent to which the Puritan position, in general, was different from that of continental divines such as Beza and Maresius. It is to be admitted that none of the Puritan works surveyed states the case for 'desertion in the broader sense' as bringing with it the right of divorce and remarriage in as summary a way as did the continental divines. Nevertheless, available evidence warrants caution in proposing a single interpretation or application of the Confession's phrase "such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied."

⁴⁰ Geesink judges Ames' discussion to be in practical agreement with the Reformed consensus. *Gereformeerde Ethiek*, vol. 2, p. 285.

⁴¹ G. Lewis, 'Calvinism in Geneva in the time of Calvin and of Beza (1541 - 1605),' ed. M. Prestwich, *International Calvinism 1541 - 1715*, Oxford, 1986, p. 49. 'The Consistory dealt with . . . notorious drunkards, adulterers, and bullies, with guardians who had misappropriated the inheritance of their wards, with forced betrothals between grown men and girls under age, and with ill-treated and deserted wives. Not for nothing was it known (with approval or derision?) as "le paradis des femmes."; The interesting case of Galeazzo Caraccioli provides some indication of the flexible way in which cases would be handled in Calvin's Geneva. Caraccioli, marquis of Vico, nephew of the head of the Roman inquisition and later Pope Paul IV, married to Victoria Caraffa, the daughter of a duke, and himself appointed chamberlain by Charles V, became interested in protestantism through the preaching of Peter Martyr Vermigli and his witnessing of the persecution of Italians under the inquisition. Eventually, after an inward struggle, he converted. In peril of the inquisition he abandoned his estates and family and came to Geneva in June, 1551. There he won the respect of Calvin, who later dedicated his commentary on I Corinthians to him, and became a citizen. His wife remained behind in Italy and at a later meeting at Vico in 1558 he failed to persuade her to follow him, with their nine children, though there was deep affection on both sides. Calvin then attempted to arrange for their reunion in a place where both he and his wife could exercise their religion, but she declined. After this the Council pronounced the marriage dissolved and in 1560 Caraccioli remarried. J. T. McNeil, *The History and Character of Calvinism*, Oxford, 1954, p. 184. On the other hand, excommunications for domestic sins far outnumber divorces. See the appendix, pp. 2394 ff. An excellent example of the caution employed by the Genevan consistory in judging marital conditions to be intolerable and of their willingness to require victimized spouses to suffer greatly for the sake of the general inviolability of marriage is found in the correspondence between the consistory and a protestant woman married to an abusive catholic husband. P. E. Hughes (ed.), *The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in The Time of Calvin*, ET: Grand Rapids, 1966, pp. 193-198.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In a paper presented to the Philadelphia Presbytery and included as an appendix to this report, W. S. Barker draws the following conclusions.

"To a direct question of whether physical abuse could be a grounds for divorce, the Puritan tradition informing the Westminster Assembly would have answered, No, not *per se* or by itself. William Perkins and William Ames before the Westminster Assembly, William Gouge as a member of the Assembly, and Richard Baxter soon after the Assembly are all consistent with Calvin and Beza and the Genevan tradition in emphasizing adultery as the essential cause for divorce.

"This same Puritan tradition also saw that under certain circumstances desertion could be a grounds for divorce, and physical abuse could be the basis of a desertion, the spouse guilty of the abuse being reputed as the deserter even though the other may have departed. Before such a situation could be the grounds for a divorce, however, a sufficient time would have to expire for the efforts of both church and civil magistrate to seek to achieve a reconciliation."

In any case, it is important to note both the broad agreement and the narrow scope both of identifiable disagreement and of remaining questions. The entire Reformed church held that marriage vows were generally indissoluble, that only a few vicious crimes against the marital covenant constituted grounds for divorce, that many alleged grounds lacked Biblical justification, that incompatibility was by no means a ground of divorce, that every effort was to be made to preserve a marriage and that divorce was always an unwelcome extremity, that adultery conferred upon the innocent party the right of divorce and remarriage, and, that, in certain extreme cases, the innocent victims of marital abandonment are released from their obligations to the marriage. Possible, though still strictly circumscribed, constructions of marital abandonment and whether in such cases a right of remarriage is conferred on the innocent spouse seem genuinely details of interpretation, differences which were insufficient to undermine the Reformed consensus on marriage and divorce.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- WESTMINSTER CONFESSION: BACKGROUND, TEACHING, AND USE IN THE CHURCH:**
Barker, Arthur. *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma: 1641-1660.* Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1942.
Guthrie, Charles J. "The History of Divorce in Scotland." *Scottish Historical Review* 8 (1910): 39-52.
Knappen, M. M. "Domestic Life." *Chapter XXV of Tudor Puritanism. A Chapter in the History of Idealism.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. 451-465.
Lachman, David C. "Divorce Reconsidered." *The Presbyterian Advocate* 1:5-6 (May-June 1991): 1. 17-20
Norskov Olsen, Viggo. *The New Testament Logia on Divorce: A Study of Their Interpretation From Erasmus to Milton.* Tubingen, 1971.

APPENDICES

Owen, Eivion. "Milton and Selden on Divorce." *Studies in Philology* 43 (1946): 233-257.

Phillips, Roderick. *Putting Asunder. A History of Divorce in Western Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Powell, Chilton Latham. *English Domestic Relations, 1482-1653; A Study of Matrimony and Family Life in Theory and Practice as Revealed by the Literature, Law, and History of the Period*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917.

Shanley, Mary Lyndon. "Marriage Contract and Social Contract in Seventeenth Century English Political Thought." *Western Political Quarterly* 32 (1979).

Smith, David L. "Divorce and Remarriage: From the Early Church to John Wesley." *Trinity Journal* 11:2 (Fall 1990): 131-142.

2. WRITINGS OF MEMBERS OF THE ASSEMBLY TOUCHING ON DIVORCE & REMARRIAGE

[Anonymous]. *An Answer to a Book, Intituled, The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. Licensed and endorsed by Joseph Caryl. London, 1644. [The only sustained response to any of Milton's divorce tracts' Joseph Caryl was a prominent member of the Assembly, as well as Licenser of Books of divinity.]

Bridge, William. *The Wounded Conscience Cured, the Weak One Strengthened, and the Doubting Satisfied*. London, 1642; reprint, *Works*, 5:234.

Carter, Thomas. *Carters Christian Common Wealth; Or Domesticall Dutyes Deciphered*. London, 1627.

Cawdrey, Daniel. *Family Reformation Promoted in a Sermon on Joshua 24:15, and by short Catechisms fited for the threefold relations in a family, or 1. Children and Parents; 2. Servants and Masters; 3. Husband and Wife*. London, 1656; reprint *Anthology of Presbyterian and Reformed Literature*. Volume 4. Dallas, TX: Naphtali Press, pp. 54-73.

Gataker, Thomas. *Marriage Duties Briefly Couched together; out of Colossians, 3.18, 19*. London, 1920.

_____. *A Wife in Deed. A Sermon concerning the Matter of Marriage*. London, 1624.

Gouge, William. *Of Domesticall Duties*. London: Printed by John Haviland, 1622.

Palmer, Herbert. *The Glasse of Gods Providence Towards His Faithful Ones*. London, 1644.

_____. *Scripture and Reason Pleaded for Defensive Armes*. London, 1643.

Seldon, John. *Uxor Ebraica*. London, 1646.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

CHAPTER 2

SCRIPTURAL PERSPECTIVE ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

I. Issues Concerning Divorce and Remarriage

A. What our denominational heritage has said about marriage

There has been a general consensus among Reformed believers regarding the nature and purpose of marriage. It is reflected in this statement of the RPCES General Synod Minutes of May 18, 1973:

"Marriage is the unique one-flesh relationship of a man and woman joined together by God in a union that He wills to be both permanent and exclusive, binding the couple to each other in a life-long companionship of common life and conjugal love. (Gen. 2:23-24, Matt. 19:4-8, Rom. 7:2-3)."¹

Scripture uses covenantal language to describe marriage: "The Lord has been witness between you and the wife of your youth to whom you have been faithless, although she is your companion and your wife by covenant" (Mal. 2:14; cf. Prov. 2:17). When Scripture says that a man shall "cleave" to his wife (Gen. 2:24), it is using a covenantal term used elsewhere to express the way the Israelites were to cleave with affection and loyalty to the Lord (Deut. 10:20; 11:22; 13:4; 30:20; Josh. 22:5; 23:8). Marriage is often used as an analogy in the Old Testament of God's covenant relation with Israel and in the New Testament of Christ's relationship with the Church. This covenantal relation between man and woman was intended by God to be loving, loyal and permanent.

Consequently, according to those same General Synod minutes: "It is the duty of husband and wife to maintain the unity and integrity of their marriage of cohabitation and coition. (Cf. Larger Catechism, Q.138). Should separation occur, reconciliation is to be sought. (I Cor. 7:10-11)."²

B. What our denominational heritage has said about divorce and remarriage

In light of our view of marriage, it seems incongruous to talk about divorce and remarriage. Nevertheless, most of us would likely agree with most, if not all, of this statement of the General Synod Minutes:

"Divorce is therefore always an abnormality arising out of human sinfulness. It was tolerated in the civil legislation of the Old Testament, but the Mosaic provision was given only 'for the hardness of your hearts.' (Deut. 24:1-4, Matt. 19:3-8). The civil

¹ "Report of Study Committee on Divorce and Remarriage," Documents of Synod: Study Papers and Actions of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod - 1965-1982, Paul R. Gilchrist, ed., New Castle, 1982, p.200.

² *Ibid.*

APPENDICES

legislation took into account in this matter the insubordination to the will of God characteristic of unbelieving Israel.

"In the New Testament Jesus calls his people to faithfulness to the original will of God for marriage as expressed in the creation ordinance. (Matt. 5:31, 32, 19:3-8). The apostle Paul presses this teaching of our Lord upon the early Christian community, (I Cor. 7:10-11). The original ideal of marriage is to be maintained by the people of God in this age of the fullness of God's saving blessing.

"This is not to say that divorce is never sanctioned in the New Testament. But it is only sanctioned in circumstances of grave infidelity -- adultery and willful, irremediable desertion (Matt. 5:32, 19:9; I Cor. 7:15. Cf. Confession of Faith, XXIV, v-vi). These are definitive actions that strike the exclusiveness of the marriage bond, malicious desertion its permanence. Both radically affect the one-flesh union and so provide 'cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage.

"The 'innocent party' [i.e., offended party] in such circumstances is free to remarry...Scripture does not forbid the remarriage of the 'guilty party' in such cases. Where there is genuine conversion, evidenced by sincere and heart-felt repentance and faith in Christ, the church, after providing pastoral counseling and instruction in the biblical teaching concerning marriage, may approve remarriage in the Lord."³

C. What views may be found today within the evangelical-reformed community regarding divorce and remarriage

The above paragraphs taken from the RPCES General Synod Minutes of 1973 represent the consensus of our tradition on the questions of divorce and remarriage. However, in our day a variety of views have presented themselves and may be grouped in the following way.

1. No divorce, no remarriage

Some believers argue that there are no legitimate divorces at all and only death dissolves the marriage bond. The exception clause in Matthew is characteristically interpreted in one of two ways.

View #1: It refers to premarital unchastity during betrothal. If the betrothed proved unfaithful during that period or was discovered on the first night of marriage not to be a virgin, then the contract could be broken. (Cf. J. Dwight Pentecost, J.M. Boice).⁴

View #2: It refers to unlawful incestuous marriages, i.e., marriages within the prohibited degrees as proscribed in Leviticus 18:6-18. (Cf. Laney, C.C. Ryrie).⁵

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 200-201.

⁴ J. Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, Grand Rapids., 1981, pp. 354-358. J. M. Boice, "The Biblical View of Divorce," *Eternity*, Dec. 1970, pp.19-21.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Gordon Wenham holds a slight variation of this view. Jesus' exception clause permitted divorce in the sense of separation, but marriage is a permanent relationship whether we get a divorce or not. In God's eyes a divorced person is still married to the former spouse. Thus remarriage following divorce for any reason constitutes adultery. The only option for a divorced person is to be reconciled or to remain single.⁶ Common to all these views is the assumption that remarriage after divorce is not allowed.

2. Strictly limited grounds for divorce, and for remarriage

The general consensus among Reformed believers is the view that the Bible neither condones nor commands divorce, but rather permits and regulates divorce due to sin. However, a person can divorce only for adultery and separation of an unbelieving spouse. In the words of the Westminster Confession of Faith: "...nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the church or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage" (24:6).⁷

John Stott and John Murray are among those who insist that such permission is given only in negative and reluctant terms. According to Stott:

"Only if a person divorces his partner on the ground of marital unfaithfulness is his remarriage not adulterous. Only if the unbeliever insists on leaving is the believer not bound."⁸

Common to all those who hold this view is the idea that these same limited grounds would be legitimate for remarriage too.

3. Broader grounds for divorce, and for remarriage

Still other believers hold the view that the major verses under question, Matthew 19 and I Corinthians 7, should be interpreted with more latitude.

- a. David Atkinson holds that there are sins other than fornication which may by their gross and persistent nature break the marriage covenant just as much as fornication, and are therefore grounds for divorce.⁹

⁵ J. Carl Laney, *The Divorce Myth: A Biblical Examination of Divorce and Remarriage*, Minneapolis, 1981, pp. 71-78. C. C. Ryrie, *The Place of Women in the Church*, New York, 1958, pp. 43-48. See also William A. Heth and Gordon J. Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce: The Problem with the Evangelical Consensus*, Nashville, 1984, pp. 154-160.

⁶ Gordon Wenham, *The Biblical View of Marriage and Divorce*, No. 3, *New Testament Teaching*, "Third Way", London, Nov. 17, 1977, pp. 7-9.

⁷ *The Confession of Faith*, Brevard, North Carolina, 1983, p. 69. (Chapter 24.6).

⁸ John Stott, *Involvement, Vol. 2, Social and Sexual Relationships in the Modern World*, Old Tappan, NJ, 1985, p. 177. Cf. John Murray, *Divorce*, Philadelphia, 1961, pp. 20-21.

⁹ David Atkinson, *To Have and To Hold*, Grand Rapids, 1979, Chapter 5, pp. 134 ff.

APPENDICES

- b. Greg Bahnsen argues that *porneia* (fornication) in Matthew 19 involves more than sexual immorality; it should be interpreted as including any violations of the essential commitments of the marriage covenant, including spousal abuse or the refusal to provide protection and sustenance necessary for daily living.¹⁰
- c. David Clowney believes that the New Testament writers were not intending to give us an exhaustive list of exceptions for divorce; we should view the texts on divorce as examples of breaking the marriage covenant and seek to apply the examples to particular situations such as persistent physical abuse, attempts on the life of a spouse, and so forth.¹¹

These views differ from the liberal Protestant view of "no fault" divorce, or divorce on merely humanistic grounds such as "incompatibility." As Clowney writes: "To seek to multiply such exceptions would be perverse, and precisely contrary to the intention of the Lord and his apostles."¹² Common to these views is the idea that appropriate grounds for divorce would allow for remarriage.

D. Are we to understand that Scripture indeed allows for divorce?

1. Divorce was permitted in Scripture

It must be conceded, writes John Murray, that divorce was practiced. Such practice is found in many passages of Scripture (Ex. 21:10-11; Lev. 21:7, 14; 22:13; Nu. 30:9(10); Deut. 22:19, 29; 24:1-4; cf. Ezra 9-10; Neh. 9:2, 13:23ff; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:1; Ez 44:22), and under certain circumstances proves to be "permanently valid and inviolable...It is also conceded that divorce was permitted or tolerated" and "the penalty of civil or ecclesiastical ostracism was not attached to it." But it is very necessary to distinguish, continues Murray, "between this sufferance or toleration, on the one hand, and divine approval or sanction, on the other...Permission, sufferance, toleration was granted. But underlying this very notion is the idea of wrong."¹³

To say that God intended for marriage never to be broken does not mean that the marriage union is unbreakable. In some instances, God breaks it by death. For Paul specifically says that the surviving spouse is free to remarry again (I Cor. 7:39, cf. Rom. 7:2f.). Moreover, younger widows are even encouraged to do so (I Tim. 5:14; cf. I Cor. 7:8-9).

¹⁰ Greg Bahnsen, "Theses of Divorce and Spousal Abuse," Unpublished paper.

¹¹ David Clowney, "An argument for the conclusion that abuse could provide biblically legitimate grounds for divorce," Unpublished paper.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Murray, *Divorce*, pp. 8-9.

2. Divorce dissolved a marriage in Scripture

That divorce was more than a separation in Scripture is noted by Charles Hodge:

"Divorce is not a mere separation...Divorce annuls the marriage contract so that the parties are no longer man and wife. They stand henceforth to each other in the same relation as they were before marriage."¹⁴

A study of the terms for divorce in Scripture support the view that divorce is not merely a separation. The Old Testament term for divorce which occurs in the phrase "bill of divorce" (Deut. 24; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:8) means "to cut off, to hew off" (*kerithuth*). Other Old Testament words are used which mean to "expel, put away" (*garash*) or to "dismiss, send away, let go, put away" (*shalach*). The New Testament has similar words in the Greek which mean the same thing: "to set free, release, dismiss, send away" (*apoluo*), "to separate, divide" (*chorizo*), and "to let go, send away" (*aphiemi*). The notion of severance or of being cut off is implied within the contextual use of these terms, and it would be difficult to argue that the terms do not connote a total break in marital obligations.

A strong argument may be made as well from customs in Jesus' day. Christ allowed for a bill of divorce to be given in the case of *porneia*. The essential text of such a bill of divorce recorded in the Mishnah is, "Lo, thou art free to marry any man." The Mishnah goes on to record the wording of Rabbi Judah: "Let this be from me thy writ of divorce and letter of dismissal and deed of liberation, that thou mayest marry whatsoever man thou wilt."¹⁵ Whether or not this was the divorce bill text envisioned by Deuteronomy 24:1 is not germane. Christ was commenting on current custom and application of that law. In other words, in Jesus' day, divorce carried with it the right to remarriage, and that would have been understood in their discussions.

It is clearly God's will that marriage be permanent. But it is obviously possible that marriage can be broken. Loraine Boettner clarifies this for us by providing a delightful illustration apparently written by Dr. Geerhardus Vos:

"We may have on our parlor table a beautiful and costly vase. It ought to be handled carefully. It ought not to be broken. It was not made to be smashed; it was made to exist as a thing of beauty and grace. But it is not impossible to break it. And if a member of the family breaks it through carelessness, or in a fit of temper smashes it deliberately, there is nothing to do but sweep up the broken fragments and dispose of them. We will not say, 'This vase was not intended to be broken; therefore it is impossible to break it; the vase is unbreakable; therefore in spite of the fact that it lies in shattered fragments on the floor, we will not throw it away; we will keep it forever.' No one would say that about a broken vase; yet that is substantially the argument of those who say that the marriage bond is 'indissoluble' and unbreakable."¹⁶

¹⁴ Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. III, London, 1961, p. 391.

¹⁵ Gittin 9:3.

APPENDICES

E. Does the evidence that divorce ends marriage mean that God looks favorably at divorce?

Scripture speaks unmistakably about God's repugnance at divorce. One passage is quite clear about this.

Malachi 2:13-16

13) "And this is another thing you do: you cover the altar of the LORD with tears, with weeping and with groaning, because He no longer regards the offering or accepts it with favor from your hand. 14) Yet you say, 'For what reason?' Because the LORD has been a witness between you and the wife of your youth, against whom you have dealt treacherously, though she is your companion and your wife by covenant.

15) But not one has done so who has a remnant of the Spirit. And what did that one do while he was seeking a godly offspring? Take heed then, to your spirit, and let no one deal treacherously against the wife of your youth.

16) 'For I hate divorce,' says the LORD, the God of Israel, 'and him who covers his garment with wrong,' says the LORD of hosts. 'So take heed to your spirit, that you do not deal treacherously.'"

In this profound passage, Malachi is pointing out one of the reasons why God has withheld His blessing from Israel. Skillfully using a question-and-answer method, Malachi points out that the people were weeping and wailing at God's altar because He was no longer responding to them. Yet the people ask, "Why doesn't God respond?" Malachi is not afraid to point his finger at the cause: "Because the LORD has been a witness between you and the wife of your youth, against whom you have dealt treacherously..." (In verses 10-12, Malachi had just accused them of marrying foreign women. Apparently they were doing so by divorcing their wives, a practice not unknown to Christians today.)

Notice how God calls their divorces "dealing treacherously," a verb which is repeated three times in these four verses. Twice he refers to the divorced woman as "the wife of thy youth," appealing no doubt to the heart of the husbands. Malachi goes on to refer to the first wife as "your companion and your wife by covenant." The term companion does not simply refer to a 'partner' or 'associate,' terms which denote a rather loose relationship. Rather, it is an intense term meaning 'knit together' and connotes an unusually close joining or bonding. It fits in beautifully with the picture of Genesis 2:24, and the term "Covenant of Companionship" describes perfectly the marriage covenant.

Malachi then reminds them that what they have done in putting away their wives is contrary to what would be done by the true Israelite who has the remnant of the Spirit. So, "take heed then, to your spirit, and let no one deal treacherously against the wife of your youth."

Then come those powerful words, "For I hate divorce," which is the translation of the NASV. There is no doubt that God hates divorce, for the entire context of this passage

16 Loraine Boettner, *Divorce*, Nutley, NJ, 1972, p. 13.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

conveys the truth that the LORD views it as an act of treachery. But there is a major problem of translation with this verse, a problem the NASV is aware of, for a marginal note reads: "Lit., He hates." A more straightforward translation of the Hebrew, confirmed by the LXX, reads:

"If [anyone] hating [his wife] divorces [her],
Says the LORD God of Israel,
Then violence covers his garment,
Says the LORD of hosts."

Dr. David C. Jones makes a most compelling case for this translation, based on a careful analysis of both the Hebrew and the Greek LXX. Does this mean that God does not hate divorce? Not at all, for as Dr. Jones points out in his concluding paragraph:

"Finally, so far from weakening the Lord's protest against marital infidelity, the prophetic word against divorce is rendered more forceful by being more definite. Divorce for 'hatred' is a radical breach of fidelity; it is 'violence' against the companion to whom one has been joined in marriage. It therefore stands condemned by the God of justice, mercy, and truth."¹⁷

II. Consideration of Major Scripture Passages

As we begin our exposition of Scripture, we should remember that every passage becomes a battle ground for every view. Our purpose will be in each passage first to provide a clear explanation of what the passage teaches, and second to show how different views interpret that passage.

A. Deuteronomy 24:1-4

1) "When a man takes a wife and marries her, and it happens that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some indecency in her, and he writes her a certificate of divorce and puts it in her hand and sends her out from his house, 2) and she leaves his house and goes and becomes another man's wife, 3) and if the latter husband turns against her and writes her a certificate of divorce and puts it in her hand and sends her out of his house, or if the latter husband dies who took her to be his wife, 4) then her former husband who sent her away is not allowed to take her again to be his wife, since she has been defiled; for that is an abomination before the Lord, and you shall not bring sin on the land which the Lord your God gives you as an inheritance."

1. Is Moses giving a command to divorce?

Many assume the KJV translation of verse 1, "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she finds no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement..." This translation makes it sound like Moses is commanding divorce.

¹⁷ David C. Jones, "Malachi on Divorce," *Presbyterian: Covenant Seminary Review*, 15 (1989), pp.1-6.

APPENDICES

However, that is not the best translation. A careful analysis of the intended structure of this lengthy sentence in Hebrew is crucial for a proper understanding. The first three verses are all part of a compound protasis (or conditional part of the sentence), while the fourth verse contains the apodosis (or consequence). In other words, we should understand the passage in this way: "If a man divorces his wife, and if he gives her a certificate, and if she leaves and remarries, and if her second husband divorces her or dies, **then** her first husband may not marry her again." Thus we learn:

Lesson #1: Moses is not instituting divorce in this passage. He deals only indirectly with divorce and remarriage, and his main purpose is to prohibit the reunion of partners after divorce and remarriage has taken place.

Lesson #2: Deuteronomy is in some sense trying to regulate divorce in what appears to be a situation which has gotten out of hand. Divorce appears as an established custom which is neither commanded nor condoned in this passage.

This is in agreement with the rest of Mosaic Law. Mosaic Law takes the custom of divorce for granted (Lev. 21:7, 14; 22:13; Nu. 30:9; Dt. 22:19, 29); it does not institute divorce, but regulates it to limit and preclude its abuse. In two cases in Scripture, the right of divorce for the offended spouse is withheld, viz. where a man slanders his newly-married wife as unchaste, or seduces her before marriage (Dt. 22:19, 29).

2. What does the phrase "some indecency" mean?

Does "some indecency" refer merely to a personal dislike of the husband, or to a biblically shameful act justifying the permission for a divorce? Can a word study give us an exact nuance on which we can all agree?

The Hebrew words are *erwath dabar*. They are translated in the KJV as "some uncleanness," and in the NIV as "something indecent." *Erwath* is commonly translated "nakedness," and is used in Old Testament contexts of shameful exposure, indecency, or improper behavior having to do with sex.¹⁸ *Dabar* is simply translated as "something" or "thing" in this context. Hence, the literal translation would be "nakedness of the thing."

The term *erwath* used alone clearly had a prominent sexual nuance. That illicit sexual sin is intimated in Deut. 24 seems probable due to two Old Testament passages which use Deut. 24:1-4 as a basis. The first passage is Jeremiah 3:1ff:

"God says, If a husband divorces his wife, and she goes from him, and belongs to another man, will he still return to her? Will not that land be completely polluted? But you are a harlot with many lovers; yet you turn to Me, declares the Lord...[Jeremiah 3:8-9 expands]...And I saw that for all the adulteries of faithless Israel, I had sent her away and given her a writ of divorce, yet her treacherous sister Judah did not fear; but she went and was a harlot also. And it came about because

18 F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1962, p. 789.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

of the lightness of her harlotry, that she polluted the land and committed adultery with stones and trees."

The second passage is Isaiah 50:1, where we read:

"Thus says the Lord, Where is the certificate of divorce, by which I have sent your mother away? Or to whom of My creditors did I sell you? Behold, you were sold for your iniquities, and for your transgressions your mother was sent away." Comparing these passages with Deut. 24, the "indecentcy" would appear to be a heinous sin, one which would involve sexual immorality.

However, the uses of *erwath* in Scripture are not limited to sexual immorality. It can also refer to perversity (I Sam. 20:30), to a dishonor for authority (Ezra 4:14), and to public shame (Isa. 20:4). The exact phrase *erwath dabar* occurs elsewhere only in Deut. 23:14 where it refers to human excrement left in Israel's camp, an uncleanness that would repulse God.

This broader use of *erwath* introduces us to a major problem in the divorce and remarriage controversy. It is the same problem we face when we attempt to define the Greek term *porneia* in Jesus' exception clause (Matt. 19:9). It is very difficult to come to a consensus on the precise distinction or subtlety of "some indecentcy."

It was difficult in Jesus' day. The school of Shammai regarded it as adultery, whereas the school of Hillel saw it as referring to anything that displeased the husband. Likewise, today, some wish to attribute a narrower, and others a more broad, meaning to *erwath dabar*. This divergence of views may be seen by comparing prominent current interpretations of Deuteronomy 24:1-4.

3. Modern interpreters differ

William A. Heth and Gordon J. Wenham in their book, *Jesus and Divorce*, contend that the first three verses are really secondary to the main thrust of the passage which is verse four. Knowing the precise nuances of *erwath dabar* is not that important. The fact that the first husband legally divorced his wife is acknowledged and the second marriage is also considered legal. The crux of the law is that the wife's remarriage to her first husband is forbidden! Why? Because the "one-flesh" bond of their first marriage was never really dissolved by their legal divorce and remarriage. Consequently, were the wife to remarry her first husband, she would have committed a form of incest, which in Lev. 18 we are told is an abomination to the Lord and defiles the land. Therefore, conclude Heth and Wenham, Deut. 24 does not allow a "dissolution divorce" in which remarriage can take place.¹⁹

Jay Adams in his book, *Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage in the Bible*, holds that Deut. 24:1-3 (the protasis) tells of a wife who finds "no favor" in her husband's eyes because of "some indecentcy" he finds in her. So the husband hands her a bill of divorce, going through a genuine divorce proceeding which in effect annulled her marriage obligations to him and set her free to marry another man, which she does. Yet the text goes on to say that

¹⁹ Heth and Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce*, pp. 106-111.

APPENDICES

she cannot remarry her first husband because she has been "defiled" and it is an abomination to the Lord and would bring sin on the land. Clearly, the judgmental language, used elsewhere in such contexts as Lev. 18, supposes gross sexual sins among the people. She was "defiled" apparently due to her entrance into the second marriage, not wrong in itself, but wrong when following a bad divorce. Why was it a bad divorce? Because "some indecency" was interpreted broadly by the husband and the divorce was not biblically justified.²⁰

John Murray in his book, *Divorce*, begins his discussion of the meaning of "some indecency" by saying: "It has to be admitted that it is exceedingly difficult if not precarious to be certain as to what the 'unseemly thing' really was." He concludes that there was no evidence to show that in Deut. 24 it refers to adultery or an act of sexual uncleanness. On the other hand, he is not willing to agree with Hillel's loose interpretation. Murray concludes that it refers to something very shameful: "While falling short of illicit sexual intercourse it may well be that the indecency consisted in some kind of shameful conduct connected with sex life. Or it may have been some other kind of impropriety worthy of censure on the part of the husband."²¹

This variety of interpretation reminds us that precious little can be gained from a study of Deut. 24:1-4. It was precisely because of its vagueness that it was being debated in Jesus' day. In any case, what we have here is the regulation of divorce, not its institution or encouragement. Moreover, the broad weight of the evidence seems to favor a generally sexual connotation for *erwath dabar*, although it is very difficult to conclude with any certainty. We can't imagine that anyone's view is going to rest on the interpretation of this particular passage. The real issue centers on an interpretation of the New Testament passages.

Three relevant principles *can* be derived from this passage however. First, it establishes the practice of making divorces official and legal instead of leaving them *de facto*. Second, it expresses God's desire that a woman be protected from being pulled back and forth by an impulsive husband. Third, it discourages divorce and especially the finalization of divorce *via* remarriage by making it unlawful to return to one's original spouse after remarriage.

