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FOREWORD

The three sections of this volume are the following:

JOURNAL - the minutes of the daily sessions of the Assembly. Though the Journal does not contain the documents that appear in the second section (Appendix) it does contain the recommendations made in those documents; those recommendations appear in the Journal at the point where they were considered. For ease of reference and cross-reference the Journal is divided into articles, denoted by the symbol §. In the Index that symbol, in bold-face type, indicates reference to articles in the Journal; page numbers refer to the Appendix and the Yearbook.

APPENDIX - the documents submitted to the Assembly by presbyteries, committees of the Church, and by other bodies, for the Assembly’s consideration. With the exception of overtures, communications, and complaints, the several documents appear in the Appendix in the order in which they were presented to the Assembly. All references to documents in the Appendix are by page number, in both the Journal and the Index.

YEARBOOK - general information about the denomination. References to items in this section are by page number.

ABBREVIATIONS

used in this volume for the Standards of the Church

BCO - The Book of Church Order
FG - Form of Government
BD - Book of Discipline
SR - Standing Rules
WCF - Westminster Confession of Faith
WLC - Westminster Larger Catechism
WSC - Westminster Shorter Catechism

The Clerk welcomes suggestions for the improvement of these annual volumes.
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MINUTES
of the
SEVENTY-THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY
of the
ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
Meeting at
Trinity Christian College
Palos Heights, Illinois
June 21–28, 2006

JOURNAL

Wednesday Evening, June 21, 2006

1. OPENING. The Seventy-third General Assembly of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by the Rev. James L. Bosgraf, Moderator of the Seventy-second General Assembly. Mr. Bosgraf constituted the meeting with prayer. The Assembly sang “And Can It Be That I Should Gain.”


3. WELCOME. The President of Trinity Christian College, Dr. Steven Timmermans, welcomed the commissioners.

4. COMMISSIONERS ROLL.

[Nos. (x/x) are (number listed/number apportioned).]

Presbytery of the Central United States (CUS)
Ministers (2/2) – J. Michael Arnaud, Joseph A. Auksela
Ruling Elders (1/1) – Philip L. Ledgerwood (Overland Park)

Presbytery of Connecticut and Southern New York (C&SNY)
Ministers (2/2) – Richard R. Gerber, William Shishko
Ruling Elders (1/1) – Michael F. Montemarano (Franklin Square)

Presbytery of the Dakotas (DK)
Ministers (3/3) – Archibald A. Allison, Benjamin K. Hopp, D. Jason Wallace
Ruling Elders (2/2) – Louis C. LaBriola (Denver), Shawn C. Mathis (Denver)

Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario (M&O)
Ministers (6/7) – Timothy L. Bero, John R. Ferguson, Stephen W. Igo, Kenneth A. Smith, Robert M. Van Manen, Peter J. Wallace
Ruling Elders (3/4) – Wayne A. Feece (Walkerton), Vito P. Lomonaco (Kentwood), William Martin III (Farmington Hills)
Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic (MA)
Ministers (5/5) – George W. Hall, Stuart R. Jones, Anthony A. Monaghan, Albert J. Tricarico, S. Scott Willet
Ruling Elders (3/4) – L. Fred Baum, Jr., (Baltimore), Newman deHaas (Silver Spring), Donald H. Potter (Manassas)

Presbytery of the Midwest (MW)
Ministers (7/7) – Heero E. C. Hacquebord, Bruce H. Hollister, David W. King, Christian M. McShaffrey, Lendall H. Smith, Alan D. Strange, David M. VanDrunen
Ruling Elders (6/7) – David W. Beezhold, (Orland Park), Stuart R. Bjork (Janesville), Tom E. Deatsch (Des Moines), John D. Mazunik (Des Moines), Jack W. Pliester, Jr. (Orland Park), Timothy J. Wieskamp (Oostburg)

Presbytery of New Jersey (NJ)
Ruling Elders (4/5) – Richard A. Barker (Westfield), David E. Haney (Pole Tavern), Bruce A. Stahl (Stratford), R. Arthur Thompson (Westfield)

Presbytery of New York and New England (NY&NE)
Ruling Elders (2/5) – Charles T. Powers II (Schenectady), W. Wayne Mortensen (Schenectady)

Presbytery of Northern California (NC)
Ministers (4/4) – Michael L. Babcock, David P. Bush, Michael D. Dengerink, Mark E. Richline
Ruling Elders (2/3) – Joseph L. Hanna (Monterey Bay), Eric H. Gelston (Berkeley)

Presbytery of the Northwest (NW)
Ministers (5/6) – Mark A. Collingridge, J. Glenn Ferrell, John W. Mahaffy, Brett A. McNeill, Murray I. Uomoto
Ruling Elders (3/5) – P. Anthony Hamstra (Lynwood), Robert J. Johnson (Lynwood), Hobart C. Newton (Boise)

Presbytery of Ohio (OH)
Ministers (6/6) – Robert L. Broline, Jr., R. Daniel Knox, Steven F. Miller, Danny E. Olinger, Douglas W. Snyder, Larry E. Wilson
Ruling Elders (4/4) – James S. Gidley (Sewickley), Paul H. Tavares (Grove City), Timothy K. Jackson (Morgantown), David K. Thompson (West Allegheny)

Presbytery of Philadelphia (PH)
Ruling Elders (6/6) – Luke E. Brown (Hatboro), Mark T. Bube (Glenside), David J. Gregg (Middletown, PA), Jesse Charles Hanson (Mansfield), Robert M. Meeker (Glenside), Timothy L. Shatzer (Gettysburg)
Presbytery of the South (SO)
Ministers (5/5) – Hendrik Krabbendam, Jack W. Sawyer, Jose Vera, Eric B. Watkins, William V. Welzien
Ruling Elders (1/2) – John R. Muether (Oviedo)