4. Proceeding to the New Testament passages

All three synoptics provide us with Jesus' own teaching on marriage, divorce and remarriage. The passages vary in precise detail, but they do not present contradictory views of what Jesus taught. They complement each other, and provide a broader picture of what Jesus taught than if we had only one passage.

We will first examine Matthew 5:31-32, and then Luke 16:18. Matthew 19:3-9 and Mark 10:2-11 will be considered jointly. Once we have looked at all the passages in the Gospels, we will return to consider the exception clauses in Matthew and the meaning of *porneia* (sexual immorality). Then we will proceed on to consider 1 Corinthians 7.

²⁰ Jay E. Adams, *Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage in the Bible*, Grand Rapids, 1980, pp. 60-69.

²¹ John Murray, *Divorce*, pp. 9-16.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

B. Matthew 5:31-32

31) "And it was said, 'whoever divorces his wife, let him give her a certificate of dismissal;' 32) but I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife except for the cause of unchastity, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery."

1. The rabbinic perversion of Deuteronomy 24

Jesus is not quoting Deuteronomy 24 verbatim, but is stating a misleading abbreviation or distortion of that passage in the oral teaching of the Pharisees. This oral teaching gives the impression that divorce was readily permissible; all one had to do was to go through the formality of handing over a certificate of divorce. (Jewish sources confirm that divorce was relatively easy to obtain.)

It seems likely that Jesus is quoting the teaching of the school of Hillel, that school which taught a more lax view of divorce. For them, marriage was viewed as a contract that could be broken. By focusing on the steps taken in obtaining a divorce, they had sidestepped the intent of the law, that divorce for unwarranted reasons is wrong.

2. Jesus' correction of the rabbinic perversion

Jesus responds to the distorted view of the rabbis by first saying that "*everyone who divorces his wife except for the cause of unchastity makes her commit adultery...*" Then he adds, "*and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.*" Concerning his response, we make these observations.

First, there is the presence of an exception clause, "*except for the cause of unchastity.*" Because this clause is at the center of debate, we have reserved for a later section the discussion of what it means and how it is to be applied. However, at present we may point out the obvious, that if a man divorces his wife "for the cause of unchastity," he is not thereby "making her commit adultery." For she has already done so and he is free from that charge.

Second, because the verb "to commit adultery" is an aorist passive infinitive, some scholars prefer to interpret the clause "stigmatizes her as an adulteress" (even though it is not so).²² But that view is to be rejected. The NIV "causes her to become an adulteress," or the NASV "makes her commit adultery" (which we are using) provides a more natural translation. The aorist passive form serves simply to accent the fact that she is the victim.

Third, the question naturally arises, "How is the divorced wife caused to commit adultery?" By divorcing his wife, the man is virtually forcing her to be remarried. The plight of the divorced wife was often desperate in Jesus' day, and divorce would inevitably lead to remarriage if there was any possibility. But how would that be called adultery? The clear

²² For example, R. C. H. Lenski, *Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel*, Columbus, 1932, pp. 226 ff. For an extensive analysis of the use of the verb *moicheo* (to commit adultery) in this passage, see John Murray, *Divorce*, p. 21, n. 2.

APPENDICES

implication is that the wife would be having sexual relations with a person other than the one with whom she ought to be having sex. It would constitute marital unfaithfulness. While the divorce from a human point of view did break the former marital obligations, from God's point of view it never should have happened. In other words, when there is no biblical warrant to be in a divorced state, those who bring about that divorce are causing their partners to commit adultery.

Fourth, the emphasis of Jesus' statement, therefore, is on the guilt of the husband who divorces his wife for an unbiblical reason. For he is being held responsible for creating a situation in which she cannot remarry without committing adultery. Some suppose that the real problem was not the divorce itself, but that to which the divorce led, the remarriage of the wife. But this text underlines the husband's responsibility for the act. He victimizes her, and causes her to be an adulteress. The stigma she bears and the position into which she is placed have been imposed on her by the sin of the husband who initiates and executes the divorce. (Today, wives initiate divorces regularly, and the same principle applies to them as well.)

Fifth, Jesus goes on to say that "*whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.*" Jesus' words indicate what happens when humans break up a marriage without the warrant of the exception clause. His words are related to that fact alone and do not deal with the status of the divorced woman when her previous husband remarries (see elsewhere in our study).

Sixth, we simply point out that the emphasis in this text should not be on the fact that there is an exception, but rather that there is only one exception. There is only one legitimate reason why the husband may be considered as not sinning by putting away his wife. As John Murray points out, "Preoccupation with the one exception should never be permitted to obscure the force of the negation of all others."²³ Nor are we led to believe that a husband is "obliged" to divorce his wife in the case of sexual immorality. All that the text says is that if he does divorce her for that reason, he is not implicated in the sin of causing her to commit adultery.

3. Interpretations influenced by the context of Matthew 5, the Sermon on the Mount

Some have argued that, because of the immediate context of the Sermon on the Mount, our text is a "hard saying" of Jesus, and as such is to be understood as "haggadic argumentation" - a statement intended to shock Jews out of their complacency over divorce, and not as halakic, prescriptive instruction. For example, just prior to this passage in Matt. 5:29, Jesus talks about plucking out the right eye that causes one to sin. That was not meant to be taken as a literal legal prescription, they say, but as a deliberately shocking statement intended to challenge existing attitudes. Then they insist that the same is true of the divorce statement.²⁴

²³ John Murray, *Divorce*, p. 21.

²⁴ For example, M. J. Down, "The Sayings of Jesus About Marriage and Divorce," *Expository Times*, 95.11 (1984), p. 333.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Our response is that although Jesus was concerned about the spirit of the law in Matthew 5, he clearly seems to be setting his own authoritative commentary and guidelines over against the legal prescription of the oral tradition. He obviously desires not just to affect their attitudes, but also to govern their external behavior. He was discouraging divorce in the strongest terms as a specific form of behavior.

Others hold that, since Jesus' statement on divorce occurs in the Sermon on the Mount, we must interpret it as being more stringent than the views of the scribes and Pharisees. For Jesus had said, "... unless your righteousness surpasses that of the scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt 5:20). They argue that if Jesus were allowing for remarriage after divorce for adultery, then Jesus "would be siding with the conservative school of Shammai which allowed divorce only in the case of adultery," and, if so, then "Jesus' teaching did not rise above that of Shammai and the Pharisees, contrary to His usual pattern...[as] Christ customarily rebuked the superficiality of the Pharisees with His own more stringent interpretation of the Law."²⁵ According to this point of view, therefore, Jesus' teaching was more stringent by not allowing for remarriage.

In response, we would point out that Jesus' statement that their righteousness must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees is not necessarily taken to mean that their standards must in every instance be more stringent. As David Jones notes:

"Jesus' interpretation of the Law is not invariably more stringent than that of the Pharisees. Indeed, sometimes the opposite is the case. Responding to the Pharisees' stringent interpretation of the fourth commandment, Jesus twice reproves them for failure to incorporate into their hermeneutic the principle of Hosea 6:6: 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice' (Mt. 9:13, 12:7)...Rigorous standards are not necessarily righteous; it is not godly to be more strict than God."²⁶

Moreover, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus is **not** saying that the great concern the Pharisees displayed for the details of observance was okay as far as it went, it just didn't go far enough; therefore they must supplement it by going further. Rather, as John Murray explains in his book *Principles of Conduct*:

"What Jesus is saying is that the righteousness of the scribes, notwithstanding its meticulous adherence to the minutiae, does not begin to qualify for the kingdom of heaven; it has no affinity with the demands of the kingdom of heaven. This is so not because the kingdom of heaven does not demand righteousness, not because it is indifferent to the minutiae of divine prescription, but because the demands of the kingdom of heaven are far greater than anything that ever enters into the conception of the scribes and Pharisees. They have not begun to reckon with the demands of the kingdom of heaven. Paradoxically, it was their concern for detail that led them

²⁵ Laney, *The Divorce Myth*, pp. 67-68.

²⁶ David C. Jones, in his paper submitted to the Eighteenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America as part of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage, entitled, "The Westminster Confession on Divorce and Remarriage," p. 25.

APPENDICES

to miss the whole genius of kingdom righteousness; the detail was not the detail of divine prescription. They made void the law of God by their own traditions."²⁷

Murray concludes that "the righteousness that exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees is therefore that of character and behavior," not that of extending the details.²⁸

C. Luke 16:17-18

17) "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one stroke of a letter of the Law to fail. 18) Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery; and he who marries one who is divorced from a husband commits adultery."

The context of Luke 16:18 is similar to that of Matthew 5:32. Jesus has just charged the Pharisees with hypocrisy, as those "who justify yourselves in the sight of men, but God knows your hearts..."(v.15). He states that not even one stroke of the Law will fail (v.17), implying this to be the case in spite of their lax attitudes to the Law. Then he applies this to their view of divorce.

The divorce text of Luke 16:18 is quite similar to that of Matt. 5:32, except that whereas the latter passage reads "everyone who divorces his wife except for the cause of unchastity makes her commit adultery," Luke reads "everyone who divorces his wife and marries another (*heteros*) commits adultery." Matthew speaks only of a divorce which causes the wife to commit adultery, but Luke speaks of a man divorcing and remarrying thereby himself committing adultery. Also, Luke omits the exception clause.

How do we understand the differences? First, we do not believe Jesus is contradicting himself. Luke 16:18 serves to clarify and reinforce Jesus' teaching in Matt. 5:32. According to Matt. 5:32, when a man divorces his wife but does not remarry, he is not committing adultery, but he is to be held accountable for causing his wife to commit adultery if she remarries. But in Luke 16:18, if a husband divorces his wife and then remarries, he is committing adultery.

Apparently divorce in Jesus' day was an act which frequently had as its object the removal of the wife to make room for another woman. This was the problem Moses was facing in Deut. 24 (cf. Ex. 34:11-16; Deut. 7:1-5), Ezra was facing in Ezra 9-10 (cf. Neh. 10:30; 13:23-30), and Malachi was facing in Mal. 2:10-17. It is at the heart of the problem we face today. In divorcing their wives to make room for others, they had made the Law of God void.

But how can Christ's teachings in Luke and in Matthew be reconciled when Matthew includes the exception clause but Luke does not? This should not be seen as a great difficulty. It is a regular feature of ethical commands or doctrinal pronouncements in the Scripture to be stated in a general form which sounds absolute, taken in and of itself, but

²⁷ John Murray, *Principles of Conduct*, Grand Rapids, 1978, pp. 155.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 156

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

which are modified or qualified in some way in another, more detailed, consideration of the same subject. For example, the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" is qualified in many ways in other places of the law (e.g. the commands concerning capital punishment and war); the fourth commandment prohibiting work on the Sabbath day is also qualified (see Mat. 12:1-5); Jesus' instruction concerning prayer, "Whatever you ask in My name, I will do it" (John 14:13-14) is qualified elsewhere in several ways (e.g. I John 5:14); Paul's command not to do anything that might make men stumble (I Cor. 10:32-33) is qualified by Jesus' example with the Pharisees (Mat. 12:1-14; Luke 13:10-17; 14:1-6); the commands to obey parents and civil authorities are qualified as well (Acts 5:29). Thus the fact that Jesus' command is absolute in Luke 16 should not prevent us from admitting the qualifications He places on His instructions when He gives them in Mat. 5 and 19."

D. Matthew 19:3-9 [Mark 10:2-11]

3) "And some Pharisees came to Him, testing Him, and saying, 'Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any cause at all?' 4) And He answered and said, 'Have you not read, that He who created them from the beginning MADE THEM MALE AND FEMALE, 5) and said FOR THIS CAUSE A MAN SHALL LEAVE HIS FATHER AND MOTHER, AND SHALL CLEAVE TO HIS WIFE; AND THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH? 6) Consequently they are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let no man separate.' 7) They said to Him, 'Why then did Moses command to give her a certificate and divorce her?' He said to them, 'Because of your hardness of heart, Moses permitted you to divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been this way. 9) And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for immorality, and marries another commits adultery.'"

There is no need to consider Matthew 19 and Mark 10 separately. The primary phrase in question, "except for immorality," is found in Matt. 19:9 and is omitted in Mark. Other differences between the two passages are secondary and do not demand separate analyses.²⁹ Therefore we have chosen simply to consider the exception clause in its Matthean context.

1. The context of Matthew 19:3-8

When the Pharisees asked Jesus, "*Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any cause?*", they were attempting to entrap him.³⁰ In the process, however, they revealed some assumptions of their own. By beginning with "Is it lawful," they revealed that they viewed marriage and divorce merely as a matter of legislation. By ending their question, "for any cause," they betrayed a lax approach to divorce, an approach more in keeping with the school of Hillel. Josephus, himself a divorcee and a Pharisee, writes:

²⁹ For a discussion of the differences, cf. David Atkinson, *To Have and To Hold*, pp. 110-111.

³⁰ The question the Pharisees asked was a bit of rabbinic casuistry. If Jesus sided with Hillel, the Pharisees could charge Jesus with moral laxity. If he sided with Shammai, Jesus could be reproached for his own friendly treatment of sinners, it could be too strict for many of his followers, and his statement could be given to Herod who had imprisoned John the Baptist for the same views. If Jesus should reject both and declare himself as totally against divorce, they could charge him with contradicting the Law of Moses (i.e., Deut. 24).

APPENDICES

"He that desires to be divorced from his wife for any cause whatsoever, (**and many such causes happen among men,**) let him in writing give assurance that he never will use her as his wife any more, for this means she may be at liberty to marry another husband, although before this bill of deliverance be given she is not to be permitted to do so."³¹ (Bold print, ours.)

These are the same assumptions we find so prevalent in today's world.

Jesus responded by asking incredulously if they had not read Genesis 1:27 and 2:24. These verses, Jesus said, show that God joined (literally, "yoked together") the two spouses, that they are now one flesh, and therefore no one should be party to their separation lest he be found guilty of rebelling against God.

The Pharisees then challenged him: "*Why then did Moses command to give her a certificate and divorce her?*" If God's best is "no divorce," why did Moses provide for divorce? And if Moses provided for divorce, does that not conflict with what Jesus had just said?

Jesus' reply is of paramount importance as he explains the connection between Moses' concession following the Fall and God's intention for marriage in Creation. "*For the hardness of your heart Moses permitted you to divorce your wives, but from the beginning it was not so.*" Two contrasts of view may be discerned in this saying of Jesus.

First, whereas the Pharisees alleged that Moses commanded (*eneteilato*) divorce, Jesus said Moses permitted (*epetrepsen*).³² Permission denotes allowance or sufferance without in the least implying approval or command. The Pharisees chose to view this divine concession as divine approval and a legal basis of divorce. It suited their purposes. But Jesus said, "from the beginning it was not so."

Second, whereas the Pharisees spoke of grounds for divorce, Jesus said the real culprit was their "hardness of heart" (*sklerokardia*). This is a term often used of Israel's stubbornness and rebellion against the will of God (Cf. Dt. 10:16; Jer. 4:40). Whenever Israel failed to believe and obey God, it was due to their hardness of heart. By implication, according to Jesus, this too is the cause behind divorce. When people fail to believe and obey what God has clearly communicated about marriage in Creation, it is their "hardness of heart" that is at fault.

2. Divorce and remarriage in Matthew 19:9

Jesus concludes by enjoining that whoever divorces his wife for any reason except for immorality and marries another, commits adultery. Setting aside for the moment the

³¹ Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 4, Chapter 8, as published in *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. W. Whiston, Philadelphia, p. 141. For a discussion of the Jewish schools of thought as to what constituted proper grounds to divorce, see David Atkinson, *To Have and To Hold*, pp. 106-110.

³² For an insightful discussion of the supposed discrepancy between Matthew 19:7-8 and Mark 10:3-4 concerning who used the word "permitted," see John Murray, *Divorce*, pp. 43 ff.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

exception clause, if we pull together his teaching from Matthew 5:32; Luke 16:18; and Mark 10:11, we find "all the bases are covered":

Mt. 5:32: a man who divorces his wife makes her to become an adulteress (when she marries again); a man who marries a woman who has been divorced commits adultery

Mt. 19:9: a man who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery;

Mk. 10:11: a man who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her; and a woman who divorces her husband and marries another commits adultery;

Lk. 16:18: a man who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery; a man who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery.

The point is, if a divorce takes place which has no sanction from God, then any new union which follows is an adulterous act, being unlawful. Not only is the act of divorce itself sinful, apart from remarriage, but the act of remarriage after an illegitimate divorce is judged contrary to the will of God. As we have stated above, the reason an unbiblical divorce can cause adultery is that God does not honor such a divorce. Following such a divorce, remarriage constitutes marital unfaithfulness. From God's point of view, they should still be married to their original partner.

Concerning the adultery involved in remarriage following an unbiblical divorce, we understand that the consummation of the new union through intercourse is an adulterous act because it is God's intention that the prior marriage not be broken. This adulterous act, while breaking the old union, establishes a new relationship which must now stand on its own.

3. The exception clause of Matthew 19:9

"And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for immorality, and marries another commits adultery."

The presence of the "exception clause" in Matthew 19:9 has caused endless debate among scholars. The discussion has generally centered around three major questions: the authenticity of the clause as the words of Jesus; the scope of the exception clause; and the meaning of the *porneia* (the Greek term translated "immorality" in the NASV). The first two questions can be handled quickly for our purposes, whereas the third question needs more careful consideration.

a. The authenticity of Jesus' words

Many commentators try to argue that the exception clause is not original with Jesus, and that Matthew or another editor of the Gospel inserted it at a later time. They contend that Jesus would not have allowed for exceptions and would have branded all divorces as contrary to the will of God. After all, they argue, look at the absolute form of Jesus' statements in Mk. 10:11-12 and Lk. 16:18.

As a denomination that believes in the inerrancy of Scripture, we take the position that if the exception clause belongs to the genuine text of Matthew's gospel (and our textual

APPENDICES

apparatus strongly confirms this fact),³³ then it is truly the *logion* of our Lord. Second, its omission by Mark and Luke is not sufficient ground for rejecting it as an authentic saying of Jesus. Their silence could be due to their taking the clause for granted. Both pagan and Jewish culture took adultery as a ground for divorce for granted. It was not in dispute. Third, we reject the notion that God's Word presents us with conflicting views of what Jesus taught, which would be the case if Matthew 19 is set over against Mark 10 and Luke 16. Fourth, the Greek text includes the emphatic "I" (*ego*), "And I say unto you." What follows would naturally all be attributed to Jesus. This was indeed Matthew's intention, and Matthew was there as an eyewitness. For these reasons, the burden of proof rests on those who with critical presuppositions would take these words from Jesus' lips. The exception clause cannot be sidestepped in this way as unimportant for one's interpretation.

It is also interesting to recall in this connection Jeremiah 3:8, where Yahweh is said to divorce Israel for her spiritual adultery (idolatry): "I gave faithless Israel her certificate of divorce and sent her away because of all her adulteries." If God himself can properly divorce his bride because of adultery, then, given Christ's unqualified adherence to the authority of the Old Testament, it seems difficult to conclude that Jesus would not have had similar words on his own lips.

b. The scope of the exception clause

A major debate has revolved around the scope of the exception clause. Does "except for immorality" refer only to divorce, or to both divorce and remarriage in this passage? The Roman Catholic Church, and more recently Heth and Wenham, have held that the phrase refers only to divorce. According to Heth and Wenham:

"The construction of Matthew 19:9 basically indicates that we are dealing with two conditional statements, one that is qualified and one that is unqualified or absolute:

1. A man may not put away his wife **unless** she is guilty of adultery.
2. Whoever marries another after putting away his wife commits adultery. Or, to paraphrase the idea in another way: "Putting away for reasons other than unchastity is forbidden; and remarriage after every divorce is adulterous."³⁴

According to John Murray, the sentence cannot be subdivided in that way. There is only one subject ("whoever"), and one main verb ("commits adultery"), and the ruling thought is of the husband committing adultery because he both divorces and remarries another woman. So the unity and coordination of the entire sentence demands that the exception clause relate to both divorce and remarriage.³⁵

³³ John Murray, *Divorce*, pp. 47-51, deals in depth with the question of textual evidence for the authenticity of these words of Jesus.

³⁴ Heth and Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce*, p. 117.

³⁵ John Murray, *Divorce*, p. 40. Thomas Edgar provides one of the strongest cases against this view of Heth and Wenham, arguing that their view is both grammatically and logically impossible. Edgar argues his case in his contribution to *Divorce and Remarriage: Four Christian Views*, ed. H. Wayne House, "Divorce and Remarriage for Adultery or Desertion," Downers Grove, 1990, pp. 156-162.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

We agree with John Murray. It is difficult, and indeed strained, to restrict the exceptive clause to divorce (*apoluse*) and not extend it also to remarriage (*gamease allen*). It is questionable grammatically to interpret Matthew 19:9 as two conditional statements, as Wenham does. Moreover, the question is logical, not grammatical. Divorce by definition entailed the right to remarry, as we have noted previously; and Jesus is locating the committing of adultery not simply in the act of remarriage, but in the fact that someone has divorced his wife for an inadequate reason and has then remarried.

c. The meaning of *porneia*

The heart of the debate centers around the meaning of *porneia*, often translated fornication. Our first step must be to survey its uses in both the Old and New Testaments.

Porneia and its cognates serve to translate the Hebrew word *zannah* and its cognates. According to the Arndt and Gingrich *Lexicon*, *porneia* may be translated "prostitution, unchastity, fornication," and may be used "of every kind of unlawful sexual intercourse." Examples include the harlotry of a married woman (Hos. 2:2), incest (1 Cor. 5:1), or even homosexuality (Jude 7).³⁶

Of particular importance is the fact that *porneia* (fornication) is on occasion used interchangeably with *moicheia* (adultery; its Hebrew equivalent is *nahaph*). Examples of this can be found in the Greek translation of the Old Testament in the parallel clauses of Hosea 2:2, and in Jeremiah 3:1, 2, 6, 8 where a married adulteress is divorced because of her fornication. In Ezekiel 23, God tells the story of two women who committed fornication both before and after marriage; in this extended passage fornication is clearly used to speak both of sexual sin leading to adultery, and of adultery as its effect. That *porneia* can refer to adultery on the part of a married spouse is best seen in a quotation from the apocryphal Sirach 23:22,23: "So it is with a woman who leaves her husband and provides an heir by a stranger (*porneia*)."

However, even though these two terms may be used interchangeably, they are not to be equated. Otherwise, why the two terms, both in Hebrew and Greek? Why would they be carefully distinguished in verses such as Hebrews 13:4b ("...for fornicators and adulterers God will judge") and Matthew 15:19 ("For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications...")? If the two terms are to be distinguished, how do they differ?

The answer is: whereas adultery refers to the marital unfaithfulness, fornication is broader and can encompass all sexual sin including adultery. As the logicians and linguists would say, 'adultery' is not part of the **intention** of *porneia*; it is part of its **extension**. *Porneia* is a class, and within the class you may have a number of specific sins which may be referred to like adultery or homosexuality or prostitution.³⁷

36 William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Grand Rapids, 1957, pp. 699-700.

37 In the words of David C. Jones (*Op. Cit.*, p. 21), "*Porneia* is the general term for all illicit or immoral sexual intercourse. The specific form may sometimes be indicated by the context. If payment of wages is involved, it is *prostitution*. If it involves close relatives, it is *incest*. If it involves persons of the same sex, it is

APPENDICES

Some scholars hold that *porneia* is referring to incest. They argue that this is its meaning in 1 Corinthians 5:1 and in Acts 15:20.³⁸ First we should note that not that many commentators agree that Acts 15:20 is referring to incest.³⁹ In the particular case of I Cor. 5:1, it seems quite clear that *porneia* is used here as a class (sexual immorality) which includes incest as one of its referents (its extension). Note how the passage reads: "It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality (*porneia*) among you, and sexual immorality of such a kind as does not exist even among the Gentiles, that someone has his father's wife."

The basic significance of *porneia* in the New Testament may be seen in I Cor 7:2, "But because of immoralities..." (*porneias*); the plural points to various immoral acts. The commands to "flee immorality" (I Cor. 6:18), and "abstain from immorality" (I Thess. 4:3), naturally refer to sexual sin in general. These are clear examples of its basic use. Thus we conclude that *porneia* is a term that refers to sexual immorality in general, and that within this general classification it may refer to a number of specific sins, depending on its context. Moreover, we choose to translate *porneia*, "sexual immorality," since the term fornication in today's English may refer to sexual sins committed only by the unmarried, and since sexual immorality communicates better the broad nature of this sin.

d. Is *porneia* ever used with an even broader meaning?

We must note that *porneia* has a figurative use as well. In the Old Testament, there are several prophetic passages which use the analogy of *porneia* extensively to picture Israel's marital (or sexual) unfaithfulness to God. These passages picture Israel as Hosea clearly delineates it as an unfaithful wife wandering away from God her husband (cp. for example Hosea 1:2). Jeremiah 3 speaks of how treacherous Israel was in going up "on every high hill and under every green tree, and she played the harlot there" (*porneuo*). Ezekiel 16 and 23 speak of Israel "multiplying her harlotries" and even "paying her lovers" for fornication.

Because *porneia* is used to designate Israel's unfaithfulness to God her husband in acts of idolatry and other sins, therefore by extension other figurative use also designates other acts of sin and unfaithfulness to God (cf. Numbers 14:33; Isaiah 1:21; and Hebrews 12:16), since that covenanted relationship is still in view. Furthermore, this figurative use of *porneia* is extended even further in the New Testament to describe the rebellion of sinful humanity in the defilements and abominations represented by the "Great Harlot" (Rev. 17:4; 19:2).

e. What are the current interpretations of *porneia*?

From our prior discussion, it is clear that *porneia* has a very common literal meaning which is "sexual immorality." This is its **intensive** sense, and its **extensive** sense can include

homosexuality. If it involves an unmarried couple, it is *unchastity*. If it involves a married person outside of marriage, it is *adultery*."

38 See above, note 5.

39 For an excellent refutation of the view that Acts 15:20 is referring to incest, see Thomas Edgar, "Divorce and Remarriage for Adultery or Desertion," pp. 177-187.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

such sexual sins as adultery, homosexuality, prostitution, and incest. It is also clear that *porneia* is used figuratively in Scripture of spiritual betrayal on the part of God's people.

The issue is, what does *porneia* mean in Matthew 19:9? We may group current interpretations under three headings:

View #1: *porneia* refers to sexual unfaithfulness before marriage

Some scholars hold that *porneia* refers to a sexual sin separate from marital unfaithfulness. They prefer to view Jesus as totally against divorce and remarriage. Therefore, *porneia* in Matthew 19:9 could not refer to adultery or any kind of sexual sin within marriage. One such view identifies *porneia* with premarital unchastity during the Jewish engagement period. Thus Jesus would be allowing divorce if the bride was found unfaithful during that period, and they would never have entered into conjugal relations. Another such view is to identify *porneia* with incestuous marriages. In this case Jesus would merely be nullifying a marriage which was unlawful to begin with.

How are we to evaluate this view? A number of compelling reasons stand against our accepting this view. First, the context of Matthew 19:9 is about marriage and divorce, not about invalid unions. The Old Testament texts about which Jesus and the Pharisees were speaking (Genesis 1-2, Deut. 24) refer to marriage, not the engagement period. To suppose that Christ would have introduced matters having to do with the engagement period, matters governed by separate legislation and concerning which there was no controversy, when the issue being discussed was marriage and divorce, seems out of place.

Second, *porneia* is never specifically used in Scripture of unchastity during the betrothal period, and is used only once in a context clearly having to do with incest (1 Cor. 5:1). Although *porneia* could be referring to both of these sexual sins, it would not be understood as referring to either one of them unless the context encouraged such an interpretation. No encouragement is seen in the context by this committee.

Third, there are incidents in Scripture of *porneia* being used of adultery. To assume that *porneia* does not have to do with marital unfaithfulness in a passage discussing marriage and divorce is to assume too much.

Finally, the whole strength of this interpretation is drawn from the assumption that divorce with remarriage does not exist in the Bible. This is to beg the argument.

View #2: *porneia* refers to unfaithfulness in marriage, not restricted to sexual sin

This second understanding of *porneia* comes from those who wish to view the term in both its literal and figurative senses. They argue, since the use of *porneia* has not been restricted to sexual sins only, but has also been used in the figurative sense of covenant breaking, neither should the grounds for divorce be restricted to sexual sins alone. Hence, *porneia* may refer to all the ways in which profound unfaithfulness can destroy the covenant of marriage. They also may view "desertion" in I Cor. 7 as included in their definition of *porneia* in Matthew 19. These are sins which undermine the foundations of the marriage covenant.

APPENDICES

How may we evaluate this view? It is undeniably true that *porneia* occurs in Scripture in a figurative sense. This view also has the apparent advantage of satisfying the supposed conflict with I Cor. 7:15 by seeing desertion as a subset of *porneia*.

In response, we may first observe that in a passage where *moicheia* (adultery) is used in a literal sense, it would be expected that its corresponding term *porneia* (sexual immorality) would also be used in the same literal way. There would need to be compelling contextual evidence to take it in its figurative use, particularly in a passage that is talking about the literal sexual dimension of being one flesh. Moreover, there is no explicit use of *porneia* in Scripture for sins within the human marriage relation other than sexual.

Second, in Matthew 19, Jesus is speaking against the backdrop of easy divorce. In doing so, he was trying to restrict divorce. That he was successful in being restrictive is clear in the amazement of the disciples to Jesus' words (19:10) and in Jesus' response to them that implies that they have understood his comments correctly (19:11-12). This context suggests a narrower use of *porneia*, that it should not be interpreted in a way that could open it up to all sorts of grounds for divorce.

Third, if desertion were a subset of *porneia*, then in 1 Corinthians 7:10-11 Paul would be denying to the divorced spouse what Jesus would be allowing, namely divorce on the grounds of *porneia*.

Fourth, we note that in Scripture Jesus only uses *porneia* in the literal sexual sense. This seems to be the most natural sense of the term in Matthew 19:9. The burden of proof rests clearly with those who would take *porneia* to include the figurative sense in this passage.

View #3: *porneia* refers to sexual unfaithfulness in marriage

The third understanding of *porneia* is the classical view, that it refers to sexual sins committed by one within the marriage relationship. Some prefer to interpret *porneia* as the equivalent of adultery. Others prefer to view it as encompassing any kind of sexual immorality while married. It could cover adultery, prostitution, incest, homosexuality, lesbianism and bestiality, all those vices which would have called for the death penalty in the Old Testament.

How are we to evaluate this view? One might object, "If Jesus meant adultery, why didn't he use the specific term for adultery?" But the strengths of this view vastly outweigh any difficulties that may be raised.

First, the literal sense of *porneia* seems to fit most naturally into the context (see above, first observation under View #2). No wonder this has been the classical interpretation for some 2000 years.

Second, the context of Matthew 19 is the breaking of the marriage covenant, divorce. Since sexual sins violate the "one flesh" principle of marriage, thereby radically breaking the unity and exclusivity of marriage, this understanding of *porneia* as "sexual immorality" fits

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

with Jesus granting it as the one exception for breaking the marriage bond and being free to marry again.

Third, the fact that *porneia* was chosen, and not *moicheia*, suggests that it was meant to cover more than adultery alone in its strictest sense. Sexual sins of a married person such as having sex with an unmarried person, homosexuality, incest, and prostitution would be included.

f. Guidelines for applying the meaning of *porneia*

We agree that *porneia* refers to "sexual immorality." But sexual immorality could be understood to include all kinds of sexual sins such as inordinate lust, pornography, or masturbation. To be sure, these are sins that impinge against the one-flesh relationship, but they do not necessarily break it.

We ask then, "What does Jesus mean by *porneia* in this passage as a grounds for divorce?" We believe Jesus intended *porneia* to be understood in a more limited way, as referring to those external sexual actions which would clearly break the one-flesh principle of marriage. The whole passage centers on a marriage relationship and the exception focuses on an act that may become the reason for a divorce. Therefore, we must distinguish between those sexual sins that clearly break the one-flesh union and those that don't. Adultery, homosexuality, lesbianism, bestiality, and incest are examples of sexual immorality that break the one-flesh union precisely because they involve sexual union with a being other than one's marriage partner, i.e., they amount to adultery.

Other acts of sexual immorality do not as clearly serve to break the one-flesh relationship. The committee would argue that masturbation and the destructive sin of pornography *per se* are not grounds for divorce, because they do not unmistakably break the one-flesh relationship; but if a person becomes so obsessed with them that they become a substitute for fulfilling the conjugal rights of the spouse, then they could be understood to break the one-flesh union. Other examples of habitual sexual sin could be cited. But all of these are unclear cases, and judgment will have to rest with the Session in their application of biblical principles.

The guiding principle should be whether the sexual sin does indeed break the one-flesh relationship. Some sexual sins may hurt the marriage union without necessarily breaking it. But when that sexual sin becomes externalized in such a way that it becomes a substitute for the one-flesh relation with one's spouse, then the Session may judge it as being the equivalent of *porneia*.

E. 1 Corinthians 7:10-15

These verses are referring to two distinct groups of persons. Verses 10-11 presuppose both partners are believers, and Paul is applying a saying of Jesus which bears directly on that situation. Verses 12-15 address a mixed marriage situation where one of the spouses has become a Christian, and Paul speaks to this issue himself.

APPENDICES

1. Instruction to spouses both of whom are believers, Verses 10-11:

10) "But to the married I give instructions, not I, but the Lord, that the wife should not leave her husband 11) (but if she does leave, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband), and that the husband should not send his wife away."

Paul tells the Christian wife not to "leave" (*chorizo*) her Christian husband, and likewise tells the husband not to "send away" (*aphiemi*) his wife. The critical point here is that Paul is telling them not to "divorce" each other. He uses Greek words which in this context are referring to divorce, not separation as we know it. According to Gordon Fee in his carefully documented commentary:

"Much has been made of the use of the verb 'to separate oneself from' [*chorizo*], in distinction from the verb used in vv. 12-13, 'to divorce' [*aphiemi*]. But that probably reflects our own urgencies for greater precision. Divorce in Greco-Roman culture could be 'legalized' by means of documents; but more often it simply happened. In this culture divorce was divorce, whether established by a document or not. Either the man sent his wife away (= 'divorce' in the sense of v.12), or else either of them 'left' the other (= 'to separate')...Ordinarily when the wife 'divorces' she simply leaves her husband ('is separated' from him); the same verb is used in v. 15 of a pagan partner of either sex who leaves, and occurs regularly in the papyri for mutual divorce (agreeing to 'separate from each other'). On the other hand, a man ordinarily 'divorced' his wife ('sent her away'); nonetheless in v.13 the wife can do the same."⁴⁰

We tend to interpret verses 10-11 in terms of modern day separation rather than divorce. But the Bible does not deal with the idea of separation as a "half-way house" step as we know it. Perhaps the Biblical writers were so committed to the permanence of marriage that they did not want to study ways to effect temporary separation. But more likely, it was the fact that separation in first century society was *de facto* divorce. That these verses are clearly referring to divorce is evidenced by the fact that the believing wife is called "unmarried" (*agamos*) in verse 11.

Paul goes on to say that for the two Christian spouses who divorce, there are only two options. They are to remain unmarried, or better still, be reconciled. (This is consistent with Jesus' prohibition against remarriage within the church [Mt. 5:31, Lk. 16:18].) The change of verb tenses emphasizes the direction of Paul's thinking. The wife is to remain unmarried (present tense, continuous action), or she is to be reconciled (aorist tense, accomplished action) to her husband. The believer must always remain in a position to be reconciled. Marriage to another would preclude reconciliation. Paul then goes on in verse 11b to say what is true of the wife is also true of the husband.

40 Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Grand Rapids, 1984, pp. 193-194.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. Important insights into verses 10-11

Three important points should be noted. **First**, Paul presents this instruction in the form of a command (*paragello*) and appeals to the authoritative teaching of Jesus. This is one of the rare instances in Paul's writings where he appeals directly to Jesus. We should not suppose that Paul lacks authority, but rather that Paul is seeking to add as much force as possible to his admonition. In other words, this instruction is not just good advice. Married believers should not divorce.

Second, Paul is acknowledging that improper divorces may in fact occur. This is the burden of the Greek construction which may be interpreted, "if for any reason this condition may possibly occur." Paul is not giving a right to divorce. He is recognizing that divorce may happen, and says that in such cases the wife may not use her present unmarried condition as an opportunity to marry someone else. This is the penalty for a sinful divorce. If she has the desire to get married, it must be to her former husband. It is striking that Paul didn't say, "you have to get back together again." Paul clearly recognizes that in certain cases the marriage will not be restored.

Third, it is remarkable that Paul should focus on the wife seeking a divorce; his remarks about the husband almost seem like an afterthought. In Jewish culture a woman was generally not allowed to divorce her husband, although in Greek culture women could do so. Why would women believers in Paul's day be seeking divorce from believing husbands? Perhaps it was due to misguided beliefs that ascetic practices or the refusal of sexual relations in those "last days" was a righteous response (cf. 7:1ff, 29ff, etc.). We are not sure of the exact reasons. But whatever the background, the reasons appear to be opposite those given in our own culture. Today women and men often divorce for the express purpose of marrying someone else. But Paul does not allow remarriage in this instance, because this would in effect be adultery, and because the norm of Christians is to be reconciled.

3. Instruction to a spouse married to an unbeliever,

Verses 12-15

- 12) "But to the rest I say, not the Lord, that if any brother has a wife who is an unbeliever, and she consents to live with him, let him not send her away.
- 13) And a woman who has an unbelieving husband, and he consents to live with her, let her not send her husband away.
- 14) For the unbelieving husband is sanctified through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified through her believing husband; for otherwise your children are unclean, but now they are holy.
- 15) Yet if the unbelieving one leaves, let him leave; the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases, but God has called us to peace."

These verses presuppose a mixed marriage. Although Paul would not allow an already-professing Christian to marry an unbeliever (7:39; 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1; cf. Ezra 10:10), in these verses he forbids a Christian to initiate a divorce with an unbeliever. The present tense prohibition, *me aphieto*, seems to suggest that some were in the process of doing so, and he wanted it stopped. Perhaps believers were using their spouse's unbelief as an excuse for

APPENDICES

getting a divorce, or perhaps believers thought that marriage with an unbeliever somehow contaminated them. But Paul argues the opposite here. It is not the believer who is defiled, but the unbeliever who is sanctified, as well as the children of that union. Therefore, if the unbelieving spouse "is well-pleased to dwell together with" the believing spouse, then the believer must not resort to divorce.

The church needs to face squarely the implications of this. Paul does not make self-fulfillment the law of marriage, and is perfectly willing to require someone to remain in a marriage that will be painfully difficult. Here is a woman going to heaven, married to a man going to hell. Here is a woman who prizes above all things the Word and the ways of the kingdom of God, and here is a man who considers those things to be irrelevant, uninteresting, and unimportant. He cannot satisfy or encourage her in any of those areas. In the dimensions of her life which are most precious to her and are most profoundly important to her, her husband is not only positively no help, but very often is an interference, a frustration. And yet, Paul says she must stay.

This accent on "no divorce" is consistent with verses 10-11. However, Paul introduces an exception: "if the unbelieving one leaves." In that case the believer is to "let him leave." The verb is a third person present imperative, which carries with it a certain ambiguity. Paul may be viewed here as giving the unbeliever permission to leave, while at the same time confirming to the believer that that course of action is proper. We should note that Paul immediately proceeds to say, "the brother or sister is not bound" and "God has called us to peace." These three ingredients indicate that Paul is allowing, if not ordering, such a separation.

Again, the verb "leaves" (*chorizo*) is referring to divorce. Herein lies an interesting point. Paul is referring to a situation in which the deserted spouse is the passive victim of the unrighteous termination of a marriage. This suggests that what we have here is not another ground for divorce, but from the perspective of the offended spouse, a *fait accompli*. We are reminded that there are various views attempting to reconcile the desertion of 1 Corinthians 7 with the *porneia* (sexual immorality) of Matthew 19. Some hold that desertion is simply an additional ground for divorce; Jesus was not giving us an exhaustive list. Others hold that desertion is simply a subset of *porneia*, *porneia* being a term which has broader connotations than illicit sexual sins. But it seems reasonable to argue that Paul views desertion as the destruction of the marriage which the Christian spouse was unable to prevent. The question Paul raises is, what should a Christian do if an unbelieving spouse leaves the marriage?

Paul says the believer "is not bound" in such a case. What this means has been disputed. Some think that Paul simply means that the believer is not bound to maintain the marriage if the partner opts out.⁴¹ Others maintain that all the bonds of marriage have been removed; the person has been released entirely from every obligation of the former marriage and is free to marry again.⁴² Support is found in 7:39: "A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if

41 A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh, 1911, p. 143. Heth and Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce*, pp. 94-96, 140-144.

42 R. H. Charles, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*, London, 1921, p. 58. H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, Transl. J. R. DeWitt, Grand Rapids, 1975, pp. 308-309, n. 139.

her husband is dead, she is free to be married..." To be bound is to remain married to your husband. Not to be bound is to be free to marry (cf. Romans 7:2f.).

This question is made more difficult by the fact that two different Greek verbs are translated "bound" in 7:15 and 7:39. In 7:39 (as in Romans 7:2), the verb *deo* is used. In the context of marriage, it refers to being bound by law and by duty to one's spouse as long as they live. In 7:15, *douleuo* is used in the perfect tense and means "is no longer in a state of bondage." Some think that since *deo* is not used in 7:15, Paul is not saying that a believer is free to remarry.⁴³ Others maintain that *douleuo* is a synonym for *deo* and is a stronger term, and therefore Paul is saying that a believer is clearly no longer bound to the unbeliever by law and is hence free to remarry.⁴⁴ It seems to us that the burden of proof rests firmly on the former interpretation. It is not easy to demonstrate that Paul's language in 7:15 means something less than his language in 7:39.

We conclude that when Paul says, "let him depart, the brother or sister is not bound," the strong presumption is that he is saying that the believer is not obliged to prevent the divorce and is also free to remarry. In the circumstances of our culture, Paul would say that the believer is not obliged to go to court to attempt to stop the divorce, and may in fact undertake to make *de jure* what is already *de facto* by initiating the legal process of divorce.

Finally, Paul states that "God has called you to peace." Does he mean, (1) God has called you to peace, so you must now be tranquil in the midst of a bad marital situation; or (2) God has called you to peace, so be at peace as you find yourself free from your former marital obligations? Coming as it does at the end of verse 15, these words appear to wrap up the significance of "not being bound." Indeed, peace would be impossible if the unbelieving spouse were compelled against his will to live with the believer, or if the believer somehow perpetuated the marriage *de jure* when it no longer existed *de facto*.

4. Applying Paul's instruction about desertion today

Are there other forms of "separation" today that may be considered equivalent to this leaving of the marriage of which Paul speaks? Specifically, what about cases of habitual physical abuse? Has that person deserted his spouse to the extent we may label it *de facto* divorce? We must be careful not to open the floodgate of excuses. On the other hand, we need to recognize the reality of the "separation". We should allow Sessions the liberty to discern with much prayer what would be the proper response in a particular circumstance.

Several considerations incline us to agree with those of our authorities who have maintained that desertion can occur as well by the imposition of intolerable conditions as by departure itself. We are struck by the fact that, taking Matthew 19 and 1 Corinthians 7 together, it appears that the Lord concedes the necessity of the abolition of marriage in certain cases precisely so as to protect a blameless spouse from intolerable conditions. Further, taking into account both the general principles of Biblical ethics and the Scripture's characteristic manner of ethical instruction, viz. the statement of commandments in a general

⁴³ Heth and Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce*, pp. 94-95, 141-142.

⁴⁴ John Murray, *Divorce*, pp. 74-75. David Atkinson, *To Have and To Hold*, p. 132, n. 18.

APPENDICES

form to which is added case law sufficient to indicate the manner of application, it seems to us that those Reformed authorities are correct who have argued that sins which are tantamount in extremity and consequence to actual desertion should be understood to produce similar eventualities (cf. *Larger Catechism*, Q. 99, A. 6).

What is more, a husband's violence, particularly to the degree that it endangers his wife's safety, if unremedied, seems to us, by any application of Biblical norms, to be as much a ruination of the marriage in fact as adultery or actual departure. This is so precisely because his violence separates them, either by her forced withdrawal from the home or by the profound cleavage between them which the violence produces, as surely as would his own departure, and is thus an expression of his unwillingness "to consent" to live with her in marriage (I Cor. 7:12-13; Eph. 5:28-29). Further, insofar as the "passivity" of the blameless spouse is an important prerequisite in Paul's permission of the dissolution of marriage on account of desertion, it seems right to note that in the case of physical abuse, for example, the blameless spouse is similarly victimized.

Finally, credible alternatives to this point-of-view seem to us to be wholly lacking Scriptural support. It is all very well to recommend separation as a temporary expedient to protect a battered wife, but perpetual separation amounts to a Roman Catholic doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage and could scarcely be justified as a Biblical alternative to divorce.

Indeed, separation of any kind as a means of dealing with marital difficulty and preventing divorce not only is neither recommended nor mentioned in Scripture, but seems to be contrary to a fundamental principle of Biblical spirituality, viz. that what ought not to be done, ought not to be approached.

We are quick to add, however, that the list of sins tantamount to desertion cannot be very long. To qualify, a sin must have the same extreme effect as someone's physical abandonment of his spouse. Both *porneia* and desertion are objective acts by which a marital covenant might be broken. The Bible gives no justification for divorce based on merely inward, emotional, and subjective reasons. Even if we find justification for interpreting *porneia* and desertion in a broader sense than some have, they must be broadened only within the boundaries of serious objective acts of sexual immorality or desertion. They must not be interpreted in any way that opens the floodgates to divorces based on subjective reasons, such as "irreconcilable differences," "emotional separation," "loss of affection," or the like. There is often great pain involved in marriage, and God intends for His people to work through the pain and learn to love even when we are not loved by the other. Emotional problems in and of themselves are not Biblical grounds for divorce. And the elders of Christ's Church must not surrender to worldly pressures and allow that which God does not allow. In this and in many more ways, the Church's health and integrity depends upon her elders' ability, willingness and unwavering courage to provide godly, wise, merciful and severe, and scrupulously Scriptural application of Biblical norms to human situations.

The fact remains that Scripture does not address the circumstance of an abusive husband. As is the case in any other area of Biblical ethics, one cannot extract from Scripture a comprehensive statement of all possible applications of a divine law. Rather, it is left to the church to apply Biblical norms, with the direction provided by the casuistry Scripture does supply, to the untold number of situations which must be faced. It is important to

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

acknowledge that the view that "desertion" in 1 Corinthians 7 cannot be made to refer to anything but actual departure from house and home and the view we have stated above are both extrapolations from the Scriptural statements. No one can appeal to a Biblical statement concerning the duty or the liberty of a battered spouse.

5. Some concluding thoughts about remarriage,

1 Corinthians 7:39:

"A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is free to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord."

This verse reminds us that Scripture provides us with guidelines for remarriage. These guidelines begin with the principle given in this verse, though they do not stop there. We may sum up the Scriptural guidelines as follows.

First, Scripture allows for remarriage after the death of one's spouse as seen in this passage (cf. also Romans 7:3b). Remarriage is commended for widows who have difficulty restraining their sexual desire as a means of dealing with that need (1 Cor. 7:8, 9). Scripture even encourages younger widows to remarry due to the temptations and position they could be in were they not to do so (1 Tim. 5:14).

Second, we have observed that a person divorced in accordance with the exception stated in Matthew 19:9 is free to remarry, because the exception relates to the sentence as a whole including both the verb "divorces" and also the verb "marries."

Third, we have seen in 1 Corinthians 7:10-11, if two believing spouses divorce, they are to remain unmarried, or else be reconciled. No remarriage to a third party is envisioned in this case. However, in a mixed marriage, according to 1 Cor. 7:12-15, the believing spouse is released ("is not bound") from the marital obligation to the unbelieving spouse when he divorces the believer and the believer is therefore free to remarry.

"But can those involved in an unbiblical divorce ever remarry? Or can the guilty spouse in a Biblical divorce remarry? Jesus was quite clear in saying that those who are involved in a remarriage after an improper divorce commit adultery. By this we understand not that they are in a continual state of adultery, but that they have committed an adulterous act by which they have entered into a new marriage relationship. It is a sinful act and should not be entertained as good or godly. Furthermore, the idea of seeking a divorce with the intention of remarrying someone else is clearly sinful. However, when one of the spouses in the former marriage remarries, we may conclude that the other is freed to remarry, because the former marriage relationship has been permanently broken by that remarriage."

The Church should be careful not to go beyond the Word of God in this matter. Quite often, persons who have been divorced for unbiblical reasons come to the Church with the desire to remarry, declaring they are repentant and desirous of living for God. They want their new union to be sanctified by the Word of God and prayer in a Christian ceremony. The Church must be careful not to sanction unbiblical remarriages. If a person is truly repentant, he or she will have a genuine desire to be reconciled with the estranged spouse. There are

APPENDICES

circumstances, however, where that has become impossible, for example where the former spouse has already remarried, or where the former spouse refuses reconciliation in such a way that he manifests himself to be an unbeliever. In such cases, remarriage to another person becomes a possibility.

Moreover, the committee believes that in the providence of God, in due time, such matters will resolve themselves. In the meantime, those divorced for unbiblical reasons should find love and counsel in the Church of Jesus Christ. If they are truly repentant, they should find the same treatment the woman taken in adultery received from Jesus.

But what about those cases where people have been in an unbiblical divorce and have already remarried? What should be the Church's response to them? The gentle use of pastoral oversight will ask parties to seek God's gracious forgiveness by repenting of their past sins in marriage and by rededicating their lives to Christ in the confidence of His forgiveness and His acceptance of their present marriage. That assumes, of course, genuine repentance on their part. We must remember that adultery and divorce are not the unforgivable sin, but that they along with other ungodly sins are covered by the blood of Christ.

CHAPTER 3

PASTORAL PERSPECTIVE ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE ¹

I. PREVENTION OF MARITAL PROBLEMS

A. Statement of prevention rationale

The proper nurturing of the couple in the life of the congregation before and during marriage is a part of supporting biblical faithfulness in marriage. The prevention of divorce is not only possible, but probable when the problems which lead to divorce are addressed and resolved in a biblical manner at early stages of development. Since it is the developed problem that does severe damage to the marriage, prevention of problem development is essential. Putting out the spark before it becomes a forest fire is both achievable and wise. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the church to do all it can to nurture marriages. For this purpose, we are providing the following guidelines and resources.

B. Guidelines for prevention

This list of guidelines is not exhaustive, but is intended simply to remind us of ways we can encourage and build up marriages and help prevent divorces from occurring.

1. Pastors may pursue continuing education in pre-marital and marital counseling.
2. Pastors and officers should seek assessment and enrichment of their own marriage and family.
3. Pastors and their wives are encouraged to establish a relationship with another, preferably older, pastor or elder (and his wife) who has a healthy marriage and is a man of wisdom.
4. Churches should provide pre-marital counseling for couples whether previously married or not (minimum of six sessions).
5. Pastors are urged to train other mature couples with strong marriages to do pre-marital counseling.

¹ The Committee encourages a Biblical approach to counseling. The following listing of resources is not intended to be an endorsement by the PCA. Certain of the resources may have statements of doctrine which are not in conformity with the Reformed position. These resources are provided, however, as aids in ministry (i.e., not as doctrinal treatises or positions). The reader should apply Biblical discernment and evaluation while using them. Also, the Committee affirms that no one person's method of counseling is being promoted through these guidelines and resources.

APPENDICES

6. Churches should expand their educational programs to include classes for marriage enhancement and marital preparation.
7. Churches should promote books, conferences and seminars on biblical marriage and family development for the congregation.
8. Pastors are encouraged to preach sermons on topics which will strengthen families in the church.
9. The church leadership should train small group leaders in the detecting and handling of a couple's troubled marriage.
10. Pastors should train Ruling Elders in proper church discipline which seeks to restore those who have been caught in a sin.

C. Suggested outline for pre-marital counseling

This outline, provided by an experienced pastoral counselor, will help us reflect on the depth and breadth of our present efforts at pre-marital counseling. It is not meant to be definitive.

1. SESSION 1: Gathering general information

- a. **Determining their spiritual condition**
 - 1) If Christian, have each given his testimony
 - 2) If non-Christian, present the gospel
- b. **Learning their background**
 - 1) How they met
 - 2) Their interests and habits
 - 3) Their immediate families
 - 4) Their church experiences and personal beliefs
- c. **Determining their eligibility for marriage**
 - 1) Would they be equally or unequally yoked?
 - 2) Are they presently living together or sexually involved?
 - 3) Are there detrimental health conditions?
 - 4) Inform them if there are reasons you cannot marry them.

NOTE: Much of the data can be gathered in a Data-Intake Form developed by the pastor in a Pre-Marital Inventory, a copy of which can be found in the A.P.P.L.E. (Active People Preparing to Love and Encourage) Training Manual referred to in the Resource section.)

2. SESSION 2: Dealing with finances (could use Larry Burkett tapes)

- a. **Looking at their financial history**
 - 1) Their families' financial attitude; note patterns
 - 2) Whether they are in debt or debt free
 - 3) The dangers of credit card living

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- b. Helping them draw up a budget for common household expenses
 - 1) Include house, insurance (life and health), automobile, food, savings, medical needs, etc.
 - 2) Include tithes and other contributions
 - 3) Consider where the money will be coming from, and how it is shared
 - c. Discussing a new will
3. SESSION 3: Discussing the family
- a. Reviewing their family histories
 - 1) Whether traditional or single parent households have affected family beliefs
 - 2) Whether major unresolved family problems or estranged relationships exist
 - 3) Whether attitudes toward prospective in-laws are detrimental
 - 4) Whether there was a history of family violence or child abuse (emotional, physical, sexual) and how these issues were resolved.
 - b. Discussing Biblical concepts of the family
 - 1) The Biblical foundation of marriage
 - 2) Sexual intimacy
 - 3) The role of the husband as the head of the marriage
 - 4) The role of the wife as his helper
 - 5) The role of parenting children
 - c. Considering their future family
 - 1) Discussing their ideas of family size
 - 2) Discussing their ideas of contraceptives; discussion of various means, and referring to a physician if appropriate
 - 3) Discussing generally any sexual inhibitions or misconceptions
 - d. Exploring past sexual activity, if any
 - 1) Whether immorality needs to be confessed
 - 2) Whether repentance needs to be demonstrated
 - 3) Whether forgiveness needs to be extended
 - 4) Whether there was any previous victimization of sexual abuse towards them in the past and how this issue was resolved (professional counseling, etc.)
4. SESSION 4: Dealing with sexual intimacy (could use Ed Wheat tapes)
- a. What were their parental husband/wife models?
 - 1) Were there warm or cold relationships?
 - 2) Were they dominating or subjugating?
 - b. What is the Biblical model?
 - 1) The husband: loving leader, protector, provider
 - 2) The wife: loving helpmate, companion, under his leadership
 - c. Are there any sexual fears?
 - 1) Possibly having physical pain
 - 2) Physically satisfying each other

APPENDICES

- 3) Communicating likes and dislikes
- 4) Holding strictly to fidelity
- 5) Issues surrounding previous victimization that should be dealt with professionally

5. SESSION 5: Looking at common interests

- a. Their friends
- b. Their hobbies and recreation
- c. Their educational backgrounds
- d. And how disinterests may affect their relationships

NOTE: The pastor or counselor may want to give personality and temperament tests to the couple in order to help them understand each other and better minister to each other as future husband and wife.

6. SESSION 6: Wrapping up the sessions

- a. Discussing perspectives that have been discovered
- b. Discussing behavior they have discovered about themselves and each other during the course of the counseling
- c. Discussing implementation of necessary changes in perspectives and behavior discovered during the course of the counseling
- d. Discussing wedding arrangements; it would probably be helpful to set aside a separate time to go through the entire wedding service
- e. Setting up a future session three to six months after the wedding to deal with challenges faced by the couple and specifically with communication and conflict resolution.

7. POST-WEDDING SESSIONS

- a. Having check-ups at three months, six months, and a year
- b. Asking whether any issues have arisen
- c. Discussing progress on necessary changes which were identified in pre-marital counseling sessions
- d. Dealing specifically with conflict resolution and communication techniques; blending family backgrounds and roles over lifetime.
- e. Encouraging them to make themselves available to marriage and family seminars

D. Resources

1. Personnel

For the personal growth and assessment of pastors and Christian leaders

- a. Other pastors or local counselors
- b. PCA conferences

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- c. World Harvest Mission, PO Box 2175, Jenkintown, PA., 19046.
- d. (CCEF) Christian Counseling and Educational Foundation, 1790 East Willow Grove Ave., Laverock, PA., 19118
- e. Wes Roberts, *Life Enrichment for Christian Leaders*, Christian Marriage Enrichment, 8000 East Girard, Suite 601, Denver, CO., 80231.
- f. Diane Langberg, Ph. D., Psychologist and counselor for pastors and wives, 8206 High School Road, Elkins Park, PA., 19117.
- g. Louis McBurney, M.D., Marble Retreat, 139 Bannock Burn, Marble, CO., 81623, 303-963-2499.
- h. Joseph Wolstencroft, Ph.D., Counselor for pastors, pastor's wives, and Christian workers; Christian inpatient adult program; OASIS Christian Treatment Programs, Suite 201, 964 Georgia Avenue, Macon, Georgia, 31201 (800-926-2747).

2. Seminars, Videos

For aid in marital counseling

- a. Larry Crabb, Dan Allender, and Tom Varney IBC (Institute of Biblical Counseling), 16075 W. Belleview Avenue, Morrison, CO., 80465 Includes seminars such as *Basic Counseling*, *Sexual Abuse*, *Parenting Adolescents*, *Next Step Seminars*. Also includes videos on counseling.
- b. Wayne Mack (CCEF), a correspondence course entitled *Marriage and Family Counseling*, 1790 East Willow Grove Ave., Laverock, PA., 19118.
- c. Wes Roberts, of Life Enrichment (ministry to hurting pastors), 14581 E. Tufts Ave., Denver, CO., 80015.

For marriage enhancement

- a. Ed Wheat, Scriptural Counsel Inc., 130 North Spring St., Springdale, AR., 72764 *Love Life Seminar*.
- b. James Dobson, Focus on the Family, 4800 West Waco Drive, Waco, TX., 76796 Various series including *Turn Your Heart Toward Home*, *Communication in the Home*, *To Spark or Not To Spark*, *As For Me and My House*, *Busy Husbands*, *Lonely Wives*, *The Intimate Marriage*, *The Wife's and Husband's View of Submission*.
- c. Gary Smalley, Relationship Today Inc., Paoli Corporate Center, 16 Industrial Blvd., Paoli, PA., 19301, 800-232-3232. *Hidden Keys to Loving Relationships* (video with guide book), and *Love Is A Decision*.
- d. Howard Eyrich, 21203 Saddlemaker Dr., St. Charles, MO., 63303, 314-441-8821. *Family Life Seminar: Destroyers and Builders*.
- e. Bob and Rosemary Barnes, Sheridan House, Word Inc. - Videos. *Marriage: Making The Spark A Flame* (4 video series)
- f. Howard Hendricks, Dallas Theological Seminary, Attn. Distribution Center, 3909 Swiss Ave., Dallas, TX., 75204. *The Role and Responsibility of the Husband*, *The Role and Responsibility of the Wife*.

APPENDICES

- g. Joseph Wolstencroft, The Institute for Family Strength (IFS), 682 Mulberry Street, Macon, GA 31201, 912-742-6940. *The Building Blocks of Family Strength Seminar*.

For help in pre-marital counseling

- a. Some of the video series above.
b. Ed Wheat and Gloria Oaks Perkins, (address above) *Before the Wedding Night*.
c. Larry Burkett, Evangelical Films Inc., 1750 NW Hwy., Suite 250, Garland, TX., 75041, 800-527-4014. *How To Manage Your Money* (3 videos)
d. Howard Hendricks, (address above), *Preparing Young People for Marriage*.

3. Books

For the personal growth and assessment of pastors

Hybels, Bill, *Honest To God*, Zondervan.

Morley, Patrick, *Man in the Mirror*, Wolgemuth and Hyatt.

For aid in marital counseling

Rekers, George, *Counseling Families: Resources for Christian Counseling*, Word Books.

Stuart, Robert, *A.P.P.L.E. Training (Active People Preparing to Love and Encourage)*, available by writing to Dr. Stuart, 7433 NW 4th St., Plantation, FL., 33317-2204.

Wheat, Ed, *Love Life for Every Marriage Couple*, Zondervan.

Worthington, Everett, *Marriage Counseling*, Intervarsity Press.

For marriage enhancement

Barnes, Robert and Rosemary, *Marriage: Keeping the Spark a Flame*, Banner.

Blichtington, W. Peter, *Sex Roles and the Christian Family*, Tyndale House.

Crabb, Larry, *The Marriage Builder*, and *Men and Women: Enjoying the Difference*, Zondervan.

Dad's Only, a magazine with creative ideas for dads, 15110 Ave. of Science, San Diego, CA., 92128, 619-487-7099.

Deal, William, *God's Answer for the Unequally Yoked*, Good News Publishers.

Harley, Willard, *His Needs / Her Needs*, Fleming H. Revell Co.

Mack, Wayne, *Strengthening Your Marriage*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.

Mason, Mike, *Mystery of Marriage*, Multnomah.

Palmer, B. M., and **J. W. Alexander**, *The Family*, Sprinkle.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Piper, John, and Wayne Grudem, eds., *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, Crossway.

Sproul, R. C., *Discovering the Intimate Marriage*, Bethany House.

Wheat, Ed, *Love Life for Every Marriage Couple*, Zondervan.

Wright, H. Norman, *Understanding the Man in Your Life*, Word Incorporated.

For pre-marital counseling

Barnes, Bob and Rosemary, *Positive Parenting*, Banner.

Elliot, Elisabeth, *The Mark of a Man*, Fleming H. Revell Co.

Eyrich, Howard, *Three To Get Ready*, Baker.

Lewis, Kay Oliver, *The Christian Wedding Handbook*, Fleming H. Revell Co.

Mack, Wayne, *Preparing for Marriage God's Way*, Virgel W. Hensley, Inc. (6116 E. 32nd St., Tulsa, OK., 74315.

McDowell, Josh and Lewis, Paul, *Givers, Takers, and Other Kinds of Lovers*, Tyndale Publishers.

Wheat, Ed, *Intended for Pleasure*, and *Love Life for Every Married Couple*, Zondervan.

Smalley, Gary, *For Better, For Best* (for women), *If Only He Knew* (for men), *How To Become Your Husband's Best Friend*, Zondervan.

Sproul, R. C., *Discovering the Intimate Marriage*, Bethany House.

Wright, Norman, *Premarital Counseling*, Moody Press.

For an overview of marriage, divorce, and remarriage

Adams, Jay, *Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage in the Bible*, Baker.

Atkinson, David, *To Have and To Hold*, Eerdmans.

House, Wayne, ed., *Divorce and Remarriage: Four Christian Views*, Intersarsity Press.

Hurley, James B., *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, Zondervan.

Murray, John, *Divorce*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.

II. PASTORAL CARE AND COUNSEL OF COUPLES WITH MARITAL DIFFICULTIES

A. Understanding the couple

1. Know the times

Marriage difficulties are a given. There is no way to escape them. Whenever two people (both having fallen natures) co-habit for any length of time, the negatives in each other's character will rise to the surface and cause conflict in the relationship. In fact, a primary factor in the decay of major civilizations has been the deterioration of the family unit. That deterioration starts with the couple. If left unchecked, divorce will occur at the rate of 50% in all marriages contracted in the United States.

APPENDICES

2. Know the people

Most people marry for wrong reasons. They may think it to be God's will, but when the reasons are analyzed and compared with the biblical reasons for marriage, selfishness normally surfaces. Most people marry not to glorify God or emulate the marriage of Christ to His Church, but to have their own needs met. A bride or groom do not normally look at marriage as a ministry to which they have been called by God. As a result, within two years of saying "I do", when the emotional and sexual part of love has waned, conflicts surface and character flaws are clearly seen.

If the conflicts are not recognized, confronted, and resolved, divorce becomes immanent. According to the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers, the following are the major causes of divorce:

- a. Lack of communication
- b. Divergent personal growth patterns (i.e. selfishness)
- c. Sex, adultery, or lack of affection (i.e. sexual sin or failure to understand each other's sexuality)
- d. Money
- e. Lack of understanding

These and other issues must be addressed during marital counseling.

Complaints by husbands and wives against the other are universal. It doesn't matter whether the couples are from the north or the south, the east or the west. The complaints are common. When each sex is asked what grates them most about the opposite sex, the following complaints surface over and over again.

- a. Women's gripes against men
 - (1) Lack of leadership
 - (2) No sensitivity
 - (3) No understanding of who we are
 - (4) Doesn't listen
 - (5) Takes me for granted
 - (6) Thinks he knows it all
 - (7) Not affectionate (only wants sex)
- b. Men's gripes against women
 - (1) Seeks to control relationship (manipulation)
 - (2) Nags
 - (3) No understanding of who we are
 - (4) Lack of respect
 - (5) Demands too much
 - (6) Doesn't like sex

If these concerns are left unresolved, they fester into greater conflicts resulting in a deeply strained relationship which in most cases leads to divorce. In comparing the gripes with the causes of divorce, one can easily see the similarities.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

3. Know the ministry

In over 50% of the marriages which are experiencing marital problems, one or more of the spouses will approach his or her local clergyman. The pastor, therefore, has to be willing and able to help his congregants work through the issues or conflicts in the marriage. Since most couples seek help at a crisis point, it will be rare that the marriage problems can be resolved in three or four sessions. The pastor must be prepared for three or four months of weekly counseling if both parties are sincerely trying to work through the difficulties. If one spouse is not genuinely concerned about resolving the problems, the time frame will be much longer.

The pastor will have to decide whether he can continue to counsel after four sessions, bring in a lay person to help, or refer to another counselor. Pastors do need to recognize their limitations so that counseling doesn't overwhelm their other pastoral responsibilities.

B. Guidelines for marital counseling.

1. Recognize the danger zones

Most pastors who fall into sexual sin become involved as a result of counseling a female member of the church. Take the following precautions:

- a. Never counsel a female alone.
Have someone nearby, in the outer office, or preferably in the session with you. If possible, have another female who will disciple, encourage, and hold the female counselee accountable during the week. Never counsel after hours or on weekends without your wife being present with you.
- b. Do not ride alone or eat in a restaurant with another female who is not a member of your family.
Gossip spreads rapidly and your reputation can be quickly ruined.
- c. In counseling with a female under proper circumstances beware of the emotional pull involved.
You may find yourself becoming emotionally attracted to the counselee. Or you may discover she is becoming emotionally attracted to you. This is a sign to break off counseling and refer her (or the couple) to another for continued counseling.
- d. Understand your own hurts
If you are struggling with emotional hurts or relational difficulties yourself, you are vulnerable to an emotional attachment which can lead to sinful activity.

APPENDICES

2. Know when to refer
 - a. Pastors have a primary responsibility to care for and counsel those whom the Lord has put under their charge.
 - b. If both parties are cooperating, it still will take three or four months of intensive counseling to work through the issues.
 - c. Decide after four sessions whether you will continue to counsel with the couple or whether to refer.
 - d. Refer:
 - (1) If issues are beyond your capabilities, or
 - (2) If you are not able to do lengthy counseling with the couple.
3. Develop a referral list
 - a. Meet with counselors in your community and determine if they are competent, biblical, and available for referrals.
 - b. Determine the specialties or areas of interest of the counselors.
 - c. Gather information from other pastors regarding counselors in your area.
 - d. Train lay people to help counsel those struggling in marriages.
4. Have readily available a list of hotlines and crisis intervention centers.
 - a. Know the procedures for involving the social service or abuse prevention people in your area.
 - b. Understand the state law for reporting domestic or child abuse cases.
5. In a crisis situation, if possible, bring another person with you when you attempt to minister.
6. Establish rules of the office
 - a. Have regular times for counseling each week.
 - b. If counseling at night or on a weekend, have your wife with you.
 - c. Never counsel a female alone.
 - d. Develop data in-take forms.
 - (1) Have couples fill out this inventory
 - (2) Make it extensive enough to gather good information and to weed out people who are not really interested in counseling.
 - e. Supervise your lay counselors.
7. Involve your counselees in the church activities, especially a small group Bible study.

C. Practical considerations

1. Monitor your own marriage
 - a. Continue dating your wife.
 - b. Spend time in meaningful communication.
 - c. Take overnight trips together.
 - d. Receive criticism and change your negative habits.
 - e. Seek counseling if wife says it is needed.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. Develop a lay counseling program.
 - a. Have interested people watch and discuss videos, i.e., on encouragement, sharing, etc.
 - b. Offer a counseling class each year.
 - c. Occasionally offer seminars that deal with helping those hurting in marriage.
 - d. Have men disciple men and women disciple women.
3. Follow up those you have counseled or referred with cards, phone calls, visits, or consultations.
 - a. Once a church member has been referred, the church's ministry to that person does not cease.
 - b. There needs to be continuing contact by the pastor, one or two elders, and some supportive lay people.
4. Start formal discipline when appropriate
 - a. First write to the uncooperative spouse and express disappointment for not counseling and request him or her to become involved in the counseling process.
 - b. If one spouse remains uncooperative or refuses to counsel, have the cooperating spouse in writing request Session intervention.
 - c. have the Session appoint a commission of two or three elders to meet with the parties, to strongly recommend counseling, and to order counseling if the parties are members of the church. If a spouse refuses and continues with contumacious and unrepentant behavior, then the commission is to commence with formal discipline according to the *Book of Church Order*.
5. Institute family ministries.
 - a. Have yearly couples' retreats.
 - b. Have family retreats and campouts.
 - c. Sponsor family seminars and marriage workshops.
 - d. Have Sunday school class on marriage and the roles of husband and wife.
 - e. Develop a pre-marital counseling program.

D. Resources

1. Personnel
 - a. Local counselors
 - b. Experts to help train the pastor and lay people to do counseling
 - c. Wes Roberts of Life Enrichment (ministry to hurting pastors), 14581 East Tufts Avenue, Denver, CO 80015.

APPENDICES

2. Seminars

- a. IBC (Institute of Biblical Counseling)
Dr. Larry Crabb and Dr. Dan Allender
16075 W. Belleview Avenue
Morrison, CO 80465
(303) 697-5425
- b. A.P.P.L.E. (Active People Preparing to Love and Encourage)
Dr. Robert D. Stuart
7433 NW Fourth Street
Plantation, FL 33317-2204
(305) 581-5910
- c. Love is a Decision
Gary Smalley and Dr. John Trent
Today's Family
Box 22111
Phoenix, AZ 85028
- d. Family Life Conference, A Weekend to Remember
A Ministry of Campus Crusade for Christ International
Family Ministry
P.O. Box 23840
Little Rock, AR 72221-3840
(501) 223-8663
- e. IFS (Institute for Family Strength)
Building Blocks of Family Strength Conference
Breaking Free: Principles of Life Management
Dr. Joseph Wolstencroft
682 Mulberry Street, Macon, Georgia, 31201
(912) 742-6940
- f. DVP Learning Center, Inc.
P.O. Box 31227
Aurora, CO 80041-1227

3. Books

To have a better understanding of biblical anthropology.

Adams, Jay, *Theology of Counseling*, Zondervan.

Crabb, Lawrence, *Understanding People*, Ministry Resource Library, a division of Zondervan Publishing House.

Crabb, Lawrence, *Inside Out*, Nav Press.

McGee, Robert H., *The Search for Significance*, Rapha.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Piper, John, and Grudem, Wayne, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, Crossway.

Seamands, David, *Healing for Damaged Emotions*, Victor Books.

To build a biblical marriage.

Crabb, Lawrence, *The Marriage Builder*, Zondervan.

Dobson, James C, *Straight Talk to Men and Their Wives*, Word Books.

Groom, Nancy, *Married Without Masks*, Nav Press.

Smalley, Gary, *If Only He Knew*, Zondervan.

Wilson, P. B., *Liberated Through Submission: The Ultimate Paradox*, Harvest House.

Wheat, Ed, *Love Life for Every Married Couple*, Zondervan.

Wright, H. Norman, *Communication: Keys to Your Marriage*, Regal Books.

Mayhall, Jack and Carole, *Opposites Attack*, Nav Press.

To understand one's sexuality.

Dillow, Joseph C., *Solomon on Sex*, Thomas Nelson Publishers. 1977.

Dobson, James, *What Wives Wish Their Husbands Knew About Women*, Tyndale House Publishers.

Hocking, David and Carole, *Romantic Lovers: The Intimate Marriage*, Harvest House Publishers.

Wheat, Ed, *Intended for Pleasure*, Fleming H. Revell Co.

Wheat, Ed, *Love Live for Every Married Couple*, Zondervan.

Unger, Ken, *True Sexuality*, Tyndale House Publisher.

III. DISCIPLINE AS IT PERTAINS TO COUPLES CONSIDERING DIVORCE

A. Guidelines for discipline issues

1. The local church's responsibility to become involved.

Maintaining the life-directing truth of Scripture is the church's responsibility to her members. In dealing with couples considering divorce or involved in the divorce process, the church must compassionately maintain the Bible's lifestyle standards. But elders must be careful not to regard discipline and compassion as competing truths of Scripture; they cannot exercise Biblical discipline apart from Biblical compassion.

The Westminster Confession states that the church must not leave persons considering divorce "to their own wills, and discretion, in their own case". Such a charge is startling to many in our society. "Mind your own business" is often the response to elders approaching a couple in trouble. Couples may call upon the church to marry them and baptize their children. But problems between a husband and wife are often viewed as a private matter and not the elders' concern.

APPENDICES

Such a charge will less likely be laid at the feet of properly trained elders who have been shepherds to their flock. This should begin with education in new members classes. Teach prospective members that their vow to "submit. . .to the government and discipline of the church" means that the elders will be active shepherds, caring for them, even to the point of embracing the fearful responsibility of stepping into problems between husband and wife. Often elders do not want to raise such issues in a new members class for fear of turning inquirers away, or giving them too much "hard doctrine". On the contrary, inquirers should know that they are considering membership in a church where the elders will love them enough to shepherd them in crisis. It is recommended that each church prepare a written membership covenant for new members describing, among other things, Biblical discipline as reflected in the *Book of Church Order*.

Biblical discipline, especially in matters of family strife, must be preceded by time spent with the family in "good" times, praying for them in their homes and sharing time and meals with them. An elder whose first visit to the family's home is to discuss marital strife will be severely hamstrung, if he is allowed to enter the home at all.

Active elder involvement with a family will also increase the likelihood of early elder involvement with problems. Too often the church faces a *fait accompli* by members who have made the decision to dissolve the marriage. Arriving late, the elder must try to get the member to reconsider his or her decision, rather than discussing the problems of the marriage.

Understanding that discipline in the narrow sense of seeking restoration of the marriage must be based upon discipline in the broad sense of compassionate involvement with members' lives, we are now prepared to consider what the church can do when a couple has such marital strife.

2. How does the local church become involved?

How does the couple, or one of them, come to the Session with their marriage problem? Perhaps both spouses will come to an elder and ask for help. If only one spouse comes to the church for help, ask the one seeking help to encourage their spouse to come for help also. But often only one spouse is willing to come to an elder. In such a case, the elder should ask the one seeking help to write a letter to the Session to request pastoral care and that the elders become involved in the attempts at reconciliation. The Session may then meet with the spouse or spouses willing to meet. Or, the Session may choose to appoint a commission of a teaching elder and one or two ruling elders to work with the family and report to the Session, rather than leaving the shepherding to one elder. But, the spouses should not be left to their own wills. If an elder becomes aware that a couple is having marital problems, it is that elder's responsibility to use appropriate, loving means to help the couple.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

3. What if both spouses will talk with an elder?

This is, of course, the best case scenario. If both members are willing to discuss their problems with a teaching or ruling elder, the church can appeal to each with the Word of God. It is not likely, however, that a few meetings with an elder will effectively deal with problems in the relationship. If Elders should refer people to another counselor, they are obliged to insure that a Biblical faith is inextricably woven into his or her counseling practices. Elders, especially teaching elders, should become familiar with local counselors and spend time with them to understand their approach to dealing with marital problems.

The elder should instruct the couple that, excepting sexual immorality, divorce is not an option for two people professing Christ. While Scripture allows divorce for sexual immorality, it does not command it, nor encourage it. The first priority is to seek forgiveness and reconciliation. Jesus is in the "business" of reconciling people and the church should be about her Savior's business. Husband and wife have the same Lord and have received forgiveness from Christ. How then can one deny the other forgiveness when it is sincerely sought?

The church must proclaim Christ and counsel each spouse regarding his or her sin against God. Forgiveness should start with repentance of the sin precipitating the crisis. Too often the church is willing to deal with the immediate sin (*e.g.* adultery, wife-beating) without asking God to expose other sins in the relationship. Such matters are hard to consider and require time and prayer by elders and counselors. But unless the couple recognizes and repents of sin in the relationship, the problems will reoccur.

The church should stand ready to assist the couple in other ways. The elders should guard against the couple withdrawing from fellowship in the church. Their friends may need to encourage them and make special efforts to include the couple in fellowship. If the church refers to another counselor, but money is scarce, the referring church should consider helping the couple to pay. If the problem is physical abuse, a temporary home may be needed for one of the spouses.

4. What if one spouse refuses to talk with an elder?

This is a common situation. One spouse makes his decision apart from, or in spite of, elder involvement and separates and files for divorce. There are concurrent steps the church should take with each spouse.

a. For the spouse who will talk with an elder

First, the elders must counsel patience. Too often a spouse is willing to initiate legal process when one can and should wait.

Second, the elders must carefully approach the question of delving beneath the precipitating cause of the divorce to the underlying issues. The elders cannot allow themselves to be used by one spouse seeking the condemnation of the other's sin, while refusing to acknowledge, in most cases, some responsibility for the crisis. The elders

APPENDICES

may face a member whose conduct evidences relief that the other spouse has committed a sin that allows the member to initiate divorce proceedings without guilt. The elders must exercise discretion and not allow themselves to be manipulated.

If the wife is the spouse willing to meet with the elders, she may feel intimidated as the only woman in the meeting. A godly woman friend or, if applicable, her counselor could be encouraged to attend the meeting with the wife, or the elders can encourage her to bring her counselor to the meetings for support and assistance.

Third, the Session must make a judgment as to each spouse's willingness to seek reconciliation and which spouse, if any, has Biblical grounds to initiate dissolution of the marriage. If the Session determines that formal discipline is mandated, the *Book of Church Order* must be followed closely. Also, the church must make clear to the offended spouse and *to the rest of the church* that that spouse is a member in good standing and should be supported by the church.

Fourth, the church should be ready to recommend legal counsel to the spouse. When one spouse leaves, the other one should be able to talk to a lawyer to be sure the demands and limits of divorce laws are understood. Godly legal counsel can help avoid steps that make reconciliation more difficult. But the elders should understand that the courts will grant a spouse's request to dissolve the marriage; present law in the various states requires scant, if any, ground for divorce. "Contesting a divorce" actually means contesting the arrangements regarding the children or finances, not whether the court will grant a divorce.

Fifth, diaconal ministry may be needed. Often a wife begins legal process for the very practical reason that her husband refuses financial support while they are living apart. Family members should be encouraged to help. If family assistance is insufficient, the church should consider whether financial assistance for living expenses can be provided to allow the wife to avoid initiating legal process during the period when attempts are being made by the church to reclaim her husband. Other appropriate assistance may include finding a home for a battered wife, assisting with child care and finding employment. Above all, elders should encourage church members to reach out to, not withdraw from, those facing divorce.

b. For the spouse who will not talk with an elder.

First, every effort must be made to reclaim the offending spouse.. The elders must try to get the member to talk with them following Jesus' guidance of Matthew 18 in resolving disputes within the church if the member is contumacious. The same approach can be made with a non-member. The Session may want to appoint a commission to attempt to talk with the member and report to the Session and to institute formal disciplinary procedures as necessary.

There may be other church members whose aid can be enlisted by the elders. Let the member know that the elders want to hear both sides of the problem and that underlying issues will be explored. This can be done without excusing sin. If the elders are perceived by the member to have "taken sides" with the other spouse,

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

communication will be impossible. The member may refuse the first attempt to talk, but the elders must not be satisfied with an "obligatory" attempt. Be persistent.

If the spouse refuses any communication with the elders, then the church should write to the unwilling spouse of their concerns. Tell the spouse that the elders want to help the couple explore the problems of the marriage and recommend a counselor, if needed. Offer, if appropriate and the church is capable, to pay for counseling. Admonish the spouse that divorce will lead to grievous consequences for the couple, their children and even their children's children. Straight talk about sin and the reality of divorce is called for. Explain the financial hardship of running two homes on an income probably stretched to run one, the effects on the children and parents of weekend visitation, and the loneliness of holidays without the children. Advise the unwilling member of possible formal disciplinary actions if the healing of the marital difficulties is not sought.

5. What if the elders pursue formal discipline?

Elders should be familiar with the provisions in the *Book of Church Order* regarding discipline and they should be aware of actions which could invite a lawsuit. If the Session determines that formal discipline is required, the *Book of Church Order* must be followed closely. This committee commends to each Session for careful consideration the following advice given by James E. Ostenson:

- "1. Of the numerous lawsuits that have been filed by disciplined church members and church staff, there have been four primary causes:
 - a. Inconsistency by a church in exercising discipline -- disciplining some, while ignoring the discipline of others.
 - b. Abuses by churches of the discipline process -- spreading gossip, failing to follow established procedures, etc.
 - c. Failure by churches to communicate with members about the role of discipline in the life of the church, so that members do not know in advance that they may be subject to discipline.
 - d. Society's emphasis on the rights of the individual.
2. There is no guaranteed method of avoiding a lawsuit, but the following are recommendations for churches in practicing church discipline:
 - a. Give notice that the church practices discipline
 - (1) In church bylaws
 - (2) In formal written membership covenants
 - (3) As part of church membership training - provide a written Biblical statement as part of membership materials
 - (4) As a subject of preaching and teaching
 - b. Make sure the church is consistent in its practice of discipline, even when a potential case is particularly awkward.

APPENDICES

- c. Determine the church's disciplinary procedures in advance of needing to use them. In the Presbyterian Church in America, the *Book of Church Order* covers all essential procedures. Be sure officers are familiar with the steps outlined there, and that they study them thoroughly before beginning a disciplinary matter.
- d. In handling a disciplinary case, stress accuracy. Basing actions on assumptions and impressions will lead to trouble.
- e. If legal action is threatened by the member charged consult a Christian attorney to review the procedures the church is following before proceeding.
- f. Limit the "audience" to the "community of interest". Unnecessary publication of the disciplinary matter is unethical and can lead to lawsuits. The *Book of Church Order* gives church courts discretion as to public announcements of church discipline. If the court decides to announce the discipline to the membership, the following are recommended guidelines:
 - (1) Hold a closed congregational meeting. Ask all visitors to leave.
 - (2) Read a brief statement from the Session which has been written ahead of time and deals with the case only generally, not in specific detail. Do not mention other individuals, who, while perhaps involved in the matter, were not members of the church subject to discipline.
 - (3) Discreetly tape record the meeting so there is a record of what was said. Also keep a copy of the written statement that was read.
 - (4) After reading a brief statement which focuses on Biblical reasons for the discipline, lead the congregation in prayer for the individual(s) involved and the church as a whole. Be sure that the scope of information disclosed is limited. It is not necessary to identify the specific sin involved -- a reference to "unrepentant sin" might suffice.
- g. Any written announcements made should usually be sent only to the congregational membership, and no more should be said than is necessary to inform the congregation of the Session's compliance with biblical teaching in dealing with the problem, and to inform the members of the repentance expected of them by the Scriptures (cf., Paul's correspondence about discipline, 1 Cor. 5:1-13; 2 Cor. 2:1-11; 7:8-13).
- h. Maintain an attitude of planning your procedures in advance rather than just reacting to problems that develop. In the care of Christ's Church, there will inevitably be difficulties, but He will honor efforts to maintain the purity of His Bride.
- i. More than anything else, do church discipline "by the Book". Follow Scripture and the *Book of Church Order* meticulously. Many problems

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

in discipline cases can be traced to church officers getting creative and ignoring established procedures."

Proceed slowly. No deadline need be immediately imposed and, although the uncertainty and pain of separation for the remaining spouse is great, the church must counsel patience. Allow time for the Holy Spirit to work in both spouses.

B. Resources.

1. Books

Baker, Don, *Beyond Forgiveness - The Healing Touch of Church Discipline*, Mulnomah Press.

Buzzard, Lynn and Lawrence Eck, *Tell It To The Church*, David C. Cook Publishing Company.

Elliott, Elizabeth, *Discipline, The Glad Surrender*, Revell.

Gage, Joy P. & Kenneth G., *Restoring Fellowship*, Moody Press.

MacNair, Donald J., *Restoration God's Way*, Great Commission Publications.

Schaeffer, Francis A., *The Church Before the Watching World*, Inter Varsity.

White, John and Blue, Ken, *Healing the Wounds, The Costly Love of Church Discipline*, Inter-Varsity.

Wray, Daniel E., *Biblical Church Discipline*, The Banner of Truth Trust.

2. Pamphlets

Buzzard, Lynn, "*Readiness For Reconciliation, A Biblical Guide*", published by the Christian Conciliation Service, a ministry of the Christian Legal Society, P.O. Box 2059, Oak Park, IL 60303.

Cassity, C. Fred, Chairman of Mediation/Arbitration Subcommittee, Christian Legal Society, "*The Resolution Of Disputes Between Christians*", published by the Christian Legal Society, P.O. Box 2069, Oak Park, IL 60303.

Gilchrist, Paul, editor, *Divorce And Remarriage*, Documents of Synod, RPCES, p. 199.

IV. PASTORAL CARE AND COUNSEL OF THOSE SEEKING REMARRIAGE

A. Understanding the person seeking remarriage

1. Know the times

Scripture tells us to know the times. We are to understand our culture, the change, and the people who respond to those factors. With first-time marriages ending in divorce at a fifty percent (50%) rate and second marriages failing at a much higher rate, the church cannot avoid the resulting issues and problems. One issue is the fact that

APPENDICES

people will seek remarriage. These couples will approach the church, will seek counsel of the pastor, and will ask to be married.

The church will have to give spiritual direction to these people, minister to the families of the divorced, and make biblical decisions concerning the remarriage of a growing number of people. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the church and the local pastor to be aware of the times, to seek knowledge of the issues involved, and to make the Bible relevant to the life and struggle of the divorced.

2. Know the people

When one or more of the parties seeking to be remarried approaches the church to perform the ceremony, the pastor or counselor should be aware of the tensions, struggles, anxieties, and euphoria that may be taking place in the once-married party.

a. The emotional state

Depending upon the person and the length of time he or she has been divorced, the party desiring remarriage may be experiencing the following emotions which the pastor must somehow help the party work through, come to acceptance of, and apply biblical solutions to.

(1) Euphoria

The party may be on an emotional high. He or she may see the future spouse as God's special gift to him or her and an answer to prayer and to the frustrations of single life. Elated with the prospect of remarriage, the person may become blinded to issues he or she never dealt with in the previous marriage. The party may become numb to his or her own faults and the faults of his potential partner. Such numbness is a failure to realize that marriage is to be a reflection of Christ's marriage to His church. As a reflection, earthly marriage is to become a Christ-centered institution with each party seeking to love the Savior more by ministering his love to the other.

(2) Anxiety

The once married person may be experiencing anxiety. He or she was emotionally hurt in the first marriage and is a bit ambivalent to proceed with another. This person may feel pressured into this marriage by the future spouse who has dreamed of a blessed relationship for some time. Anxiety may indicate that the person has not completely worked through the process of loss (divorce being a loss), has not adequately "deconstructed" his prior marriage to come face to face with his own faults, has entered his present relationship too quickly after divorce, or is not entirely convinced he or she should be remarried. Sufficient time should be taken (some studies suggest two years) to insure that a new marriage rests on a solid foundation.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(3) Fear

The formerly married party may be experiencing fear which makes it hard for us to take the next step. He or she may fear falling into the old patterns of the past that contributed to the prior divorce. Or the fear may be directed at the future spouse becoming like the former. Or the fear may have to do with being a step-parent, an absentee parent, or a parent of a blended family. These are normal fears that need to be resolved, faced, or accepted.

(4) Anger

Anger is a common emotion seen in the formerly married. This emotion may be overt or held inside. If inside, bitterness may take root, and bitterness is like an acid that eats the container (the person) from the inside out. The anger or bitterness may be directed at the former spouse or in-laws because of a hotly contested divorce, disagreement over parental right and responsibilities, or personally inflicted innuendos and emotional pain. It is important for the formerly married to attempt at least a reconciliation of friendship. If bitterness is involved, the party should ask for forgiveness of the bitterness even if it is provoked by the former spouse.

(5) Guilt

The formerly married may still be carrying guilt from the former marriage. Now walking more closely with the Lord, he or she may have been convicted of past sins, faults, and unkindnesses. He or she may see remarriage as the opportunity to make amends for past sins. But this is not a reason for marriage. The person needs to confess the sins causing the guilt, seek forgiveness from the party he hurt, and attempt at least a reconciliation of friendship.

(6) Stubbornness

This is more of an attitude than a feeling, but the pastor should be aware that some formerly married people will not care what the church says. He or she is here to be remarried, the church has no business in his or her former life, and no one can require him or her to submit to counseling. This person is basically present in the church or in the pastor's office by the request of the future spouse. A contumacious behavior is sinful and must be confronted with loving discipline if the person is a member of the church. If not, the church should counsel the future spouse, who is a member, about its concerns and beliefs that marriage is not appropriate at this time.

b. The cognitive state

The tendency of the formerly married will be to make decisions based upon one or more of the above emotional states. Good cognitive judgment based upon scriptural principles gets clouded by the emotions. God created mankind to emote, to experience the entire range of emotions. If man has been created with emotions, emotions are, therefore, good. But one definition of evil is the abuse, misuse, or perversion of anything good. In man's fallen state emotions are easily abused and misused. And

APPENDICES

because people feel intensely and desire to feel good, they will tend to make choices based upon how they feel or what they desire to feel.

The pastoral counselor should recognize the tendency, point out areas where choices were made based on feelings, and direct his counselees to Scripture in order to think God's thoughts and make choices based on God's will.

c. The relational state

All human beings were created to relate to God and to each other. Their motivational thirsts for security and significance were to be satisfied in God and his design for His creation. Man and woman were created to complete and complement each other - to give each other a soul oneness. Since the Fall, this oneness has been disrupted. The thirst for security and significance became misdirected. Sin entered the world and self-centeredness became the norm. Men and women still want security and significance, but sin causes them to seek it by illegitimate means, i.e., not through God's constructed order.

A formerly married person may see the future spouse as filling the void which he or she has been experiencing. A man may see his future wife as providing the significance he needs. Or a woman may view her future husband as satisfying the security she desires. Now, there is nothing wrong with having security and significance in a marriage, but if these thirsts are sought to be satisfied outside of the Main Thirst Quencher, God, they will never be fully satisfied.

Relationship, therefore, has to be first established with the One who is the fountain of living waters and secondly, with people who are at times God's vessels to carry His thirst-quenching water to those seeking the oasis of life in a second marriage. The formerly married (as well as all of us) may have the tendency to be focused more on the human relationship and not on his or her relationship with Christ Jesus.

3. Know the ministry

When a formerly married person approaches the pastor in order to be remarried, the pastor is encouraged to seek understanding of the emotional state of such a person, how he or she may come to the decision of remarriage and how the pull to relate with another may cloud his or her relationship with the Savior. The pastor is the shepherd of his people and must know his sheep. As difficult as it may seem, the shepherd is to have an understanding of counseling his sheep. If he doesn't, he must seek training, have others in his congregation aid in the shepherding (and train them), or refer to people skilled in the field of counseling.

The pastor is a busy man. His job is to equip the saints for ministry, but he can't equip if he has never been equipped himself. More and more people will seek to be remarried. The pastor is the first person to whom they will come. If he is not equipped to minister to them, to make the Bible relevant to the issues they face, he must seek to be equipped by reading various resources, attending appropriate seminars, or bringing in an expert to teach him and his congregation.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

B. Guidelines for remarriage

The local Session should establish its guidelines for remarriage. The position the church takes will clear up much confusion about the possibility of remarriage. The couple approaching the pastor for marriage can be handed a set of guidelines. The pastor can explain that the Session has made this a policy of the church. This will take pressure off him if there is a question about marrying the couple. The pastor should not be left in a position where he is the sole determinant in the remarriage of a couple. The following are suggested guidelines for remarriage which a local Session may adopt, modify, or just use as a reference.

1. Where the former spouse is deceased, remarriage is permitted. *Romans 7:2* "For the married woman is bound by law to her husband while he is living; but if her husband dies, she is released from the law concerning the husband."

1 Corinthians 7:39 "A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is free to be married to whom she wishes, but only in the Lord."
2. Where divorce occurred prior to one's conversion, it is unclear whether the believer may remarry.

Note:

The Committee was divided in its opinion regarding related questions. A majority maintained, for example, that a Christian who was divorced during the time of his or her unbelief was obligated to seek reconciliation with the former spouse even though still an unbeliever. In their view, some of the Lord's statements in Matthew 19 and Paul's in 1 Corinthians 7 are based on the binding obligation of the original marriage. The minority felt, contrarily, that the requirement to marry only in the Lord took precedence. Again, the majority, by a similar principle, held that two divorced unbelievers, upon their conversion, are obligated to remarry one another. The minority, believing such a marriage to be, in fact, a new marriage, did not admit that obligation.

In the case of those who hold that the believer may remarry, but only in the Lord, the reasoning is followed:

- (1) *2 Corinthians 5:17* "Therefore, if any man is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old things passed away; behold, new things have come".
 - (a) When a person has experienced the new birth, all sin is forgiven and all condemnation removed (Romans 8:1).
 - (b) Therefore, divorce prior to conversion doesn't preclude a remarriage to a Christian mate.
 - (c) Similarly, conversion does not necessarily require remarriage to a former spouse.

APPENDICES

- (2) The Point: Jesus is in the ministry of reconciliation. We, his disciples, should reflect his ministry. Furthermore, repentance ('shuv') has the element of returning and going back in the opposite direction. This direction is back toward relationship with the offended party, vertically with God and horizontally with people. The church, therefore, should strongly encourage a healing of any difficulties with a former spouse.
3. Where the Session or its representatives has determined that the divorce had occurred on Scriptural grounds, remarriage is permitted for the party sinned against.

Matthew 19:9 *"And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for immorality, and marries another commits adultery."*

1 Corinthians 7:15 *"Yet if the unbelieving one leaves, let him leave; and brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases; but God has called us to peace."*

4. Where a former spouse has remarried and the Session or its representatives is convinced that the parties seeking remarriage are born-again, remarriage is permitted.

Reasoning: Regardless of the reasons for the divorce or who was the offending party, if remarriage has occurred, the marital union is permanently broken. Marriage could never occur between the parties (Deuteronomy 24:1-4). Reconciliation is, therefore, impossible and the remaining former partner is eligible to remarry.

5. Where a Christian causes his or her marriage to end in divorce on non-biblical grounds, remarriage may be permitted only if the former spouse has remarried or has died, and the future spouse is born-again.

Note:

See Note above in B.2.

6. Where a "professing Christian" spouse has left his or her spouse, the offended party may seek a divorce and remarry only after discipline under the guidelines of Matthew 18 and the *Book of Church Order* has been persecuted to its conclusion; and the Session has ecclesiastically decided to treat the offending spouse as an unbeliever (Matthew 18:17).

C. Concerns of those in the congregation who have been divorced

1. Will a divorced person be allowed to participate in various activities and service opportunities in the church?

Answer: Divorce in and of itself need not preclude opportunities to be involved in the church, except insofar as it may preclude a man holding a

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

church office or other leadership position. As far as service opportunities are concerned, spiritual, psychological and relational maturity as well as giftedness are the primary requisites. The Session will have to make the evaluations on a case by case basis. A person's divorce may be considered as only one part of the evaluation process. The primary consideration should be the person's reputation in the church and the local community, not his or her divorce.

2. Will there be a stigma placed upon a divorced person?

Answer: Stigmas are the result of individual biases. The Session should do all it can to remove any stigma. It should attempt to assimilate divorced people into its membership by involvement on Sunday morning, explaining who they are, the difficulties they have and the need for the church to accept them openly and warmly into the fellowship.

D. Practical considerations for ministering to those contemplating remarriage

1. Require the couple to submit to pre-marital counseling which should cover the following subjects:

- a. A frank discussion of the prior marriage and pitfalls.

Reasoning: Before a new marriage is attempted, the person seeking remarriage should "deconstruct" his prior marriage. He or she needs to break it apart, face the old issues and patterns, and confront the person he or she was and may still be. This is a painful process, but if a new relationship is to last, the former married must analyze his or her former way of thinking and responding to an unpleasant situation. Such an activity and process will also help the person work through any grief process not yet completed. Divorce is a loss. It is a heart-wrenching experience that needs a time of healing in order to bring one to acceptance of the divorce, of the finalization of a relationship, and of oneself as being okay in the economy of God (if God's forgiveness is obtained).

- b. An honest discussion on sexuality

Reasoning: Often men and women don't really understand each other. A couple should seek to understand how each sex views the other, and how to be sensitive to each other's needs. A study of the Song of Solomon would be very beneficial.

- c. A look at personalities and temperaments

Reasoning: Personality testing (like the Myers/Briggs Test) may be given with proper and adequate explanation to follow. God has created

APPENDICES

us all differently. If we are to minister properly to our spouse, we need to know his or her personality. We are commanded by Scripture to understand our spouse. Testing is a tool which aids us in this endeavor.

Temperament testing (like the Taylor/Johnson Temperament Analysis) may help the couple to see areas of weakness, compatibility and potential problems in dispute resolution.

Either a pastor will have to be trained to give and interpret these tests or he will have to ask a local counselor to perform the task.

d. An in-depth look at biblical responsibilities

Reasoning: It is astonishing how little married couples know about their biblical responsibilities and their roles as husband or wife. It is the responsibility of the church to teach each party what their biblical job description is and how to accomplish it. For instance, what does it mean for a husband to love his wife as Christ loved the church? Or what is the meaning of biblical submission?

e. A teaching on the different kinds of love that must be practiced in marriage

Reasoning: If you were to ask the average person to give you a definition of love, he or she would invariably describe something that had the concept of caring for another. Well, that is partially correct, but when we read the Scripture in its original languages, we discover many words for love, each having a different meaning. How do these words relate to marriage? If a marriage is to last, the parties need to be loving in a number of different ways.

f. A teaching of vows

Reasoning: People in this society have not taken commitments seriously. A broken promise is not a big thing to people. But it is to God. People who are seeking remarriage have taken vows before, but the everlasting nature of them was not fulfilled. What makes this "go-round" any different? The seriousness of taking a vow before God must be stressed.

g. A discussion, teaching, and practice of communication

Reasoning: The biggest complaint of spouses is a lack of communication. "My husband just doesn't listen to me", complains the wife. "Oh, yeah," responds the husband, "She doesn't understand me". Pastors and counselors must teach the skills of communication as well as establish for his counselees ground rules for good healthy arguments.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

- h. An honest discussion of the problems that normally occur in blended families

Reasoning: Remarriage often brings two families together. One spouse becomes the step-parent to the other's children. Occasionally, there is a mixture of children from both parents living under the same roof. Such a situation produces a new dynamic and creates additional tensions and problems.

- i. Encouragement to reconcile a friendship with the former spouse when possible

Reasoning: Although remarriage to a former spouse may be impossible, the party seeking remarriage needs to attempt a reconciliation of friendship with the former spouse. Friendship may never be attained, but the attempt should be made. The purpose for such an act is to complete the process of healing the loss occurred in divorce, to complete any process of forgiveness still needed, and to benefit the children if there are any.

NOTE: There are other subjects which undoubtedly should be covered. However, the process of preparing a person for remarriage is not a quick and easy one. A pastor may develop his own methodology, train lay people to help, or add to the subjects to be discussed.

- 2. Encourage the parties to discover and use their spiritual gifts.

Reasoning: This helps them to see in what way God has graced them, and gives them direction in the areas of their use to the church. Once tested, plug them into the appropriate ministry in your church.

- 3. Place them in a small group (preferably a group with the same or similar affinities).

Reasoning: This helps to assimilate them into the church and fosters acceptance within the church community.

- 4. Encourage them to participate in Sunday School and various church functions.

Reasoning: This helps them to feel part of the church body and aids in removing any stigma they may feel as being formerly married.

- 5. Once the person is remarried, introduce the person and the new spouse one Sunday morning as newly married.

Reasoning: It helps complete the process of assimilation into the church membership. It shows the members that the leadership supports the couple.

APPENDICES

It aids in the removal of stigma caused by the prior divorce. It enhances the couple's acceptance by the local church body.

E. Resources

1. Personnel

- a. While the Elders may never abrogate their primary responsibility to the flock, they may for reasons sufficient to themselves refer them to a local counselor to do the counseling and/or administer the testing required. Prior to use of or referral to any counselor, determine the counselor's approach to therapy. Find out where and how the Bible fits into the counselor's philosophy of therapy. If you disagree or have reservations, do not refer to that counselor.
- b. Pastors may seek help from those who are more experienced in counseling.

2. Seminars

(See II.D.2., p. 2361)

3. Books

To have a better understanding of biblical anthropology:

(See II. D. 3., p. 2362)

To gain insight in counseling couples for marriage and remarriage:

Stohman, Robert F. and Hiebert, William J., *Premarital Counseling*, Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Company.

Wright, H. Norman, *Premarital Counseling*, Moody Press.

To help determine if a person has gone through steps of reconciliation:

Jones, John Edward. *Reconciliation*, Bethany House Publishers.

Talley, Jim. *Reconciliation Differences*, Thomas Nelson Publishers.

To build a biblical marriage:

(See II. D. 3., p. 2362)

To understand one's sexuality:

(See II. D. 3., p. 2362)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

To understand the single parent:

Barnes, Robert G. Jr., *Single Parenting*, Tyndale House.

Smoke, Jim, *Living Beyond Divorce, The Possibilities of Remarriage*, Harvest House.

Mowday, Lois, *The Snare*, Nav Press.

Brown, Michael A., *Second Class Christians? A New Approach to the Dilemma of Divorced People in the Church*, Intervarsity Press.

V. PASTORAL CARE AND COUNSEL OF THE CHILDREN OF DIVORCED PARENTS

A. Understanding the child of divorced parents

1. Know the times

The single-parent family is the most rapidly growing family form in America. Since 1960 the female-headed family has doubled and is outgrowing the typical husband-wife family at a rate of two and a half times faster. One out of every five school age children lives in a single parent household. Furthermore, it has been estimated that as many as fifty percent (50%) of all children born in the next ten years will experience the loss of a parent (mostly the father) through divorce. For most of the affected children, divorce will be experienced as a personal, familial, and social loss.

Since remarriage is quite common within a few years, these children will be faced with still more emotional struggles - the remarriage of a parent, the living with a step-parent, and/or the living in a blended family (i.e., a family with children from two or more different families).

Pre-marital counseling of those seeking remarriage should, therefore, include frank discussions of the potential or present problems that children will or may be experiencing. Most remarriages have not given adequate consideration to the psychological, social, or familial effects upon the children. Since most pastors are not and will never be experts in the counseling of children, it is recommended that a child psychologist or similar expert be solicited to help counsel children and instruct the couple seeking remarriage of the present or potential problems that such a remarriage may expect.

2. Know the People

It is not the intent of this committee's report to make pastors experts on children of divorced parents. A pastor is wise to seek aid and assistance from those whose ministries are directed toward children and adolescents. What the pastor should understand is the various emotional states that such children may experience in order to properly counsel the parent and to determine if the child needs help.

APPENDICES

Children have little or no say in the divorce of their parents. Yet the hurt they must endure is enormous. They are not as resilient as the modern-day libertines would have us believe. Studies are showing that the emotional scars from the trauma still remain years later. The following are some reactions and feelings by children to the divorce of their parents.

a. Resentment

Since they feel the tension and experience the turmoil of divorce, children tend to become resentful toward one or more parents and/or toward God. They may think, "Why did they bring me into the world? I didn't ask to be born? Why didn't God do something to bring my Daddy back? It isn't fair". Or they resent the new step-parent who tries to fill the shoes of the lost parent. They may think, "Look, I didn't ask for him to be my father. You picked him out. I don't have to like him or even cooperate with him".

b. Anger

Anger is a little stronger than resentment. Bitterness could be taking root. Older children may experience this more deeply and act it out with behavior that is obnoxious, unkind, inconsiderate, stubborn, and at times violent.

c. Guilt

Some children tend to blame themselves for their parents' failure. They may have heard their name called out in an argument or felt the angered look of a parent and took it personally. They may have thought it was their stubborn or disobedient behavior that caused a fight which eventually ended in divorce. Small children are especially tender and susceptible to taking the heavy burden of the marriage failure on their own shoulders.

d. Fear

A child's emotional and economic security is shattered by the breakup of his parents. He becomes fearful of the future. "Will I see Daddy anymore? Will I be loved? Where will we live? What about my friends?" are all questions that may arise. The best security a child has are two loving parents who nurture him to the point of facing the world alone. Divorce fractures this and thrusts the child into a cold and cruel world before he is ready. One parent can never give the total security a child needs. And so fear can easily enter the child's psyche.

e. Depression

Experiencing the collapse of his familial world, the child can sink into depression. If his own little world (the family system) couldn't protect him, what can? The child may look at himself as worthless. "If I were a better or different kid, Dad would have stayed", he may think. His self-worth is lowered, and positive reinforcement can't come from the parent from whom he needs it most -- the parent who isn't there. Fear may

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

also contribute to the depression. Older children may develop a fear of commitment (They saw betrayal.) or fear of falling in love (They saw a bad result.) or a fear of making decisions (They saw wrong ones made.). All these emotions add to the withdrawal of the child into himself, and then he becomes a prime candidate for depression which may even lead to suicide.

f. Lack of love

Children almost always feel the loss of love when their parents divorce, even when one parent is showering them with affection and consoling them with the loss of the other parent. Children innately know that love does not walk away from personal responsibility. When the leaving parent says, "I love you and always will," the affected child sees these words as hollow. What he is thinking is, "Oh yeah, if you really loved me, you would work this out with mommy." Love seeks answers, not excuses, and either parent usually comes up with excuses.

In the same manner, when a parent wants to remarry, the child could be thinking, "If she really loved me, she wouldn't marry him, or she would ask Daddy back, or she wouldn't want to bring him into our little nest."

g. Loss

Children of divorced parents may feel cheated. They experience loss -- of companionship of a parent, of celebrating holidays together, of establishing family traditions, of family structure, of economic stability, of normal existence. One teenager asked her mother a hundred times why she and her father divorced. The answer she kept hearing was, "Everybody is happier this way." Well, this teen wasn't happier. She missed her dad's hugs, the walks in the park with him, the fun times together. Divorce is usually the result of selfishness, and so, because of the self-centeredness of one or more parent, the children suffer loss.

h. Confusion

Divorce abruptly changes life which causes children to experience confusion and conflict. Not knowing what caused the divorce or what was going on, children are suddenly put in a quandary. This confusion stays with them for a long period of time.

And if a new marriage brings in children from the step-parent, conflict usually results. Children invariably think the step-parent favors his or her own children. They, therefore, feel less love and complain to their natural parent who usually takes their side and speaks to the step-parent, who disagrees. Before you know it, there is turmoil between the parents and the children.

Discipline is another problem area in blended families. One parent has normally not disciplined his or her children as sternly as the other. In fact, he or she may have been quite lax. Now, when the step-dad disciplines his step-children who were not used to the method nor the intensity, the natural mom may complain, demand he not discipline "her" kids, or defend "her" children.

APPENDICES

A problem in discipline leads to a problem with authority. A problem with authority leads to confusion and problems in relationships.

i. Being different

Some children feel that they are not like the other kids anymore. They can't do what they used to do. The school may have a "Dad's Day" and Dad isn't there to participate. There may not be any money to participate in a favorite sport or buy the dress for the prom. Older children may have to baby-sit younger ones and, therefore, can't linger with friends after school.

Not only may they feel different, they may feel isolated because of their difference. Because they can't linger with friends, they may not get invited to the special parties or outings or social events. It is not uncommon for these children to feel lonely and helpless.

3. Know the ministry

To help single-parents and their children cope with their situation and to foster a better relationship for families of the remarried, the church must provide services and programs that meet the special needs of the children and the parents. Possible programs are single-parent support groups, children's peer support groups, parenting classes, latch-key programs after-school teen activities, counseling referrals, counseling programs, divorce recovery workshops, Pioneer or Awana programs, adult home Bible groups, and service-oriented projects.

Parents have to be encouraged to pursue social and physical activities, especially those that involve peers. The tendency of a single parent is to withdraw because of lack of energy, low motivation, or smothering of the child. Once remarried, the couple needs to be continually active, particularly with other couples.

B. Practical considerations for ministering to those contemplating remarriage when children are involved.

1. Require the person with children to make a list of the problems he or she thinks each child is having at present as a result of the prior divorce or loss of a parent.
 - a. Have the fiance' make a separate list based on his or her observations.
 - b. Compare these lists and bring up other areas of possibilities such as various emotional states of children of divorce.
 - c. Be frank in your discussions because the children are an integral part to remarriage. Remind the future step-parent that when he or she marries the parent, the children are part of the package.
 - d. Suggest methods to overcome some of the problem areas -- which should include the seeking of family counseling.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. Require the person with children to make a list of potential problems or foreseeable conflicts as a result of this remarriage.
 - a. Have the fiance' do the same.
 - b. Compare lists and see how realistic they are.
 - c. Discuss openly the potential problem areas and formulate a plan to prevent them from occurring or to overcome them if they do occur.
3. Require that the children visit with the pastor.
 - a. Explore their feelings about the divorce, about their future step-parent, and about their relationship with both natural parents.
 - b. Determine if they need professional counseling.
4. Encourage the parent to have his or her children involved with the church youth programs, including Sunday Schools.
 - a. Have the youth leaders monitor their participation and social adaptation.
 - b. Have youth leaders encourage other children to socialize with them.
 - c. Consider establishing a peer counseling program at your church since kids will more readily talk with peers than with adults.
 - d. Encourage your youth leaders to:
 - (1) Visit the child at his or her home.
 - (2) Call the child and let him know he is missed when he is sick or could not attend a youth function. Or send the child a "We missed you" postcard from the youth group.
 - (3) Assure the child that the youth leader is always available to talk.
 - (4) Attend athletic events, special activities, and/or school plays in which the child is involved.
 - (5) Send birthday cards.
 - (6) Demonstrate unconditional love at all times especially when the child is frustrating.
 - (7) Pray daily for the specific needs of the child and ask God for wisdom to touch the life of this child in a unique way.
 - (8) Give the child personal attention outside the normal youth activities. Take him to a ballgame. Go out for ice cream.
 - e. Have the church sponsor after-school programs.
5. Encourage the parent and potential step-parent to participate with the children in various church activities.
6. Encourage the parent to maintain social friendships and participate in fellowship activities without the children.

APPENDICES

7. If remarriage is decided upon, have a ceremony which recognizes and includes the step-children. (See suggested Ceremony below.)

C. Resources

1. Personnel

- a. A local counselor could be of great help. Prior to any referral or request for aid, determine the counselor's relationship with Christ, his or her approach to therapy, and how the Bible fits into this approach.
- b. A trained lay person who loves kids, has had experience in ministering to them, and is willing to help them overcome the difficulties in divorce and remarriage should be sought, encouraged, and used in the church's ministry.

2. Ministries

- a. Fresh Start Seminars, Inc.
751 North Wayne Avenue
Wayne, PA 19087
800-882-2799
- b. Dad, The Family Shepherd
P.O. Box 21445
Little Rock, AR 72221
- c. Rainbows for All God's Children
1111 Tower Road
Schaumburg, IL 60173

3. Books

To help understand children of divorce:

Barr, Debbie, *Caught in the Crossfire*, Pyranee Books.

Hart, Archibald, *Children and Divorce*, Word Publishing.

Johnson, Laurence and Rosenfeld, Georglyn, *Divorced Kids*, Thomas Nelson Publishing.

Wallenstein, Judith and Blakeslee, *Second Chance*, Ticknor & Fields.

To help understand the changed family dynamic:

Nordtvedt, Matilda, *Daddy Isn't Coming Home*, Zondervan.

Spilke, Francine Susan, *The Family That Changed: A Child's Book About Divorce*, Crown.

Phillips, Carolyn E., *Our Family Got Divorced*, Regal Books.

Danziger, Paula, *The Divorce Express*, Delacorte Publishing Co.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

To help children cope:

Stein, Sarah Bonnett, *On Divorce: An Open Family Book for Parents and Children Together*, Walker and Co.

Berger, Terry, *A Friend Can Help*, Advanced Learning concepts.

Rofes, Eric E., Editor, *The Kids' Book of Divorce*, Lewis Publishing Co.

Berger, Terry, *How Does It Feel When Your Parents Get Divorced?*

Julian Messner/Simon and Schuster Publishing Co.

D. Addendum:

Ceremony For Recognition Of Children At Remarriage

This part of a remarriage ceremony may be inserted after the prayer for blessing the covenantal union and before the lighting of the unity candle. In any event, it should be inserted prior to the declaration of marriage.

RECOGNITION OF CHILDREN

Minister: The ring(s) that you have exchanged symbolizes the bond and commitment that you _____(groom)_____ and you _____(bride)_____ have just made. As we bring praise for the bringing of you two together, we also give thanks for the merging of families. As a result of your union, you _____(whichever party is becoming a step-parent to live-in children)_____ have committed yourself to rearing _____(children's name)_____ in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. As an Israelite was to take in his deceased brother's family and raise the children within his own family environment, so, too, have you agreed to take in as your own the child of _____(groom or bride)_____.

BRING CHILDREN FORWARD (Young ones may be carried by grandparents or close friends.)

Minister: As part of the family which the bonds of matrimony have united, we recognize _____(children) ____and the significant role he/she/they play(s) in this marriage today celebrated. The love and the hope which God sends to you through the gift of children find expression in Psalm 127:3-5.

Behold, children are a gift of the Lord;
The fruit of the womb is a reward.
Like arrows in the hand of a warrior,
So are the children on one's youth.
How blessed is the man whose quiver is full of them;
They shall not be ashamed,
When they speak with their enemies in the gate.

APPENDICES

EXPLANATION OF THE MEDALLION *

Minister: I understand you, ___(groom)___ and you, ___(bride)___ have a medallion to present to ___(children)____. The medallion has engraved upon it three intertwined circles which represent the linkage of all members of this family into a bond of love. It also depicts the way in which children are a part of the family unit -- not alone or separated from their parent and step-parent, but an integral part of a relationship which begins today. Each time ___(children)___ look(s) upon the medallion, he/she could be reminded of the love both parents have for him/her.

PRESENTATION OF THE FAMILY MEDALLION (OR NECKLACE)

Minister: Do you ___(groom)___ and you ___(bride)___ now wish to present a family medallion (or necklace) to ___(children)___ as a symbol for family unity and ___(children's name)___love?

Bride and Groom: "We do."

Minister: Take the medallion(s) [or necklace(s)] from the Best Man and place it (them) upon each child repeating after me these words in unison:

Bride and Groom: (repeat after minister):

"We pledge our continuing love for you ___(name)___, ___(name)___, and we promise to cherish you/ and to hold you close to our hearts./ We promise to raise you/ in the nurture and admonition of the Lord/ and to give you the security/ of a family in Christ."

PRAYER FOR THE FAMILY

(Have children remain standing -- some with the Best Man and some with Bridesmaids. When the couple is presented and they leave to proceed from the church, have the children follow after them and the wedding party after the children.)

SPECIAL MUSIC (optional)

NOTE: Proceed to part of service that has the lighting of the Unity Candle.

* Medallion information: Rev. Roger Coleman, % The Westport Allen Center, 706 West 42nd Street, Kansas City, MO 64111, (816) 753-3886

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

VI. The Church's Ministry to the Separated and Divorced

A. Understanding the separated and divorced

1. Know the times

The single parent family is the fastest growing in the United States. During the past two decades, the single parent household, i.e., the separated or divorced has increased at a rate 2 1/2 times that of a two-parent family. Along with the rapid growth has come an awareness that single mothers are experiencing a considerable amount of emotional and psychological stress. Added to these stresses are the anxieties felt from rejection in the churches. The separated and divorced have complained about being treated as second class citizens in the family of God.

The church will have to give both spiritual direction to these people, minister to them and their children, and give practical wisdom to them for coping with life's struggles.

2. Know the people

a. The emotional state

The separated and divorced person experiences many varied emotions, some of which are similar in description as those listed in Section IV. A. 2. a. (Pastoral Care and Counsel of Those Seeking Remarriage), but different in intensity. For example, fear and anxiety are quite prevalent and attack the single parent in an acute way. Fear of the future, what will happen next, whether happiness will ever occur are haunting thoughts which can paralyze the individual. Fear of loneliness and not being accepted by former friends or church members may preoccupy the separated. The tendency will be to make choices based upon these fears and not upon good cognitive judgment. Wanting to feel secure and significant will lead them to wrong decisions and inappropriate friendships.

b. The cognitive state

See IV. A. 2. b. Two possibilities could occur in the exercise of the cognitive functions. The separated may make decisions based on his or her will to please, for the desire to overcome loneliness and make friendships is a strong survival instinct. The wrong friendships, or a quick marriage could result.

On the other hand, the separated or divorced may make decisions based on the hurt or guilt he or she may feel. This will normally catapult them into depression or isolation. They don't want to be around people; so they take themselves out of the mainstream to avoid further hurt.

The pastoral counselor should recognize the tendencies, encourage proper choices, and bring them to a point where they can risk further hurt.

APPENDICES

c. The relational state

See IV. A. 2. c. Separated and divorced people still need to relate. Since God created them as relational beings they must continue to exercise this capacity and become involved with others. Withdrawal from relationships is a strong possibility. The church must prevent this.

3. Know the ministry

The pastor as the shepherd of his flock should realize that the separated and divorced feel estranged from the church and its members. They may think they have been stigmatized or branded as second class citizens. In fact, there are church members who are predisposed against them. The pastor needs to root out the bias and plug the separated and divorced into the ministries of the church. He should solicit session members to aid him in the assimilation of the separated and divorced into the membership of the church as well as the appropriate ministries of the church.

Of course, the session will have to make evaluations on a case by case basis whether a separated person may undertake a ministry. For instance, if reconciliation to a spouse or former spouse has been proposed, then the person should be working on the matters that would heal the marriage. Involvement in a ministry may hinder the process.

Furthermore, a person may be in an unrepentant state of sin. If so, then participation in a church ministry or program would be inappropriate. In fact, the process of discipline should have commenced.

B. Guidelines for ministry

1. Converse with the separated and divorced.

Many people who have become or who are in the process of divorce have felt themselves unseen, unknown, and untouched by the church. Even though most churches benignly neglect these people, neglect is still painful.

It is wrong to assume that the separated or divorced prefer silence on the subject of their marriage or the position in which they find themselves. Talking to them shows concern, and concern care. They already are treated like lepers by some friends. They surely don't want to be lepers in the church.

Conversing with them doesn't mean to force yourself on them. Pray for opportunities to speak, but in any event show cordiality and sincerity in greeting them if only in passing.

Do not worry what to say to them. Even if your words are "I just didn't know what to say", they convey concern. And remember, divorced people really don't need your guidance and wisdom nearly so much as the warmth of your smile and the sincerity of your words.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2. Act on their behalf.

If you sincerely care for the separated and divorced person, you will act on his or her behalf. If he or she needs a place to live, help him or her find it. If a shoulder is needed to cry on, give him or her yours. Introduce him or her to people who could help meet a need.

3. Include them in activities and ministries.

The reason why most separated and divorced people feel like they don't fit in is because in many churches they don't. Most church ministries focus on families, not the divorced or single parent. Most church functions are designed around family activities.

It is not specialized programs, as helpful as they are, that these people need. Rather a genuine awareness of their existence among the congregation is needed more. They need love and the feeling of belonging. So encourage congregants to include them in special activities, to invite them to special events and programs, and to ask them to their homes.

As a church, include them in ministry opportunities. They want to feel part of the team, contribute to the goals of the team, and make themselves useful to the team. Let them serve in some capacity, for serving is conforming to the image of Christ. And the job of the pastor is to disciple his sheep so that they do mature in Christ.

4. Reach out and touch them.

The separated and divorced have been deeply hurt and in some cases greatly traumatized by their divorce and the splitting of families. They need people to acknowledge their hurt, give them a hug, and to extend warmth and acceptance. These brothers and sisters more than others need to be physically touched. Yet when a godly brother or sister hugs a person of the opposite sex, sexual innuendos rush to the surface and rumors fly about.

Divorced people often feel they have become a threat to other marriages. Those who are insecure and have rocky marriages are the ones who fan the gossip fires. This is a shame, for the body of Christ is to hurt with each other and rejoice with each other. When the arm suffers, the whole body hurts. What often happens in churches is that the arm is hurting and the rest of the body wants to amputate it for fear of contamination.

The separated and divorced will always be part of the church. They will be a fast growing part of the church. In fact, most of the church families have been or will be touched by divorce in one way or another, whether it be through direct family split or a child of a member gets divorced. The church has the job of recognizing these people, ministering to them, and encouraging others to fellowship with them.

APPENDICES

C. Resources

1. Personnel

- a. Local counselors may be able to give insight on ministering to the separated and divorced.
- b. Experts in the field may come to train pastors and lay people to do counseling and sponsor programs for the separated and divorced.

2. Seminars

- a. Fresh Start Seminars, Inc.
751 North Wayne Avenue
Wayne, PA 19087
- b. Fresh Start is one of several ministries that offers a three-day divorce recovery program. It is founded by Rev. Bob Burns, Associate Pastor at Perimeter Presbyterian Church (PCA), Atlanta, Georgia.

3. Books

To have a better understanding of biblical anthropology:

(See II. D. 3., p. 2362)

To understand the separated and divorced:

Smoke, Jim, *Suddenly Single*, Fleming H. Revell.

To help determine if a person has gone through steps of reconciliation:

(See IV. E. 3., p. 2377)

To help in recovering from divorce:

Augsburger, David, *Caring Enough to Forgive; Caring Enough Not to Forgive*, Regal.

Burns, Bob, *Through The Whirlwind: A Proven Path to Recovery From the Devastation of Divorce*, Oliver Nelson. (Bob is the founder and Board Chairman of Fresh Start Seminars, Inc.)

Smoke, Jim, *Growing Through Divorce*, Harvest House.

To understand the single parent:

(See IV. E. 3., p. 2377)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

To look at sex from the single perspective:

Jones, Tom, *Sex and Love When You're Single Again*, Oliver Nelson. (Tom is the former pastor of Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Belleville, Illinois, and is Associate Director of Fresh Start Seminars, Inc.)

White, John, *Eros Defiled*, Intersity Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

THE WESTMINSTER DIVINES ON DIVORCE FOR PHYSICAL ABUSE

by the Ad Hoc Committee of Philadelphia Presbytery
RE: Westminster Assembly's View of Divorce for Physical Abuse
Dr. William S. Barker, Chairman

Introduction.

The mandate of Philadelphia Presbytery's committee was very narrow: to seek to know whether physical abuse of a spouse might have been in the thinking of the Westminster Assembly as it formulated its position: "...yet nothing but adultery, or such willful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage...." (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, XXIV, 6).

Of particular help in this study have been the article by David C. Jones, "The Westminster Confession on Divorce and Remarriage," *Presbyterian* XVI, 1 (Spring 1990), 17-40 (see also Minutes of the 18th General Assembly of the PCA, 1990, pp. 139-162) and the book by Roderick Phillips, *Putting Asunder: A History of Divorce in Western Society* (Cambridge U. Press, 1988), although the reader of this 640-page book should be forewarned that the index is not complete (William Ames, Robert Cleaver, John Dod, William Gouge, Herbert Palmer, and William Perkins are not included in the index but are referred to in the text at least on pages 111-112, 118, 126, 309, and 326-328).

The Problem. The problem confronting a study of what may have been in the thinking of the Westminster Assembly is that the whole question of divorce was in flux in the Reformation era, particularly and prolongedly so in England, and the most highly regarded guides on such ethical questions could be understood as ambivalent.

For example, William Ames (1576-1633) probably the most respected Protestant casuist of the time (see Richard Baxter, "Advertisement" and Part II, Chapter IX, Question VII of *A Christian Directory*, pp. 3-4 and 444 in Volume I of *The Practical Works of Richard Baxter*, London, 1838) wrote as follows in his *Conscience and the Cases Thereof* (1639 and 1643) concerning "Whether or no, and how Marriage may be dissolved?":

A.4. There is not any just cause of making, a divorce approved in Scripture, besides adultery and the like horrid impurities, whereby it comes to passe, that two remaine no longer one flesh but divided; and so the faith of Wedlock, is directly violated; Matthew 5.32. and 19.9.

A.6. An obstinate desertion, although in the party deserting, it containeth no just cause of making a divorce, yet it makes a faire cause for the party deserted, after the triall of all other meanes in vaine, to suffer a divorce, 1 Cor. 7:15. ...

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

A.8. The great danger, which one party may bee in by the cruelty of the other, or by any other manifest meanes of cohabitation, may bee just cause of retiring for a time, so to provide for his owne safety and security, but not for an absolute desertion, unlesse first hee bee deserted. For if one party drive away the other with great fiercenesse and cruelty, there is cause of desertion, and hee is to be reputed the deserter. But if hee obstinately neglect, that necessary departure of the other avoyding the eminent danger, hee himselfe in that playeth the deserter.

Thus adultery is seen as the primary Scriptural grounds for divorce; however, prolonged willful desertion is also seen as a Scriptural occasion for dissolution of a marriage, and in the case of necessary separation because of physical danger the spouse guilty of cruelty is regarded as the deserter.

Ames's teacher, William Perkins (1558-1602), can likewise be understood as ambivalent on this question. On the one hand, in *An Exposition of Christ's Sermon on the Mount*, Perkins comments on 1 Corinthians 7:15:

The malicious or wilful departing of the unbeliever, doth dissolve the marriage; but that is no cause of having a bill of divorce: only adultery causeth that. Here the believer is a mere patient, and the divorce is made by the unbeliever, who unjustly forsaketh, and so puts away the other. (*Works*, 1612-13, III, 69)

He here disallows divorce for physical abuse:

5. **Object.** But married persons may seek to spill the blood one of another, and therefore it is good to give a bil of divorce, to prevent that evill. **Answer.** Such enmitie may cause a separation for a time, till reconciliation be made, but the bond of mariage must not therefore be broken. (*Ibid.*)

Commenting on 1 Corinthians 7:10, 11, he adds:

Here (say they) is a plaine place against mariage after divorcement. **Answ.** The Apostle speaketh of departure, and putting away, for other causes than adulterie; as for hatred, dislike, &c. which indeede are no sufficient causes of divorce, and therefore they that separate thereupon, ought not to marrie. (*Ibid.*, III, 70-71)

On the other hand, in his *Christian Oeconomie* Perkins appears to validate a dissolution of a marriage on the basis of desertion caused by physical cruelty. In the case of a mixed marriage:

Suppose that an husband which is an unbeliever or a heretic in the foundation, of his own accord, upon detestation of true religion, quite forsakes the believing wife, and denies any more to dwell with her: what is to be done?

All good means must be used to bring the infected party to repentance; and when none will succeed, but the case remaineth desperate, then marriage is dissolved on his part, and the believing wife is free to marry another. (*Works*, III, 687)

APPENDICES

In the case of two believers:

The faulty person, who is the cause of this desertion, is to be forced by course of civil, and ecclesiastical censure to perform his, or her duty. Upon which proceeding if he remain obstinate and perverse in will; the other must in patience, and earnest prayer unto God, wait the time, until his mind may be changed, and he be made to relent by the order of the Magistrate. But if one of them, by just occasion of fear, be compelled to depart from the other: and cannot return again without apparent danger of life; in this case they are not bound to return; but the delinquent party is to remain solitary, till they be instructed and made willing to do their duties: and in the mean while, the party innocent must be resolved that God hath call him or her to a single life.

Again, be it that the one is resolutely unwilling to dwell with the other, and thereupon flies away without any fault of the other: if the thing after a long space be sufficiently known beforehand, and all probable means have been used, to reclaim the guilty person; yea, being called he doth not personally appear before the judge, to yield a reason of the fact; after public and solemn declarations made, the Minister upon such desertion may pronounce the marriage to be dissolved. For he that upon malice flieth away from his mate, is to be holden in the same terms as with an unbeliever, who departs upon detestation of religion, and the service of God, I Tim. 5.8. (*Ibid.*, III, 687-688).

Perkins goes on to discuss "malicious and spiteful dealing of married folks one with the other":

Malicious dealing is, when dwelling together, they require each of other intollerable conditions; and when the one doth not regard nor relieve the other, being in danger or extremity as it is meet. For this is as much as to betray one another's estate and life to their utter enemies. Here it may be demanded, what a believer should do, who is in certain and imminent danger, either of loss of life, or breach of conscience, if they both abide together.

... If [this danger is] from a stranger, then the husband either takes upon him the defence of his believing wife, or not; if he doth, then she ought to abide with him. If not, she may depart and provide for her own safety. Again, if the husband threateneth hurt, the believing wife may flie in this case; and it is all one, as if the unbelieving man should depart. For to depart from one, and drive one away by threats, are equipollent. (*Ibid.*, III, 688)

Historical Context.

Resolution of the seeming ambiguities in the resources most likely relied upon by the Westminster divines is helped by an understanding of the historical context. In the medieval Roman Catholic church "'divorce' was understood to be the separation of the adulterous spouse from the bed and table of the innocent spouse, not a definitive dissolution of their marriage bond and the right of each to remarry" (Steven Ozment,

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe, Harvard U. Press, 1983, p. 80). Although annulments could be obtained, sometimes after years of marriage producing several children, the difficulties surrounding divorce and the prevention of marriages between parties deemed of too close a relationship (even descendants of godparents) caused a host of problems in the area of sexual immorality. The Protestant reformers, in addition to doing away with the exaltation of celibacy, and with the concept of marriage as a sacrament, contributed to a healthier state of marriage and family life by seeking to restore a biblical understanding of marriage and divorce. In Zwingli's Switzerland the pendulum swung far in an opposite direction from the Roman Catholic practices: "The Zurich court recognized six basic grounds for divorce -- adultery, impotence, willful desertion, grave incompatibility, sexually incapacitating illness, and deception. The court in Basel recognized adultery, impotence, willful desertion, capital crimes, leprosy, and a serious threat to life" (Ozment, p. 93).

The Zurich court refused to grant divorce for what it interpreted to be bearable, transient incompatibility. ... However, the court did recognize three instances of grave, life-threatening incompatibility that justified separation and divorce. These were if a husband beat a wife to the point of endangering her life; if proven *impotentia superveniens* resulted from physical injuries inflicted by marital fighting; and if an older spouse became ill and his or her mate refused to provide the necessary care because of enmity between them.

The Basel court was even more reluctant to grant a full divorce for alleged threats to life ..., although it recognized such threats as a legitimate ground. It preferred to dismiss hateful spouses and wife-beaters with warnings. Men who persisted in beating their wives eventually received short prison sentences to encourage them to reform, and recurrent hostility between spouses did bring about separation from bed and table and a division of property, but these solutions still fell short of divorce. Even in cases of "furious and insane" threats to life, the Basel court would tell the couple to separate for a time before granting an actual divorce, clinging as long as possible to the slimmest hope of reconciliation. (Ozment, p. 96)

The church in Geneva was more cautious. Calvin held strictly to the divorce text in Matthew and would not allow divorce on account of leprosy or impotence. He did allow for divorce for desertion in certain circumstances, sometimes with the implication that adultery would be involved:

With respect to Calvin's divorce doctrine, then, we may choose between thinking of it as allowing a single ground for the dissolution of marriage (that is, adultery, with desertion constituting an offense giving rise to a presumption of adultery) or the same two principal grounds as Luther: adultery and desertion. Calvin excluded other grounds not only as justifying divorce but even as justifying *de facto* separation. In his letters to noblewomen, Calvin insisted that even if a Protestant wife were cruelly beaten by her Catholic husband, she should not leave him unless she were convinced that her life was actually in danger. (Roderick Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, p. 55. An example of such correspondence is to be found in *The Register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin*, ed. and trans. Philip E. Hughes, 1966, pp. 193-198.)

APPENDICES

Theodore Beza, whose *Tractatio De Repudiis et Divortiis* (1573, 1591) would have an influence upon English Puritan thinking, continued Calvin's position. The Consistory of Geneva resorted to excommunication far more often than to divorce in cases of marital quarrels and disputes. In the period from 1564 to 1569 there were 302 Genevans excommunicated for domestic quarrels (15.8% of the total excommunicated; sixty-one husbands and two wives excommunicated for *mauvais menage* were accused of beating their spouses), whereas divorces probably averaged no more than one per year. (Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, p. 58; E. William Monter, "The Consistory of Geneva, 1559-1569" in Peter DeKlerk, ed., *Renaissance, Reformation, Resurgence*, 1976, pp. 72-73).

The Situation in England.

In England the foundation of the state-established Reformation lay in a divorce, or more technically an annulment, -- that of King Henry VIII from Catherine of Aragon. Yet, somewhat ironically, the English Reformed church remained the most conservative of all the Protestant churches on the issue of divorce, no legislation on divorce being passed in England until the mid-19th century (Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, p. 77). Martin Bucer, who came from Strassburg to England in 1549, dedicated to King Edward VI his *DE Regno Christi*, substantial portions of which dealt with the subject of marriage. John Milton in the period of the Puritan Rebellion translated these portions as part of his argument for divorce for incompatibility. Bucer was probably the most liberal of the Protestant Reformers in this regard although his views did not go quite so far as Milton's (Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, pp. 123-125; cf. pp. 69-71).

Beginning in 1543 there was an effort to revise English canon law. In the 1550s a commission, apparently influenced mainly by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer and Peter Martyr, produced the desired *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*. The death of Edward VI and the subsequent reaction of Mary Tudor, along with the later disapproval of Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, prevented this revision of church law from ever being adopted, but it reflects the thought of leading English reformers of the time:

It specified that when one spouse was guilty of adultery the innocent party should be allowed to divorce and remarry, but only after a six-month period had elapsed so as to give the couple an opportunity for reconciliation. The adulterous spouse would not be permitted to remarry. Divorce would also be justified for reason of desertion or absence without news, with the qualification that the deserted partner could not remarry for two or three years. If a remarriage did take place but the absent spouse subsequently returned, then the first (dissolved) marriage was to take precedence and the second would be declared null. It is not clear whether this provision would operate in all cases, for the *Reformatio Legum* also prescribed life imprisonment for desertion and for prolonged absences that could not be satisfactorily explained.

These grounds for divorce -- adultery and desertion -- were a Protestant orthodoxy, as we have seen, so it is interesting to note that the *Reformatio Legum* went even further and permitted divorce where one spouse was the victim of deadly hostility

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

or violent treatment on the part of the other. "Deadly hostility" referred to attempted murder: "If deadly hostility should arise between husband and wife, and become inflamed to such an intensity that one attack the other, either by treacherous means or by poison, and should wish to take his life in some way, either by open violence or by hidden malice, we ordain that, as soon as so horrible a crime can be proved, such persons should be by law separated by divorce in the courts." As for ill-treatment, the *Reformatio Legum* specified that "should a man be violent to his wife and display excessive harshness of word and deed in dealing towards her," he should be admonished and cautioned to "treat her as the intimate union of marriage requires." If the husband failed to improve his behavior, the wife should be able to obtain a divorce. This revision did not abrogate the legal authority vested in husbands to administer "moderate correction" to their wives who were "rebellious, obstinate, petulant, scolds and of evil behaviour" (Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, pp. 83-84).

These proposals, though supported by such as John Foxe, did not meet with official approval in Elizabeth's reign (1558-1603). The views of Zurich, however, were entertained when Heinrich Bullinger's *Decades* were given official endorsement for ministerial training in 1587. Concerning divorce Bullinger wrote:

Divorcements and separations were permitted by the law in the twenty-fourth of Deuteronomy, for nothing else but for the hardness of the Jewish people's hearts, and for the avoiding of some greater inconvenience; to wit, lest peradventure any man should poison, strangle, or otherwise kill the woman, his wife, which he hated, when he could by none other means rid his hands of her. And they that were in that manner divorced might at their pleasures be married to others (3rd Decade, Sermon VII, Parker Society edition, II, 228).

But if for adultery, or some other matter more heinous than that, necessity forceth to break wedlock, yet in this case the church will do nothing unadvisedly. For she hath her judges who will judge in matters and causes of matrimony according to right and equity, or rather according to God's laws and the rule of honesty (5th Decade, Sermon X, Parker Society, IV, 511).

For the laws of God and men admit a divorcement betwixt a man and his adulterous wife. And yet let not any less or lighter cause dissolve this knot betwixt man and wife, than fornication is. Otherwise God, which in the gospel hath permitted the less, doth not forbid the greater, to be causes of divorcement (2nd Decade, Sermon X, Parker Society, I, 403).

Bullinger's *The Christian State of Matrimonye* had been translated into English by Miles Coverdale earlier, in 1541, and said:

Fifthly: What the right occasion of divorce is hath Christ mentioned in the gospel and named whoredom or adultery. With the which no doubt, he hath not excepted like and greater occasions, but understood and comprehended them therein. For the holy Apostle also did leave infidelity as an occasion of divorce. 1 Cor. vii. Manifest it is also, that wedlock was partly instituted for the eschewing of adultery.

APPENDICES

Wherefore when the guilty party is divorced, the unguilty is at liberty to marry again, if he or she cannot live sole, according to Paul, if thou canst not be chaste, marry, for better it is to marry than to burn in concupiscence (leaf lxxvii).

Moreover the faithful and virtuous Emperors, holy Constantine, Theodosius, Valentinus, Anastasius and Justinian decreed other things also to be lawful occasions of divorce as murder, poisoning, and such like as it is evident in Cod. Lib. v. Tit. xvii *De repudiis*. Every reasonable man then consider, that God did ordain wedlock for the honesty and wealth of man, and not for his shame and destruction. They therefore that in no case will help the oppressed person, nor in any wise permit divorce to be made, do even as the Pharisees, which by reason of the commandment of the Sabbath after the letter, suffered men to be destroyed and perish (facing leaf lxxviii).

Bullinger thus saw adultery as inclusive of other violations of the marriage bond which were either equal or greater and hence sufficient basis for divorce. The revised English church law of 1604, however, while allowing separation from bed and board, prohibited divorce entirely (Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, p. 107).

In the early 17th century there are a few other clues to Puritan thought on divorce leading up to the time of the Westminster Assembly. In addition to Perkins and Ames, already discussed, William Whately (1583-1639) published two works on marriage. In *A Bride-Bush, or a Wedding Sermon: Compendiously describing the duties of Married Persons: By performing whereof, Marriage shall be to them a great Helpe, which now finde it a little Hell* (London, 1617), he commented on 1 Corinthians 7:15:

In which words, he permits not to the unbeleever such separations as lawfull, but casts the fault upon him alone, and after frees the other party from the band by which he or shee was formerly tied: as if hee had saide; If he will needes be gone, let him; and trouble not your selves about it, the sin lyes wholly upon his owne soule. A Christian man or woman, when cases of this nature fall out, is no longer tied to the former covenant, nor to the former partie, which hath himselfe first broken it. Neither is this any whit contrary to that of our Saviour, who forbids a man to put away his wife & marry another, unlesse it be for adultery. For we allow not to him or her, any such liberty of putting away, but upon that only cause. Yet if he or she be wrongfully put away (the yoke-fellow withdrawing him or herselfe out of the way, so that there be no hope to recall them, or else not returning upon good persuasion or meanes used) we yeelde with the Apostle, a freedome to the party so wronged. And these things you see may well stand together. No man may lawfully forsake his wife, nor the wife the husband (but in case of adultery) to marry another; and yet any man or woman, being wrongfully forsaken by his or her yoke-fellow, may lawfully then marry another, as being disburdened of the former yoke, without any sinne, on their parts, in that thing, procuring it. Onely we professe, that in cases of this nature, a just and orderly course must bee taken (pp. 4-5).

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Whately's *Bride-Bush* was reprinted in 1619, and he was subsequently summoned to appear before the Court of High Commission to explain himself. He retracted his position on divorce in 1621, and when a second edition of *A Bride-Bush* was published in 1623, he admitted the error of his divorce doctrine, but primarily acknowledged that an adulterous partner could be received back and hence adultery did not automatically dissolve a marriage. In his other work on marriage, *A Care-Cloth: or a Treatise of the Cumbers and troubles of marriage: Intended to advise them that may, to shun them; that may not, well and patiently to bear them* (London, 1624), is mainly a warning against the difficulties of marriage, perhaps because the strictness of English divorce law constrained Whately to counsel in this direction (cf. Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, pp. 112-115).

Among the Westminster divines themselves at least two had published works on marriage, Thomas Gataker (1574-1654) and William Gouge (1575-1653). Gataker's works, being wedding sermons, do not shed direct light on the question of divorce (*Marriage Duties Briefly Couched Together; out of Colossians 3.18,19* [London, 1620] and *A Wife in Deed. A Sermon concerning the Matter of Marriage* [London, 1624]). Gouge, however, does take an explicit position on divorce in his *Of Domesticall Duties*, published in 1622 with second and third editions in 1626 and 1634:

Concerning adultery, we deny not, but that it giveth just cause of divorce: but withall we say (as we have good warrant from Christ's words) that it is the only cause of just divorce (3rd ed., 1634, II, ii, 16).

Gouge does also discuss desertion:

The vice contrary to matrimonial unity is desertion, when one of the married couple through indignation of the true religion, and utter detestation thereof, or some other like cause, shall apparently renounce all matrimonial unity, and withdraw him or her self from all society with the other, and live among infidels, idolaters, heretics, or other such persecutors, as a faithful Christian with safety of life, or a good conscience, cannot abide among, and though all good means that can be thought of be used to reclaim the party so departed, yet nothing will prevail, but obstinately persisteth in renouncing all matrimonial fellowship (II, ii 3).

Referring to 1 Corinthians 7:15, Gouge says:

That desertion therefore on the delinquent's part is such a dissolution of marriage, as freeth the innocent party from the bondage thereof. By bondage he meaneth matrimonial subjection (by reason whereof neither of the married persons have power of their own body, but one of the others) (II, ii, 3).

Gouge does not see desertion as a total dissolution of the marriage such that the innocent party is free to remarry. He distances himself from Reformed churches like those of Zurich in this regard:

In many reformed Churches beyond the seas desertion is accounted so far to dissolve the very bond of marriage, as liberty is given to the party forsaken to

APPENDICES

marry another; and it is also applied to other cases than that which is above mentioned: as when an infidel, idolater, or heretic shall depart from one of the true religion for other causes than hatred of religion: or when both man and wife having lived as idolaters among idolaters, one of them being converted to the true faith, leaveth his abode among idolaters, and goeth to the professors of the true faith, but can by no means get the other party to remove: or where one of the true religion shall depart from another of the same profession, and will by no means be brought to live with the party so left, but openly manifesteth peremptory obstancy; the matter being heard and adjudged by the magistrate, the marriage bond may be broken; and liberty given to the party forsaken to marry another. But because our church hath no such customs, nor our law determined such cases, I leave them to the custom of other churches (II, ii 3).

Gouge was a highly respected and very active member of the Westminster Assembly, sometimes filling the moderator's chair in his absence. "For many years he was esteemed the father of the London ministers" (Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans*, London, 1837, II, 611). Since he served as chairman of the subcommittee on divorce (Alexander F. Mitchell and John Struthers, *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines While Engaged in Preparing Their Directory for Church Government, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms [November 1644 to March 1649]*, Edinburgh and London, 1874, p. 266; cf. pp. lxxxvii, 91 and 190), it appears remarkable that the Assembly came to adopt its position concerning desertion as a grounds for divorce. Dr. David Jones comments, "One could wish that Gouge had published a post-Assembly volume on *How My Mind Has Changed*" ("The Westminster Confession on Divorce and Remarriage," *Presbyterion* XVI, 26). As Dr. Jones surmises, this was very likely because of the influence of the delegates from Scotland, where since 1573 divorce had been allowed by law for willful desertion for four years or more as well as for adultery:

The deserted spouse had to raise an action of adherence (a demand that the deserter return) as early as a year after the actual desertion, and the guilty spouse was warned by the court and the church to return. If he or she refused to return, the deserting spouse was denounced and excommunicated and if he or she had not returned at the end of four years' absence, the abandoned spouse was permitted to apply to the Commissary court for a divorce (Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, p. 61).

Even with the Scottish influence, therefore, the English Puritan position on divorce would be relatively cautious and conservative, more like that of Geneva than that of Zurich.

The comparatively conservative stance of the Westminster divines in the context of debate over divorce in their time is reflected also in another key member of the Assembly, Herbert Palmer. When the English Civil War was beginning, royalists argued for loyalty to the King on the basis of analogy between the people's relation to their monarch and a marriage which could not be dissolved. Palmer, as a good Puritan, sought to defend Parliament's action short of making it like a divorce:

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

A wife is tyed to her Husband by the Covenant of God (so called, Prov. 2.) and by the Ordinance of God more ancient, and no lesse strong than that of Politick Government. She cannot recall wholly her Husbands Authority over her Yet for her necessity, she may by the Law of God and conscience ... secure her Person from his violence by absence (though that ordinarily be against the Law of Marriage, and the end of it) or any other means of necessary defence (*Scripture and Reason Pleaded for Defensive Armes*, London, 1643, pp. 35-36, quoted in Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, p. 118).

On the other hand, when Milton was republishing Martin Bucer to support his broader approach to divorce, Palmer responded with a sermon before Parliament and the Assembly which Sottish commissioner Robert Baillie called one "of the most Scottish and free sermons that ever I heard any where" (Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, Edinburgh, 1841, II, 220). Arguing against toleration, Palmer cites Milton's writing on divorce as one example of pernicious opinions that are abroad:

If any plead Conscience ... for divorce for other causes then Christ and His Apostles mention; Of which a wicked booke is abroad and uncensured, though deserving to be burnt, whose Author, hath been so impudent as to set his Name to it, and dedicate it to your selves ... will you grant a Toleration for all this? (*The Glasse of God's Providence Towards His Faithfull Ones*, 1644, p. 54; quoted in Ernest Sirluck, "Introduction," *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1959, II, 103).

A further bit of evidence for the Westminster divines' understanding of ground for divorce is to be found in the *Westminster Assembly Annotations upon all the books of the Old and New Testament* (1st ed. 1645, 2nd ed. 1651, 3rd ed. 1657), a work done under the auspices of the Assembly but without its official approval (cf. Mitchell and Struthers, *Minutes of the Westminster Assembly*, p. 132 for an instance of apparent disapproval of a portion). In the *Westminster Annotations*, produced in large part by members of the Assembly, including Gataker and Gouge, comments on such passages as Mark 10:5 (in the 3rd edition), Malachi 2:16 (3rd ed.), and Deuteronomy 24:1 (1st ed.) reveal a tendency to uphold the ideal of no divorce while recognizing the necessity of the civil magistrate's dealing with the reality of human hardness of heart:

For Moses commanded not dismissal of the wife; but (as a civil Magistrate) permitted it, to avoid murder and cruelty ... (on Mark 10:5).

And thus divorce was, if not permitted, yet not punished under the Law: As the Magistrate sometimes suffers what he allows and approves not (on Mal. 2:16). Hereby God approveth not the ficklenesse of men's affections, in a light, or causelesse leaving of their wives, Mal. 2.16. but permitteth a parting, for preventing of danger through dislike, Matthew 19.6, 7, 8, 9 (on Deut. 24:1).

One further reflection of the thinking of the Westminster divines can be seen in *A Christian Directory*, by Richard Baxter (1615-91), which was written in 1664 and 1665, almost twenty years after the Westminster Confession was produced. In Part II,

APPENDICES

Chapter IX of his *Christian Economics*, (or *Family Duties*) Baxter answers several questions relating to desertion:

Quest. XV. Doth not the desertion of one party disoblige the other?

Ans. ... It is sometimes easy, and sometimes hard to discern which is the deserting party. If the wife go away from the husband unwarrantably, though she require him to follow her, and say that she doth not desert him, yet it may be taken for a desertion, because it is the man who is to rule and choose the habitation. But if the man go away, and the woman refuse to follow him, it is not he that is therefore the deserter (*Practical Works*, London, 1838, I, 445).

Quest. XVI. What if a man or wife know that the other in hatred doth really intend by poison, or other murder to take away their life? May they not depart?

Ans. They may not do it upon a groundless or rash surmise; nor upon a danger which by other lawful means may be avoided (as by vigilancy, or the magistrate, or especially by love or duty). But in plain danger, which is not otherwise like to be avoided, I doubt not, but it may be done, and ought. For it is a duty to preserve our own lives as well as our neighbours). And when marriage is contracted for mutual help, it is naturally implied, that they shall have no power to deprive one another of life (however some barbarous nations have given men power of the lives of their wives). And killing is the grossest kind of desertion, and a greater injury and violation of the marriage covenant than adultery; and may be prevented by avoiding the murderer's presence, if that way be necessary. None of the ends of marriage can be attained, where the hatred is so great.

Quest. XVII. If there be but a fixed hatred of each other, is it inconsistent with the ends of marriage? And is parting lawful in such a case?

Ans. The injuring party is bound to love, and not to separate; and can have no liberty by his or her sin. ... But the innocent party's case is harder (though commonly both parties are faulty, and therefore both are obliged to return to love, and not to separate). But if hatred proceed not to adultery, or murder, or intolerable injuries, you must remember that marriage is not a contract for years, but for life, and that it is possible that hatred may be cured (how unlikely soever it may be). And therefore you must do your duty, and wait, and pray, and strive by love and goodness to recover love, and then stay to see what God will do; for mistakes in your choice will not warrant a separation.

Quest. XVIII. What if a woman have a husband that will not suffer her to read the Scriptures, nor go to God's worship public or private, or that so beateth or abuseth her, as that it cannot be expected that human nature should be in such a case kept fit for any holy action, or if a man have a wife that will scold at him when he is praying or instructing his family, and make it impossible to him to serve God with freedom, or peace and comfort.

Ans. The woman must (at necessary seasons, though not when she would) both read the Scriptures, and worship God, and suffer patiently what is inflicted on her.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Martyrdom may be as comfortably suffered from a husband, as from a prince. But yet if neither her own love, and duty, and patience, nor friends' persuasion, nor the magistrate's justice, can free her from such inhuman cruelty, as quite disableth her for her duty to God and man, I see not but she may depart from such a tyrant. But the man hath more means to restrain his wife from beating him, or doing such intolerable things; either by the magistrate, or by denying her what else she might have, or by his own violent restraining her, as belongeth to a conjugal ruler, and as circumstances shall direct a prudent man. But yet in case that unsuitableness or sin be so great, that after long trial there is no likelihood of any other cohabitation, but what will tend to their spiritual hurt and calamity, it is their lesser sin to live asunder by mutual consent (I, 446).

Baxter also has remarks concerning wife-beating:

Divines used to say, that it is unlawful for a man to beat his wife: but the reason is not, that he wanteth authority to do it; but, 1. Because he is by his relation obliged to a life of love with her; and therefore must so rule, as tendeth not to destroy love: and, 2. Because it may often do otherwise more hurt to herself and the family, than good. It may make her furious and desperate, and make her contemptible in the family, and diminish the reverence of inferiors, both to wife and husband, for living so uncomely a life (I, 447).

Baxter's counsel in this regard is similar to that of William Ames prior to the Westminster Assembly:

Quest. 5. Whether or no, and how farre it is lawfull for a Man to reprove his Wife being faulty.

14. **A.** Hee may and ought to restraine her by such meanes as are not repugnant to conjugall society, as by admonitions, reprehensions, and the deniall of some priviledges which are due to a godly and obedient Wife. But it is by no meanes the part of any Husband, to correct his Wife with blowes:

Because first, It proceedeth from an unwarranted bitterness and cruelty.

Secondly, It is repugnant to the ingenuous, quiet and peaceable society of Wedlock.

Thirdly, It destroyeth conjugall affection, as well in the Husband, while hee useth his Wife as his Servant, as in the Wife while shee seeth herselfe contemned and tyrannically dealt with.

Fourthly, Experience teacheth, that this is not the way, either to the amending of the Wife, or the peace of the Family.

Fifthly, It is not allowed by any law, nor practised by any, but furious or drunken men (Ames, *Conscience and the Cases Thereof*, Book V, Chapter XXXVII, pp. 207, 208).

APPENDICES

William Perkins had earlier taken a similar position:

Here question is mooved, whether the husband may correct the wife?

Ans. Though the husband be the wives head, yet it seemeth he hath no power nor libertie granted him in this regard. For we read not in the Scriptures, any precept or example to warrant such practise of his authoritie. He may reprove and admonish her in a word onely, if he seeth her in a fault. For, thus we read, that Iacob censured his wife, beeing impatient, even in anger. Gen 30.2 ... And Iob reprooved his wife, Iob 2:10 ... But he may not chastise her either with stripes, or stroakes. The reason is plaine. Wives are their husbands mates; and they two be one flesh. And no man will hate, much lesse beat his owne flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, Eph. 5.29 .. Againe, it is the commandment of God, that man should not trespasse against the wife of his youth, Malac. 2.15

Neverthesse; if she growe to extremities, and be desperately perverse, so as there be no hope of amendement: then the Magistrate may be informed; who to prevent scandals, and to provide for publicke peace, both ought and may assigne unto her necessarie correction, and punishment according to her desert. Now the husband that hath a wife so stubborne and peevish, must beare it, if it may be borne, as the portion of his crosse laid upon him by God. And in this case if he bee impatient, he may in some sort be pardoned and pitied, but he is not wholly to be excused (Perkins, *Christian Oeconomie*, in *Works*, III, 691, 692).

The Puritan attitude of Perkins, Ames, and Baxter must be understood in the context of their times:

Wife beating, which was doubtless the most widespread form of marital ill-treatment, was rarely condemned, either explicitly or implicitly. Even the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* was careful to specify that the ability of women to divorce would not imply a reduction of men's power of "moderate correction" over their wives. Such neglect of cruelty as a matrimonial offense was quite consistent with the prevailing social attitudes toward the relationship of husband and wife, which specified the latter's inferiority and her duty of obedience (Phillips, *Putting Asunder*, p. 89).

As another scholar has commented: "Much more than the Anglicans, the Puritans developed marriage as a partnership and simultaneously made the strongest objections to wife-beating" (Richard L. Greaves, *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England*, Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1981, p. 739).

Conclusions.

The Puritan movement, with the Westminster Assembly coming at its culmination, manifested both a masterful knowledge of Scriptural teaching and also a pastoral sensitivity to the needs and tendencies of the human soul. This combination is apparent in the materials that would have been available to the Westminster divines as

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

they dealt with the subject of divorce and whether physical abuse could be regarded as a grounds for dissolution of a marriage.

1. To a direct question of whether physical abuse could be a grounds for divorce, the Puritan tradition informing the Westminster Assembly would have answered, No, not per se or by itself. William Perkins and William Ames before the Westminster Assembly, William Gouge as a member of the Assembly, and Richard Baxter soon after the Assembly are all consistent with Calvin and Beza and the Genevan tradition in emphasizing adultery as the essential cause for divorce.

2. This same Puritan tradition also saw that under certain circumstances desertion could be a grounds for divorce, and physical abuse could be the basis of a desertion, the spouse guilty of the abuse being reputed as the deserter even though the other one may have departed. Before such a situation could be the grounds for a divorce, however, a sufficient time would have to expire for the efforts of both church and civil magistrate to seek to achieve a reconciliation.

What do such findings indicate for our contemporary setting? First of all, in the Reformation era settings of Geneva, Scotland, and England the civil magistrate could be expected, to a greater degree than in late-20th-century America, to be mindful of and respectful toward Scriptural principles. With regard to a matter like divorce, while we must be respectful toward the secular courts, we cannot rely on contemporary judicial principles to determine what is right.

Secondly, this means that we must rely even more than did the Reformation era on the constructive discipline of the church. When physical abuse is occurring in a marriage, the church must deal with a situation which, as the Puritans saw, is contrary to God's purpose for marriage. A temporary separation may be necessary for safety, which the church may need to facilitate, and the abusing partner should be disciplined, with helpful counsel but eventually to the point of excommunication if there is not repentance in deed as well as in word. The situation is complicated in our cultural setting when the marriage partner is not a member of a church, or is a member of some other church; nevertheless, discipline must be attempted. Only after a suitable length of time and a sufficient process of church discipline should a divorce be granted for such a desertion of one's marriage partner and the marriage covenant. (This is essentially the conclusion reached by David D. Prescott in *The Problem of Wife Abuse: Wife Abuse and Pastoral Counseling*, Westminster Theological Seminary D.Min. project, 1991; cf. pp. 212-221 on "Divorce: Is It a Possibility?")

In its understanding of the Bible's teaching on divorce as "nothing but adultery, or such willful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage," the Westminster Assembly was seeking to steer the Scriptural path between two demonstrable extremes and in the process uphold God's high ideal for marriage. On the one hand, this ruled out the Roman Catholic concept of no divorce, allowing divorce for adultery and under certain circumstances desertion. On the other hand, it ruled out divorce for incompatibility as some such as Milton were advocating. Physical abuse of a spouse was seen as contrary to the biblical purpose for marriage and would thus be grounds for church discipline

APPENDICES

and could, if it led to prolonged separation without remedy, become a cause for dissolution of a marriage. Such circumstantial details can be handled only by a body of elders cognizant of and close to the situation. Whereas proven adultery would be readily acknowledged as grounds for a divorce, desertion on the basis of physical abuse as a cause for dissolution of a marriage should be determined from the circumstances by the local session or in the case of a minister by the presbytery.

TE David Brewer

TE William S. Barker, Chairman

APPENDIX II

DIVORCE RECONSIDERED

by RE David C. Lachman

The Ad Interim Committee on Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage is submitting a lengthy report to the Nineteenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America. The committee was requested to "ask whether the Westminster Confession Chapter 24.6 is more lax or more restrictive than Scripture" and to "suggest any revisions to that article of the Confession it deems appropriate," particularly addressing the question "whether a Christian may have other legitimate grounds for divorce, besides desertion by an unbelieving spouse, or adultery (for example, inveterate physical abuse, marital rape or other sexual abuse, attempted murder, or equally serious violations of the marriage covenant)." It was also asked to "Recommend guidelines and resources for pastoral care and counsel of couples with marital difficulties,..." [etc.] The committee's proposed report considers the Confession historically, discusses Scriptural perspectives and suggests guidelines and resources for pastoral care and counsel.

Taken as a whole, the report can be characterized as a significant departure from previous Reformed teaching, both in suggesting that "wilful desertion in the Westminster Confession can be more broadly interpreted than has previously been believed (p. 2319) and in maintaining that, in Scripture, abandonment by an unbeliever can mean more than simple physical departure. (pp. 2345-6) It even maintains "that the believing spouse may initiate legal action to make her biblical divorce legal in the eyes of the state," explaining that an abuser can be held to have deserted the spouse, declared an unbeliever and then treated accordingly. (pp. 2381-1) The practical section of the report reflects this deviation.

It should be clearly understood that this report, for all its language of restraint, is a substantial departure from what has hitherto been believed to be the Reformed and Biblical teaching. Historically, opinion has been divided, but between those who denied the possibility of divorce entirely, those who believed divorce permissible on the ground of adultery (both with and without the possibility of remarriage), and those who added desertion to adultery. It is only recently that grounds of divorce have been substantially expanded, first by liberals and then by various others. Though conservatively worded, this is the position taken by the Committee's report.

This article will focus on the historical part of the report, both because the material presented is less familiar and less accessible and an erroneous interpretation can thus more readily be imposed on even the careful reader and because what is new in the report is the claim that modern 'Reformed' expansion of Biblical grounds for divorce has historical Reformed precedent. The Biblical material, with the various arguments respecting its interpretation, is readily available and does not need to be duplicated here.

APPENDICES

I. Historical

The Committee's report claims that there is no need to revise the Confession, since the Confession reflects a range of beliefs which would allow the position the Committee recommends. But its historical paper, though presented with an impressive scholarly apparatus, completely fails to sustain the position taken.

- V. Adultery or fornication committed after a contract, being detected before marriage, giveth just occasion to the innocent party to dissolve that contract. In the case of adultery after marriage, it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce: and, after the divorce, to marry another, as if the offending party were dead.

- VI. Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage: yet nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage: wherein, a public and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed; and the persons concerned in it not left to their own wills and discretion, in their own case. (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, XXIV, 5 & 6)

According to the *Westminster Confession of Faith* only "adultery, or such wilful desertion" as can not be remedied dissolves "the bond of marriage." Historically, the *WCF* has been interpreted as meaning such physical abandonment as removes the deserting party deserting both from the discipline of the church, which would lead to repentance and restoration, and from the coercion of the state, with punishment appropriate to the crime. The assumption has been understood to be that the guilty party is no longer resident in the bounds of the state and therefore cannot be brought to justice, either ecclesiastical or civil.

Since a confession consists of necessity of brief, pithy statements, in the absence of an accompanying commentary or detailed report of any discussion or debate which led to the final draft of a statement (*The Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, ed. A.F. Mitchell and J. Struthers, Edinburgh, 1874, pp. 279-80 & 299-300 are brief and informative), further inquiry into their meaning must of necessity resort to contemporary works on the subject. To this end a brief study will be made of the opinions of several influential English Puritan divines, particularly those writing prior to the Westminster Assembly. Reference will also be made to the influential *Christian Directory* of Richard Baxter, composed not long after the Assembly, and to Continental Reformed thought as well.

The great sixteenth century Puritan William Perkins has been quoted at length in the Committee's report, though without drawing any explicit conclusion. It correctly cites J. I. Packer as judging Perkins "to have permitted divorce and remarriage to the innocent spouse in the case of desertion and that desertion was understood by him 'to

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

cover all behavior that nullified the matrimonial relationship in practice,' such as the imposition of intolerable conditions." (p. 2313, footnote 24) Packer himself goes so far as to say that Perkins regarded "desertion, broadly interpreted to cover all behaviour that nullified the matrimonial relationship in practice -- 'malicious desertion', when 'they require of each other intolerable conditions', 'long absence', cruelty, diseased conditions, and insanity are specified -- as ground for the same grant" of divorce. (*A Quest for Godliness*, Wheaton, 1990, p. 269; without substantiation he claims the Puritans followed Perkins in this.) But Packer's claim is without foundation in Perkins. (It is questionable if he has even bothered to consult Perkins at all. He appears to have read and followed M. M. Knapper's *Tudor Puritanism*, Chicago, 1939, uncritically, even to the point of citing page references in Perkins back to front). For Perkins allows the dissolution of a marriage contract for such reasons as the discovery of an incurable disease, such as would be an impediment to performance of marital duties, and in the case of insanity. But when he passes on from the chapter dealing with 'Of Rejection, or Refusall of the Contract' to 'Of Marriage', he expressly denies them to be reason for divorce. (*The Workes*, Cambridge, 1618, compare pages 682-4 with 687-8).

What, then, did Perkins teach? In addition to divorce for adultery, Perkins clearly allows the believing wife (or husband) to remarry when the unbelieving or heretical husband (or wife) forsakes her and will no longer dwell with her, though only after "all good means" have been used to bring him to repentance. He cites 1 Cor. 7:15 as the basis for teaching that such behavior is that which dissolves a marriage. But when there is desertion between two believers,

The faulty person, who is the cause of this desertion, is to be forced by course of Civill, and Ecclesiasticall censure, to performe his, or her duty. Upon which proceeding, if he remain obstinate, & perverse in will; the other must in patience, and earnest prayer unto God, wait the time, until his mind may be changed, and he made to relent by the order of the Magistrate. But if the one of them, by just occasion of feare, be compelled to depart from the other: and cannot returne againe without apparent danger of life; in this case they are not bound to return; but the delinquent party is to remain solitary, till they be instructed & made willing to doe their duties: and in the meane while, the party innocent must be resolved that God hath called him or her to single life.

Againe, be it that the one is resolutely unwilling to dwell with the other, and thereupon flies away without any fault of the other: if the thing after a long space be sufficiently knowne before-hand, and all possible meanes have been used, to reclaime the guilty person; yea being called, he doth not personally appeare before the Judge, to yeeld a reason of the fact; after publike and solemne declaration made, the Minister upon such desertion, may pronounce the marriage to be dissolved. For he that upon malice flieth away from his mate, is to be holden in the same tearms with an unbeliever, who departs upon detestation of religion, and the service of God, I. Tim. 5.8 (pp. 687-8)

APPENDICES

Having considered 'Desertion', Perkins goes on to consider the "malicious and spitefull dealing of married folkes one with the other."

Malicious dealing is, when dwelling together, they require each of other intollerable conditions: & when the one doth not regard nor releeve the other, beeing in danger or extremity, as is meete. For this is as much as to betray one anothers estate and life to their utter enemies.

Here it may be demaunded, what a beleever should doe, who is in certaine and imminent danger, either of losse of life, or breach of conscience, if they both abide together.

Ans. I. This certaine danger hath his originall, either from one that is a stranger, or from one of the parties: If from a stranger, then the husband either takes upon him the defence of his beleiving wife, or not; if he doth, then she ought to abide with him. If not, she may depart and provide for her own safety. **II.** Againe, if the husband threateneth hurt, the beleiving wife may flie in this case; and it is all one, as if the unbelieving man should depart. For to depart from one, and drive away by threats, are equipollent. (p. 688)

That this is the case should not seem strange, for if the believer has a choice of denying Christ or continuing with the unbelieving partner, separation from the unbeliever must be the choice. But, in answer to the allegation that this makes the believing wife to forsake "the unbelieving husband, which she may not doe," Perkins answers that "She forsakes him not finally, but leaves him for a time." (p. 688)

This is consonant with what Perkins says in his 'A Godly and Learned Exposition of Christ's Sermon in the Mount'. In commenting on Matthew 5: 31-2, he poses the objection based on 1 Corinthians 7: 15,

Here (say they) is another cause of divorce.

Ans. The malitious or wilfull departing of the unbeliever, doth dissolve the mariage; but that is no cause of giving a bill of divorce: onely adulterie causeth that. Here the beleever is a meere patient, and the divorce is made by the unbeliever, who unjustly forsaketh, and so puts away the other. (Workes, 1618, III, p. 69)

After denying that "a contagious and incurable disease" is grounds for divorce, he even denies that physical cruelty which goes the length of attempted murder is sufficient cause for divorce:

Object. But married persons may seeke to spill the blood one of another, and therefore it is good to give a bil of divorce, to prevent that evill. **Ans.** Such enmitie may cause a separation for a time, til reconciliation be made, but the bond of mariage must not therefore be broken. (p. 69)

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

He also denies that other similar causes are grounds for divorce. Speaking of 1 Cor. 7:10-1, Perkins comments:

Here (say they) is a plaine place against marriage after divorcement. Answ. The Apostle speaketh of departure, and putting away, for other causes then adulterie; as for hatred, dislike, &c. which indeed are no sufficient causes of divorce, and therefore they that separate thereupon, ought not to marrie. (pp. 70-1)

We may conclude, therefore, that Perkins is consistent both with himself and with what has hitherto been considered the Reformed teaching. He allows divorce for adultery and irremediable physical abandonment, but not for any other cause, including disease, hatred and even attempted murder.

William Ames, a highly esteemed early seventeenth century Puritan, in a passage not quite clear either in the English translation or the Latin original, seems to follow Perkins. In addition to adultery, he clearly allows divorce in the case of desertion:

An obstinate desertion, although in the party deserting, it containeth no just cause of making a divorce, yet it makes a faire cause for the party deserted, after the triall of all other meanes in vaine, to suffer a divorce, 1 Cor. 7:15.

He goes on to say:

The great danger, which one party may bee in by the cruelty of the other, or by any other manifest meanes of cohabitation, may bee just cause of retiring for a time, so to provide for his owne safety and security, but not for an absolute desertion, unlesse first hee bee deserted. For if one party drive away the other with great fierceness and cruelty, there is cause of desertion, and hee is to be reputed the deserter. But if hee obstinately neglect, that necessary departure of the other avoyding the eminent danger, he himselfe in that playeth the deserter. (*Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof*, London, 1643, pp. 108-9)

In the case of physical cruelty, Ames asserts that the deserter is the party driving the other away. But he does not go on to reflect on this as a cause for divorce and thus can not be cited in support of making the desertion resulting from physical abuse a ground of divorce.

William Gouge, the only Westminster divine to publish on the subject, is particularly important to the purpose at hand, both in that he was a highly respected member of the Assembly and in that he wrote particularly to the point in question. Gouge acknowledges adultery as grounds for divorce: "Concerning Adultery, we deny not, but that it giveth just cause of divorce: but withall we say (as wee have good

APPENDICES

warrant from Christs words) that it is the only cause of just divorce." 'Of Domestic Duties' in *The Workes*, London, 1627, pp. 136-7, II, ii, 16)

Gouge speaks at some length about desertion:

The vice contrary to matrimonial unity is *Desertion*, when one of the married couple through indignation of the true religion, and utter detestation thereof, or some other like cause, shall apparently renounce all matrimonial unity, & withdraw him or her selfe from all society with the other, and live among Infidels, Idolaters, heretiques, or other such persecutors, as a faithfull Christian with safety of life, or a good conscience, cannot abide among: and though all good meanes that can be thought of be used to reclaim the party so departed, yet nothing will prevaile, but obstinatly persisteth in renouncing all matrimonial fellowship.

This *Desertion* is in the case of mariage so capitall, as it freeth the innocent party from any further seeking after the other. ... That *Desertion* therefore on the delinquents part is such a dissolution of mariage, as freeth the innocent party from the bondage thereof. In many reformed Churches beyond the seas Desertion is accounted so farre to dissolve the very bond of mariage, as liberty is given to the party forsaken to mary another; and it is also applied to other cases then that which is above mentioned: as when an Infidel, Idolater, or Heretique shall depart from one of the true religion for other causes then hatred of religion: or when both man and wife having lived as Idolaters among Idolaters, one of them being converted to the true faith, leaveth his abode among Idolaters, and goeth to the professors of the true faith, but can by no meanes get the other party to remove: or when one of the true religion shall depart from another of the same profession, and will by no meanes bee brought to live with the party so left, but openly manifesteth peremptory obstinacy, the matter being heard and adjudged by the magistrate, the mariage-bond may be broken: and liberty given to the party forsaken to mary another. But because our Church hath no such custome, nor our law determined such cases, I leave them to the custome of other Churches. (*Ibid.*, 125-6; II, ii, 3)

While Gouge does not go so far as to adopt the position taken by "many reformed Churches beyond the seas," neither does he oppose it. Thus, while it may be true that other commissioners, and perhaps the Scots in particular, influenced the Assembly to recognize irremediable desertion as a ground for divorce, Gouge did not necessarily change his mind. Even if he had no private inclination to the position, he could have been in the minority when the report was drawn up and may well have acquiesced for the sake of peace. Surely granted the tone of his discussion this would not have been difficult.

But Gouge is also important in that his position indicates the state of the question as it was then discussed. It was not a matter of how expansively "desertion"

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

should be interpreted, but rather if the person deserted could be considered divorced and thus free to remarry. Gouge was among those inclined, in harmony with English law, to think not.

Two further early seventeenth English divines help to clarify and delineate the state of the discussion at the time of the Westminster Assembly. Andrew Willet, in his massive *Synopsis Papismi, that is, A Generall View of Papistrie* (5th edition, London, 1634), devotes thirty-five large folio pages to the question of divorce. He recognizes "another cause whereby the marriage knot may bee dissolved, though not for fornication: as when one of the parties doth wilfully renounce, leave and forsake the other person upon no just cause, but either of lightness or for divers religion, as when an Infidell forsaketh a Christian;... Citing the plain words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. 7:15, Willett says that the innocent Christian brother or sister "is freed from the yoke or bond of marriage." (pp. 778-9)

He goes on to describe the desertion "that causeth a dissolution of a marriage" as first being "*malitiosa desertio*, a malicious departure without any just cause;" second, "the innocent partie must use all meanes to reconcile, reclaime, and bring home againe the wilfull and obstinate partie so departing, if possible;" and third, "if hee continue in his obstinacie, and depart, having no purpose to returne, the matter must be brought before the Judge or Magistrate in such cases: who after publike citation of the obstinate partie, and certaine knowledge that hee refuseth wilfully to appeare being cited, and is not otherwise letted to come, may with mature deliberation pronounce the innocent partie free and at libertie to marrie, according to S. Pauls rule," (p. 779) In the whole of his discussion, Willet does not so much as mention the possibility of physical cruelty as grounds for desertion or divorce.

Another extended discussion of divorce is found in Richard Ward's *Theological Questions, Dogmaticall Observations, And Evangelicall Essays, Upon...Matthew* (London, 1640). Commenting on Matthew 5: 31-2, Ward says that adultery is cause for a "cleane dissolution of marriage by way of divorce:...for that cause our Saviour hath granted liberty, both to dissolve matrimonie, and to marry againe." (pp. 230-1) Of 1 Cor. 7:10-1, in answer to the Roman Catholic objection that "it is not lawful after divorce, to marry so long as both parties live," he says "The Apostle speaks not there of a lawfull departure or separation, to wit, by reason of fornication and adultery (for then he should diametrically have opposed his Master Christ saying here, for adultery there may be a divorce, and departure; Paul there, I command, ne discedat, let not the wife depart from her husband) but of a separation for Religions sake, or for afflictions, or for the cares of those times." (p. 231) In this he does not even appear to recognize a divorce for desertion, much less does he address the issue of physical cruelty.

George Petter in his massive commentary on Mark (*A Learned, Pious, and Practical Commentary Upon...Mark*. London, 1661) is somewhere between the positions taken by Perkins and Goude. He interprets 1 Cor. 7:15 to mean a "case of malicious and willfull desertion; when one of the married couple, being an unbeliever, that is, a Pagan, or Gentile, and the other a Believer, being after marriage converted to the Christian Religion; the unbeliever doth forsake the believer by departing from him or her, and obstinately refusing to dwell or live with the party forsaken, and that out of a

APPENDICES

hatred of the true Christian Religion: in this case, the Apostle showeth, that the Believer is not in subjection, but at liberty to marry with another." (pp. 715-6) Beyond this very narrow ground he says (repeatedly) that "No sin but this of adultery, can, or doth dissolve the marriage bond." (p. 710)

None of the divines discussed above, from Perkins on, gives the least ground for thinking that the Westminster Assembly divines intended to include physical cruelty, whether immediately considered and of itself or secondarily as forcing the other to flee, as something which would constitute grounds for divorce. None gives any indication that the temporary separation (which only some spoke of as following such abuse), the case of religious persecution excepted, could lead to divorce. And most do not even mention this as a possibility.

Richard Baxter, in his great work on cases of conscience, *A Christian Directory: or, a Summ of Practical Theologie, and Cases of Conscience* (2nd edition, London, 1678), is in essential harmony with his predecessors. Fully accepting divorce in the case of adultery, Baxter considers the question, "Doth not the desertion of one party, disoblige the other?" He begins his answer by considering which of the two is the deserting party, it being sometimes hard to discern. He declines absolutely to determine if a wife should follow her husband from a place where "Gods publick Ordinances" are rightly administered to go among "ignorant, prophane, heretical persons, or Infidels" where they are not, there being so many considerations to take into account and the inconveniences being great whatever way is taken. ("Cases of Divorce", p. 55; II, 9, Q. 15)

He also considers such questions as departure in the cases of attempted murder and fixed hatred. In the case of "a man or wife know[ing] that the other in hatred doth really intend by poyson or other murder, to take away their life," he answers that "in plain danger... it may be done and ought." But in the case of a "fixed hatred" he concludes that even so wicked a heart as can not be brought to do its duty to love the other is capable of cure and that "if hatred proceed not to adultery, or murder, or intolerable injuries, you must remember that Marriage is not a Contract for years but for life...." He concludes that "therefore you must do your duty, and wait, and pray, and strive by Love and Goodness to recover Love, and then stay to see what God will do; For mistakes in your choice [in marriage] will not warrant a separation." (p.56)

He continues:

Quest. 18. What if a Woman have a Husband that will not suffer her to read the Scriptures, nor to go to God's Worship publick or private, or that so beateth or abuseth her, as that it cannot be expected that humane nature should be in such a case kept fit for any holy action; or if a man have a Wife that will scold at him when he is praying or instructing his family, and make it impossible to him to serve God with freedom, or peace and comfort?

Answ. The Woman must (at necessary seasons, though not when she would) both read the Scriptures, and Worship God, and suffer patiently what is inflicted on her: Martyrdome may be as comfortably suffered

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

from a Husband, as from a Prince. But yet if neither her own Love, and duty, and patience, nor friends perswasion, nor the Magistrates justice, can free her from such inhumane cruelty, as quite disableth her for her duty to God and man, I see not but that she may depart from such a Tyrant. But the man hath more means to restrain his Wife from beating him, or doing such intolerable things: Either by the Magistrate, or by denying her what else she might have, or by his own violent restraining her, as belongeth to a Conjugal Ruler, and as circumstances shall direct a prudent man. But yet in case that unsuitableness or sin be so great, that after long tryal, there is no likelihood of any other co-habitation, but what will tend to their spiritual hurt and calamity, it is their lesser sin to live asunder by mutual consent. (p. 56)

He concludes by answering the question, "Who be they that may or may not marry again when they are parted?," first by allowing those released by adultery to remarry and then by considering the rest:

The case of all the rest is harder. They that part by consent, to avoid mutual hurt, may not marry again; Nor the party that departeth for self-preservation, or for the preservation of estate, or children, or comforts, or for liberty of Worship, as aforesaid: Because it is but an intermission of Conjugal fruition, and not a total dissolution of the Relation: And the innocent party must wait to see whether there be any hope of a return.

He recognizes a difficulty in this: "A short desertion must be endured in hope: But in the case of a very long, or total desertion or rejection, if the injured party should have an untameable lust, the case is difficult. ... I dare not say that Marriage in that case is unlawful to the innocent." (p. 56) Baxter does not say to whom he means to apply this and it is not clear if he intends it liberally of very long and total desertions and rejections or if he intends it to apply to those he has just said may not marry again. In any case Baxter is *sui generis* and ultimately his views can not be taken as representative of anyone but himself.

The Committee's report makes reference to sixteenth and seventeenth century Continental Reformed theology. While it is apparent that in the early sixteenth century both in Zurich and Basel a variety of grounds for divorce were recognized as valid, including not only adultery and desertion, but disease, life-threatening incompatibility, impotence, and the like, -- and while influential Reformers such as Martin Bucer and Heinrich Bullinger can readily be quoted to that effect --, there is no evidence that such views had any lasting influence, particularly in England and Scotland. Although they represent an attempt to address a real problem, one which needed a solution other than the recently abandoned Roman Catholic teaching, after mature consideration the Reformed community as a whole rejected their thinking. It is to Geneva that we should rather look if we are to seek the historical roots of the views expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith. John Calvin's views are well-known and need no exposition here, allowing only adultery and desertion as grounds of divorce, and expressly permitting a Protestant wife to flee for safety only if in actual danger of her life and not simply for cruel beatings. Theodore Beza followed Calvin in this and such

APPENDICES

views, fully compatible with Lutheran doctrine, became normative in Reformed thought.

In defining desertion as it is ground for divorce, Continental Reformed divines came to speak of a *malitiosa desertio* (see Willet's use of the term above), a desertion which is either a deliberate and permanent removal from the marriage union (such as the magistrate cannot rectify) or a forced removal caused by such cruelty as puts the partner's life at hazard. This was particularly spoken of in the context of the spouse tenaciously adhering to Romanism; in the case of the husband this often meant physical prohibition of the wife's exercise of her faith in public or private, such as led to Calvin's advice mentioned above. In the case of the wife, Roman Catholic persecution being what it was, it meant a refusal to accompany her husband to a place where he could worship without fear of the Inquisition. In such cases they believed that the worship of God took priority over marriage vows and, when there was obstinate continued refusal by the marriage partner to continue the marital union in circumstances which allowed the other the exercise of the true religion, they believed divorce justified, though only after a considerable period of time and as a last resort. They did not, however, consider simple physical cruelty cause of any more than temporary separation. (See, for example, Samuel Maresius, *Collegium Theologicum, sive Systema Breve Universae Theologiae*, Groningae, 1659, p 230, as quoted in the General Assembly Committee's report; see also the more extended discussions in Frideric Spanheim, *Dubiorum Evangelicorum Pars Tertia*, Genevae, 1639, pp. 603-614 and 886-976 and Gisbertus Voetius, *Politicae Ecclesiasticae, partis primae, Libri duo Posteriores*, Amsterdam, 1666, pp. 170-215.)

English and Scottish divines, not having the practical pressure of living on the continent in close proximity to Roman Catholic countries, often felt no need to address this question. The assumption apparently was that any physical cruelty or danger was not in a religious context and could therefore be addressed by the proper exercise of discipline, both ecclesiastical and civil. Although they recognized that temporary separation might be necessary while the discipline did its work, such separation was not thought to be anything but temporary (e.g. Perkins, above). It was not considered preparatory to divorce.

It may be concluded that there is nothing in Puritan thought which would allow the suggested re-interpretation of the Westminster Confession. The debate then was between those who would allow divorce for irremediable physical abandonment and those who would not. None prior to the Westminster Assembly so much as hints at interpreting desertion in such a way as to include physical abuse -- or other violations of the marriage contract -- as grounds for more than a temporary separation.

II. Biblical

Although for reasons of space and the relative familiarity of most with the Scriptural data particular attention will not be given to the exegetical considerations, it should be recognized that the Committee's recommendations are opposed to all but a few, contemporary, revisionist interpreters. This is quite evident from careful reading of the Committee's report. And its conclusions in regard to desertion are based on an

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

extension of 1 Cor. 7:12-5, recommending careful examination of intent to see if the spouse judged to be unbelieving has deserted the marriage (pp. 2344-6). This the Westminster divines almost certainly would have characterized as studying "arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage."

III. Practical

It should be observed that virtually no one holds that a believer must remain in a situation which is genuinely life-threatening; but any such separation, of however indefinite duration, must be viewed as temporary and never as a step toward divorce. In such a situation, as Perkins said, the innocent party must conclude that God has called him or her to a single life.

The Committee has recommended that the General Assembly receive its report "as a reliable summary of the Historical and Biblical Data and as drawing from that data valid conclusions" and to adopt its conclusion "That under extreme circumstances, a Session may properly judge that such desertion (separation) has occurred, even though the offending spouse is still physically present in the home" and that the believer is then free to sue for legal divorce. (pp. 2382-3) If the church endorses such a report, it will not only have affirmed that which is historically erroneous, but will have abandoned, both in principle and practice, the historic position of the Christian church.

APPENDICES

CONCLUSION

I. A SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee was asked to consider:

A. Whether the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, Chapter 24.6, is more lax or more restrictive than Scripture, and whether the committee would suggest any revisions to that article of confession.

In answer to the first part of this request, the Committee finds the *Westminster Confession of Faith* is neither more lax nor more restrictive than Scripture if its statement about desertion is understood to apply only when a believer is deserted by an unbeliever as is the case of the Pauline teaching in 1 Cor. 7:15. If this be the case, then the Confession contains Jesus' concern for the permanence of marriage, and would be understood to indicate that only Jesus' statement about adultery and Paul's about the desertion of a believer by an unbeliever are causes sufficient for dissolving a marriage and giving freedom to remarry, and would therefore faithfully reflect the Scripture's teaching about marriage, divorce and remarriage. If however the church, its elders and members understand that the confession's statement on desertion is intended also to apply to a believer separating from a believer, then the confession would be too lax at this point because it would be permitting what Paul denies when he says to two believers when they separate that they "must remain unmarried, or else be reconciled" (1 Cor. 7:11).

Thus in answer to the second part of this request, the Committee would recommend for clarity's sake and to provide a more explicit statement on the question of desertion and separation reflecting the two different approaches which Paul commands (on the one hand for an unbeliever deserting a believer and on the other hand for two believers that separate) an amendment to Chapter 24.6 of the *Confession*². The Committee would serve the church by suggesting the following wording for an amendment to that section. After the word "desertion" add the words "of a believer by an unbeliever" so that the relevant clause in the section would read as follows: "yet, nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion of a believer by an unbeliever as can no way be remedied by the Church, or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage". And add as a new sentence at the end of the entire section the words "Believers who separate for reasons other than adultery must remain unmarried, or else be reconciled."

B. Whether a Christian may have other legitimate grounds for divorce, besides desertion by an unbelieving spouse, or adultery (for example, inveterate physical abuse,

² Compare John Murray who concluded an analysis of the *Confession's* statement on desertion in light of Scripture with the carefully worded evaluation that "the proposition respecting wilful desertion in the Confession is not sufficiently guarded and delimited so as to confine itself to the teaching of the apostle in this passage" (i.e., 1 Cor. 7:15), *Divorce*, Philadelphia, 1953, pp. 76-77.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

marital rape or other sexual abuse, attempted murder, or equally serious violations of the marriage covenant).

We find that Scripture teaches there is only one biblical justification for a divorce, namely, "sexual immorality" which breaks the one-flesh relationship. Jesus did not intend by the exception clause to open wide the door for divorce. *Porneia* is used by Jesus to refer only to those sexual sins that clearly destroy the marital union.

In 1 Corinthians 7:10-15, Paul is not giving a second ground for divorce. He is responding to those real life situations where divorce has become a *fait accompli*. According to verses 10-11, if two believers divorce, they are to remain single or be reconciled. According to verses 12-15, if an unbelieving spouse divorces a believing spouse, the believer is not bound as he or she would be if the deserting spouse had been a believer.

In Paul's day, the separation spoken of in 1 Corinthians 7:10-15 was itself an act of divorce. In our day such separation is not regarded as such. Therefore, the believing spouse whose unbelieving spouse separates from him or her is left in an anomaly, i.e., divorced and free to remarry in the eyes of God (and His Word), but not divorced in the eyes of the State. To resolve this anomaly the Committee holds that the believing spouse may initiate legal action to make her biblical divorce legal in the eyes of the State.

The Committee believes that when there are words and actions on the part of one spouse that threatens the life of the other spouse and/or children, that the one(s) threatened should be counseled by the Session, or representative thereof, to remove themselves from the threatening situation and the abuser should be urged to seek counsel. Such a procedure will protect those threatened. When the abuser does not cease these words and actions, the Session should investigate whether these words and actions are in effect breaking the one-flesh relationship by "hating" the abused spouse and not "nourishing and cherishing" this one (Eph. 5:28-29). In counseling the abuser, the reality of his Christian faith should be ascertained. When it is determined by the Session that the abuser does not appear to them to be Christian and the abuse continues, the Pauline teaching about an unbeliever leaving a believer should be applied.

We realize that there are some who will see our viewpoint on desertion as a relaxing of standards, as an opening of the door to all sorts of reasons for divorce. As a Committee, we repudiate such an inference for our viewpoint remains solidly within the Reformed consensus. We believe this less wooden construction of desertion is a more faithful representation of Scripture.

C. Whether there are recommended guidelines and resources for pastoral care and counsel of couples with marital difficulties, persons considering divorce or remarriage after divorce, divorced persons, and children and other family members affected by divorce.

There are recommended guidelines and resources the Committee has sought to provide the Church. Ruling and teaching elders are encouraged to review these

APPENDICES

guidelines and practical considerations that have been presented in Chapter 3 of the report, and to use them as appropriate.

The recommended resources include books, videos and seminars to help elders shepherd their flock. Though not necessarily agreeing with all aspects of these resources, we do recommend that they be reviewed and used insofar as they are consistent with biblical principles.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE 20TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PCA

1. That the General Assembly receive the report of the Ad-Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage. *Adopted*
2. That the General Assembly adopt the following conclusions regarding divorce and remarriage:
 - a. That according to both the institution of marriage and its regulation in Scripture, marital vows are to be kept until death. *Adopted*
 - b. That nevertheless, Scripture does provide for the dissolution of marriage under certain circumstances. *Adopted*
 - c. That the innocent spouse is free to divorce and remarry when the other spouse commits sexual immorality (*porneia*, Mt. 19:9), in the sense understood in the Committee report (Chapter 2, Section II.D.3.f.). *Adopted*
 - d. That while divorce is permitted to the innocent spouse, divorce is not mandated in the case of *porneia*, however, and forgiveness is always to be offered to the one who has sinned (cf., e.g., Mt. 6:12, 14, 15). *Adopted*
 - e. That when believers divorce for other than Biblical grounds, they should remain unmarried or else be reconciled (1 Cor. 7:11). *Adopted*
 - f. That when an unbeliever separates from the marriage relationship with a believer, the believer is free from that marriage and free to remarry but only in the Lord (1 Cor. 7:15, 39). *Adopted*
 - g. That under extreme circumstances, a Session may properly judge that such desertion (separation) has occurred, even though the deserting spouse is still physically present in the home ("desertion" being viewed in the sense understood in the Committee report, Chapter 2, Section II.E.4.). *Adopted*
 - h. That the believer in the aforementioned cases (f, g) is free to make the Biblical divorce a legal divorce in the eyes of the State. *Adopted*
 - i. That in matters pertaining to sexual immorality and desertion, the pastor and Ruling Elders are responsible for providing counsel, direction and judgment, according to the Scriptures and the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America. *Adopted*

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

3. That the General Assembly propose the revision of 24.6 of the *Confession* (which could be construed as too lax at this point, but is otherwise neither too lax or too restrictive) for clarity's sake to provide a more explicit statement of the Pauline teaching by means of the following amendment:
 - a. Add after the word "desertion" the words "of a believer by an unbeliever," and
 - b. Add as the concluding words of the section the sentence: "Believers who separate for reasons other than adultery must remain unmarried, or else be reconciled."

The present wording of 24.6 reads as follows:

"Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage: yet, nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church, or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage: wherein, a public and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed; and the persons concerned in it not left to their own wills, and discretion, in their own case."

Defeated

4. That the General Assembly present to ruling and teaching elders for their careful consideration the guidelines and resources provided in Chapter 3, "Pastoral Perspective on Divorce and Remarriage." *Adopted*
5. That the Ad Interim Committee on Divorce and Remarriage be dismissed with gratitude. *Adopted*

APPENDICES

APPENDIX P

AD INTERIM COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS REPORT TO THE TWENTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY JUNE 1992

The Ad Interim Committee on Communications was appointed by the 18th General Assembly "to study the whole area of PCA communications: . . . what should be done, by whom, and how and who should fund them, and report to the 1991 Assembly."

Due to financial restriction, the Committee did not begin meeting until late 1990, and was unable to begin effective work until after the 19th General Assembly. Since that time, the committee has met several times, engaged in several telephone conference calls, and, through interviews with communications professionals on the staffs of our committees and agencies, has gathered a good deal of information about past and present programs of communications in the PCA.

To date, our primary focus has been on our denominational magazine, the *PCA Messenger*, but we fully expect to study and bring recommendations concerning all instruments for communications presently used in the PCA.

The Ad Interim Committee, convinced that effective communications are absolutely necessary to the growth of unity in the Church and, therefore, to the usefulness of the Church of God in the ministry of His Word, requests the Assembly to suffer its continuance until its task is finished.

It is hoped that an up-to-date readership survey may be taken in the near future to enable the committee to answer the question why so few of our people are subscribing to the *Messenger*, and, hopefully, to discover just what kinds of publications or other media may be most needed and helpful.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Twentieth General Assembly continue this Committee and instruct it to bring a report, with recommendations, to the Twenty-first General Assembly.
2. That this Assembly allow the Committee thirty minutes at this time to survey the commissioners, with a view to learning the opinions, felt needs, and personal commitments of the "grass roots" in reference to communications in the PCA.

Respectfully submitted,

Ad Interim Committee on Communications

RE John B. Prentis

TE John D. Holmes

RE W. Jack Williamson

RE Edward Harris

RE John B. White, Jr.

TE Paul G. Settle, Chairman

CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS MINUTES OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PART III CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS MINUTES

ERRATA FOR MINUTES OF THE 19TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1991

- p. 69 Under "Guests:" Dwight Dunn is a TE not RE
- p. 120 Third paragraph of 19-56 should read:
"The Assembly on motion received items 21 and 22 as information to be attached to the stated clerk's report (see Appendix A, Attachment 1, p. 236 as an Addendum)."
- p. 186 Item 37: Strike "NONE" and insert "June 5, 1990; July 31, 1990"
- p. 208 Item 19-72: Add TE Morton H. Smith to the list of additional signers.
- p. 236 Insert the following articles at end of the report of CCB:

ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS REPORT

21. Reference for advice from Mississippi Valley Presbytery

Answer:

In response to the Mississippi Valley Presbytery's reference, dated April 16, 1991, the proposed action of Mississippi Valley Presbytery (found on Appendix N, page 1) may not be the appropriate way to respond to the judgment of the Standing Judicial Commission in the judicial case 90-7, "Randy C. Stringer, Appellant versus Mississippi Valley Presbytery, Respondent."

The most appropriate response to the judgment of the Standing Judicial Commission would be to follow these steps:

1. Follow the specific dictate of the judgment in accordance with *BCO* 46-8 and take the appropriate action; find a PCA session which will receive Mr. Stringer as a member under censure of the particular church, and assign him to that particular church.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NOTE:

There is a divergence of opinion concerning whether or not a Presbytery can assign a member to a particular church which is not under the jurisdiction of that particular Presbytery. Given the diversity of opinion and given the silence of *BCO* 46-8 on this exact determination, it is the opinion of the Committee on Constitutional Business that Mississippi Valley Presbytery may limit its search for a "willing session" to the churches which are members of Mississippi Valley Presbytery.

2. If it becomes apparent that there is no Session within the bounds of Mississippi Valley Presbytery who will receive Mr. Stringer, the Presbytery could reference General Assembly in accordance with *BCO* 41-3 and ask the Assembly to make "final disposition" of this matter.

22. A reference for advice from Ascension Presbytery

The Committee on Constitutional Business finds that the reference from Ascension Presbytery is not in order. Presbytery should consult *BCO* 41-1 and 41-6 for the requirements for a proper reference.

INDEX

PART V

INDEX

AD-INTERIM COMM. ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE	20-14, p. 59; Appendix O, p. 513
ADJOURNMENT	20-78, p. 269
ADMINISTRATION	
Comm. of Commissioners' Report	20-63, p. 127
Permanent Committee	
Budget	Appendix C, Attachment 3, p. 316
Report	Appendix C, p. 303
APPOINTMENT OF	
Assistant Parliamentarians	20-8, p. 46
ARCHIVES (see Historical Center)	
ASKINGS	Appendix C, Attachment 2, p. 315
AUDITORS	
Arthur Anderson & Co.	20-47, III, 3, p. 92
Coopers & Lybrand	20-42, III, C, p. 90
Ernst & Young	29-63, VI, 33, p. 135
Jackson McDaniel III	20-61, III, 6, p. 126
Robins, Eskew & Farmer	20-63, VI, 14, p. 133
BETHANY CHRISTIAN SERVICES	20-23, III, C, 6, p. 77; Attachment 6, Appendix J, p. 421
BILLS AND OVERTURES REPORT	20-51, p. 98;
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES	Appendix B, p. 299
BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER	
Amendments Enacted	20-12, p. 48; 20-20, p. 62
Amendments Proposed	20-51, 3, 4, 19, 20, p. 99, 100, 116
BUDGETS--APPENDIX C, Attachment 3	
Administration	p. 316
Approved	20-63, VI, 15-26, p. 133-134
Christian Education	p. 320
Covenant College	p. 344
Covenant Theological Seminary	p. 347
Insurance, Annuities and Relief	p. 353
Investor's Fund for Building and Development	p. 354
Mission to North America	p. 325
Mission to the World	p. 330
MTW/IMPACT	p. 339
PCA Foundation	p. 355
Ridge Haven	p. 356
BYLAWS	20-63, VI, 6, p. 130
CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION	20-63, VI, 6, p. 130
CHAPLAINS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL REPORT	Attachment 4, Appendix J, p. 417
CHAIM	20-23, III, B, 6, p. 76

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND PUBLICATIONS	
Committee of Commissioners' Report	20-36, p. 82
Permanent Committee	
Budget	Appendix C, p. 320
Report	Appendix D, p. 357
CHURCHES NOT REPORTING 1991 STATISTICS	Table 3, Appendix A, p. 276
COMMUNICATIONS listed by title and cross reference	
1. From Grace Presbytery	20-23, 3, p. 74
"Concur with Overture 13 from Louisiana to Divide"	
2. From Westminster Theological Seminary	20-63, VI, 11, p. 132
"Appoint Ovsserver to Westminster Theological Seminary Board"	
3. "Consider Merger, not J & R"	20-22, III, 1, p. 63
4. "Thanks for Relation Through MTW; Request Fraternal Relationship"	
.	20-22, 11, p. 66
5. "Greetings to the 20th GA of the PCA, 1992"	20-22, 11, p. 67
6. "Greetings"	20-22, 11, p. 68
COMPLAINTS--SEE JUDICIAL CASES	
CONRAD, WILLIAM A. et. al. - Judicial Case	20-69, p. 232
CONSTITUTIONAL BUSINESS COMMITTEE	
Business Referred to.	20-62, p. 127; 20-75, p. 267
Report	20-67, p. 137; Attachment 1, Appendix A, p. 290
CONSTITUTIONAL INQUIRY.	
	20-46, p. 92; 20-57, p. 123; 20-68, p. 138
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS:	
MTW - New	20-37, III, 12-14, p. 85-86
Caribbean Christian Center for the Deaf, Inc.	20-37, III, 12, p. 85;
.	Attachment 5, Appendix K, p. 450
Lumiere Medical Ministries	20-37, III, 13, p. 86;
.	Attachment 6, Appendix K, p. 455
International Teams	20-37, III, 14, p. 86; Attachment 7, Appendix K, p. 461
CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS MINUTES.	Part IV, p. 639
COVENANT COLLEGE	
Board Report	Appendix E, p. 366
Budget	Appendix C, p. 344
Committee of Commissioners' Report	20-39, p. 87
COVENANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	
Board Report	Appendix F, p. 370
Budget	Appendix C, p. 347
Committee of Commissioners' Report	20-42, p. 89
DAY OF PRAYER FOR WORLD EVANGELISM	20-37, III, 9, p. 85
DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE	
Committee Report	20-14, p. 59; Appendix O, p. 513

INDEX

ELECTION OF	
Assistant Clerks, Recording Clerks	20-8, p. 46
Permanent Committees and Agencies Coordinators	
CE/P	20-36, III, 8, p. 83
MNA	20-23, II, C, 1, p. 77
MTW	20-37, III, 6, p. 85
Moderator	20-5, p. 45
Stated Clerk	20-63, VI, 13, p. 133
ENROLLMENT OF COMMISSIONERS	20-2, p. 20
EXCUSED COMMISSIONERS	20-77, p. 268
FRATERNAL DELEGATES	20-21, p. 62
GENERAL ASSEMBLY	
Meeting Dates	20-63, VI, 1-3, p. 129
GUNTER, HERMAN III, et. al. - Judicial Case.	20-69, p. 197
HISTORICAL CENTER (Archives)	
Report	Attachment 1, Appendix A, p. 312
HOPPER, ROBERT D. - Judicial Case.	20-69, p. 160
INSURANCE, ANNUITIES AND RELIEF	
Board of Trustees Report	Appendix G, p. 371
Budget	Appendix C, p. 353
Committee of Commissioners' Report	20-47, p. 92
INTERCHURCH RELATIONS	
Committee of Commissioners' Report	20-21, p. 62; 20-22, p. 63
Permanent Committee Report	Appendix H, p. 379
INVESTORS FUND FOR BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT	
Committee of Commissioners' Report	20-61, p. 125
Permanent Committee	
Budget.	Appendix C, p. 354
Report	Appendix I, p. 387
JUDICIAL CASES	
Case 1: 91-1 Sandra Lovelace vs. Northeast Presbytery	p. 140
Case 2: 91-2 Bruce Nicholey et. al. vs. Southwest Presbytery	p. 142
Case 3: 91-3 Daniel R. Morse vs. Covenant Presbytery	p. 154
Case 4: 91-4 Robert D. Hopper vs. James River Presbytery.	p. 160
Case 5: 91-5 Herman Gunter, III, et. al. vs. Central Florida Presbytery	p. 197
Case 6: 91-7 W. Austin Kenly vs. Potomac Presbytery	p. 214
Case 7: 92-3 Richard E. Olson et. al. vs. Heritage Presbytery.	p. 231
Case 8: 92-4 William A. Conrad, et. al. vs. Central Carolina Presbytery	p. 232
KENLY, W. AUSTIN - Judicial Case.	20-69, p. 214
KOREAN LANGUAGE BCO.	20-63, VI, 4, p. 129
KOREAN LANGUAGE PRESBYTERIES	20-23, II, B, 1, p. 70; 20-71, IV, 1, p. 262
LOVELACE, SANDRA - Judicial Case	20-69, p. 140
MEMORIAL TO STANLEY R. PETERS	Appendix K, p. 429

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

MESSENGER 20-63, VI, 26-27, p. 134; Attachment 3, Appendix C, p. 322-323

MISSION TO NORTH AMERICA
 Committee of Commissioners' Report 20-23, p. 69
 Permanent Committee
 Budget Appendix C, p. 325
 Report Appendix J. p. 396

MISSION TO THE WORLD
 Committee of Commissioners' Report 20-37, p. 84
 Cooperative Agreements 20-37, III, 12-14, p. 85
 Permanent Committee
 Budget Appendix C, p. 330
 Report Appendix K, p. 424

MODERATOR
 Election and Installation 20-5, p. 45
 Retiring Moderator 20-6, p. 45

MORSE, DANIEL R. - Judicial Case 20-69, p. 154

NAE 20-22, III, 7, p. 66

NEW CHURCHES SINCE 19TH GA 20-11, p. 46

NICHOLEY, BRUCE et. al. - Judicial Case 20-69, p. 142

NOMINATING COMMITTEE
 Elections and Report 20-49, p. 95
 Meetings and Membership Appendix L, p. 469

OLSON, RICHARD E. et. al. - Judicial Case 20-69, p. 231

ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH 20-22, III, 1, p. 63

OVERTURES listed by title and cross reference

1. **From Presbytery of Southern Florida** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 20-1 To Clarify Calls" 20-51, 1, p. 98
2. **From Missouri Presbytery** (to AC)
 "Print RAO to Fit in Looseleaf *BCO*" 20-63, VI, 7, p. 130
3. **From Missouri Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Have the Committee of Commissioners Serve a 2-Year Term" . 20-51, p. 99
4. **From New Jersey Presbytery** (to AC)
 "Worship Services at General Assembly" 20-63, VI, 9, p. 131
5. **From Potomac Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 15-4 to Limit Membership on SJC" 20-51, 3, p. 99
6. **From Covenant Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 14-1 by Inserting RAO 13-1" 20-51, 4, p. 100
7. **From Northeast Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 43-2 and 43-3" ** 20-51, 5, p. 101
8. **From Central Georgia Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Study Committee to Encourage Psalm Singing" 20-51, 6, p. 102
9. **From Korean Southeastern Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Divide Korean Southeastern Presbytery" 20-23, 2, p. 72

INDEX

10. **From Korean Southeastern Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" 20-23, 1, p. 72
11. **From Western Carolina Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 13-1 and 14-2 to Permit All Ruling Elders to Serve a
 Presbytery and General Assembly" 20-51, 7, p. 103
12. **From Korean Southern Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" 20-23, 1, p. 71
13. **From Louisiana Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Divide Louisiana Presbytery" 20-23, 3, p. 73
14. **From Potomac Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Amend *SJC* Manual 7.3 (c)" 20-51, 8, p. 104
15. **From Presbytery of Southern Florida** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 32-2 and 32-3 to Clarify" ** 20-51, 9, p. 106
16. **From Presbytery of New River** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 43-3 to Clarify if, if Current Amendment
 is Adopted" 20-51, 10, p. 107
17. **From Heritage Presbytery** (to IRC)
 "Reporting on the Work of NAE" 20-22, 7, p. 66
18. **From Korean Eastern Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" 20-23, 1, p. 72
19. **From Korean Central Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" 20-23, 1, p. 72
20. **From Korean Southwestern Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Continue Korean Language Presbyteries" 20-23, 1, p. 72
21. **From Grace Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Instruct AC to Appoint Committee to Revise RAO" 20-51, 11, p. 108
22. **From Western Carolina Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Objection to Using Cult Facilities" 20-51, 12, p. 109
23. **From New River Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 16-3 to Require Grounds for Not Approving
 Ordination Exam" 20-51, 13, p. 110
24. **From Presbytery of the Ascension** (to MNA)
 "Divide Ascension Presbytery into Two" 20-23, 4, p. 74
25. **From Pacific Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Evangelism of Jewish People" 20-51, 14, p. 111
26. **From Korean Southwest Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Divide Korean Southwest Presbytery" 20-23, 5, p. 75
27. **From Central Georgia Presbytery** (to IAR)
 "Make PCA Health Plan Mandatory" 20-47, 7, p. 93
28. **From Central Georgia Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Study Clergy Burnout, Stress, etc, in PCA" 20-51, 15, p. 112
29. **From Evangel Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Restatement of *BCO* 38-2" 20-51, 16, p. 113
30. **From New River Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 15-4 to permit General Assembly to Adjudicate"
 20-51, 17, p. 114
31. **From Westminster Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* Preface II, to Avoid Pluralistic Interpretation" 20-51, 18, p. 115

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

32. **From Ascension Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 34-1 so Neighboring Presbyteriy may adjudicate case"
 20-51, 19, p. 116
33. **From New River Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 24-5 to Permit Session to Ordain Elders and Deacons"
 20-51, 20, p. 116
34. **From New River Presbytery** (to CCB & B&O)
 "Amend *BCO* 15-4 So As to Limit Membership on SJC"*** 20-50, 21, p. 118
35. **From Heritage Presbytery** (to CCB)
 "Amend *BCO* 37-4 to Apply to Presbyteries as Well as Sessions"
 20-51, 22, p. 118
36. **From Central Carolina Presbytery** (to IAR & B&O)
 "Require IAR to Produce Legal Opinions and GA to Appoint Interim Board"
 20-47, 8, p. 94
37. **From Southeast Alabama Presbytery** (to B&O)
 "Have GA Meet Only Every Two Years" 20-51, 24, p. 120
38. **From Philadelphia Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Regarding Evangelism of Jewish People" 20-51, 14, p. 112
39. **From Philadelphia Presbytery** (to MNA)
 "Regarding Endorsement of CHAIM" 20-23, 6, p. 76
40. **From Philadelphia Presbytery**
 "Appoint Study Committee: 'Are Drama and Liturgical Dance Consistent with
 Doctrine of Worship?'" 20-25, 1, p. 79
41. **From Northeast Presbytery**
 "Establish Ad Interim Committee to Plan Anniversary 350th of WCF"
 20-25, 2, p. 79

** Declared Unconstitutional

PARLIAMENTARIANS

Appointment of Assistants 20-8, p. 46

PCA COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE. 20-26, p. 80; Appendix P, p. 637

PCA FOUNDATION

Articles of Incorporation of PCA Foundation . Attachment 3, Appendix M, p. 497

Bylaws of PCA Foundation. Attachment 4, Appendix M, p. 497

Board Report Appendix M, p. 494

Budget Appendix C, p. 355

Committee of Commissioners' Report 20-60, p. 123

PERSONAL RESOLUTIONS listed by title and cross reference:

1: From TE William S. Henderson 20-63, VI, 34, p. 135

2: From RE James White. 20-28, p. 80

3: From TE Howard Griffith. 20-62, p. 127

4: From RE Jack Brown 20-51, 25, p. 120

5: From TE John Peoples 20-51, 26, p. 121

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF BRAZIL 20-21, p. 62

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF KOREA. 20-21, p. 62

PRESBYTERY BOUNDARIES. 20-23, II, C, 3-5, p. 73-75

PROTESTS. 20-59, p. 123; 20-72, p. 265

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF INDIA
 20-21, p. 62; 20-22, III, 11, p. 67

INDEX

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NORTH AMERICA	20-21, p. 62
REPORTS - see each subject	
REVIEW OF PRESBYTERY RECORDS	
Report	20-71, p. 235
RIDGE HAVEN	
Board of Trustees	
Budget	Appendix C, p. 356
Report	Appendix N, p. 510
Committee of Commissioners' Report	20-41, p. 88
RULES FOR ASSEMBLY OPERATIONS	20-63, VI, 6, p. 130
SPECIAL OFFERINGS:	
IAR Ministerial Relief	20-47, III, 6, p. 93
MNA Mercy Ministries	20-23, II, C, 5, p. 77
MTW World Relief	20-37, III, 8, p. 85
STANDING JUDICIAL COMMISSION	
Report	20-69, p. 138
STATED CLERK	
Report	20-11, p. 46; Appendix A, p. 271
THANKS COMMITTEE	
Appointed	20-15, p. 61
Report	20-73, p. 266
THEOLOGICAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE	20-40, p. 88
WEF	20-22, III, 8-9, p. 66
WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD OF AUSTRALIA	20-22, III, 11, p. 66
WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	20-63, VI, 11, p. 132
WOMEN IN THE CHURCH (WIC) LOVE GIFT	20-36, III, 1-3, p. 82
WOMENS CONFERENCE IN 1992	20-36, III, 4, p. 82; 20-38, p. 87
WORSHIP SERVICES	20-1, p. 19; 20-16, p. 61; 20-43, p. 91; 20-64, p. 136