Presbytery of the Southeast (SE)
Ministers (6/6) – L. Anthony Curto, Sidney D. Dyer, John V. Fesko, M. Daniel Fincham, George W. Knight III, Patrick Ramsey
Ruling Elders (3/3) – Jeremy D. Huntington (New Bern), Scott W. Shallenberger (Lynchburg), Bradley Y. Winsted (Atlanta)

Presbytery of Southern California (SC)
Ruling Elders (3/6) – Robert M. Coie (Westminster), Archibald M. Laurie (Goleta), Thomas M. McManus (Chula Vista)

Presbytery of the Southwest (SW)
Ministers (4/4) – Chad E. Bond, Nathan J. Hornfeld, John H. Johnson, M. Scott Johnson
Ruling Elders (2/2) – John S. Emmett (Garland), David T. Mahaffy (Dallas)

Ex Officio
Ministers
– Donald J. Duff (PH), James L. Bosgraf (MW)

Committee Representatives:
Commissioners: Richard A. Barker (Trustees), James L. Bosgraf (Coordination), Robert L. Broline, Jr. (Financial Review), Paul N. Browne (Foreign Missions), Mark T. Bube (Foreign Missions), Robert M. Coie (Chaplains), George R. Cottenden (Directory for Worship), John V. Fesko, Alan D. Strange and David M. VanDrunen (Committee on Justification), Richard B. Gaffin (Foreign Missions), Richard R. Gerber (Home Missions), James S. Gidley (Christian Education), Ross W. Graham (Home Missions), David E. Haney (Arrangements, Loan Fund), John R. Hilbelink (Home Missions), Stuart R. Jones (Appeals and Complaints), John R. Muether (Historian), Danny E. Olingar (Christian Education), Ronald E. Pearce (Diaconal), Bruce A. Stahl (Financial Review), David K. Thompson (Committee for the Historian), Thomas E. Tyson (Ecumenicity), Larry E. Wilson (Directory for Worship)

Corresponding Members: Douglas B. Clawson (Foreign Missions), Leonard J. Coppes (Diaconal), Brenton C. Ferry (C. for Historian), Roger W. Huibregtsae, (Pensions), John W. Mallin III (Appeals and Complaints), Robert B. Needham (Chaplains), Jack J. Peterson (Ecumenicity)

Fraternal Delegates: James K. Kim (Korean American Presbyterian Church), Todd P. Joling and Casey Freswick (United Reformed Churches), Charles A. Brown (Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America), Roelf Christiaan (Karlo) Janssen and Klaas Wezeman (Reformed Churches in the
Seventy-Third General Assembly

Netherlands (liberated), Dave Schutter (Presbyterian Church in America), R. Sherman Isbell (Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)), Morris C. McDonald (Bible Presbyterian Church), Herman Van Stedum (Reformed Church in the United States), Chong Soo Lim and Tae Jun (Presbyterian Church of Korea, Kosin)

5. SURVEY OF COMMISSIONERS’ LENGTH OF SERVICE. A survey of commissioners and corresponding members present yielded the following information as to their dates of ordination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of Ordination</th>
<th>No. of Presbyters Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since Jan. 1, 2000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1990 through Dec. 31, 1999</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1970 through Dec. 31, 1979</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1960 through Dec. 31, 1969</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1950 through Dec. 31, 1959</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1, 1940 through Dec. 31, 1949</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Jan. 1, 1940</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those attending the General Assembly for the first time</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. APPORTIONMENT OF COMMISSIONERS TO 73rd GA. The apportionment of commissioners to the Seventy-third General Assembly, in accordance with Chapter I of the Standing Rules of the General Assembly, and enrollment are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Ruling Elders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apport’d</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut and S. New York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakotas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Ontario</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York and New England</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator, 72nd GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk, 72nd GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **INTRODUCTION OF FRATERNAL DELEGATES.** Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. Casey D. Freswick, fraternal delegate of the United Reformed Churches, and the Rev. Morris C. McDonald, fraternal observer of the Bible Presbyterian Church. On motion they were seated as corresponding members.

8. **COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS.** Mr. Haney reported for the Committee on Arrangements at this time and at other times during the Assembly (see §199). The Rev. Iain A. M. Wright also reported for the Committee on Arrangements.

Recommendation 1 of the Committee was adopted that the deadline for accepting valid travel vouchers be set for 6:30 p.m., Friday.

9. **PRESENTATION OF MINUTES.** The Stated Clerk presented the Minutes of the Seventy-second General Assembly.

10. **ELECTION OF MODERATOR.** The floor was declared open for nominations to the office of Moderator. Mr. Gerber was nominated. In the absence of other nominations, the Moderator announced the election of Mr. Gerber. Mr. Graham escorted Mr. Gerber to the chair. Mr. Bosgraf welcomed Mr. Gerber.

11. **OVERTURES, COMMUNICATIONS, AND APPEALS.** The Stated Clerk presented overtures, communications, and appeals addressed to the Assembly. They were referred as indicated in §15.

See: OVERTURES, pp.
COMMUNICATIONS, pp.
APPEALS, pp.

12. **DAILY SCHEDULE.** By general consent the times for convening, recessing, and reconvening were adopted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Evening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convene</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess</td>
<td>10:00-10:20 a.m.</td>
<td>3:15-3:35 p.m.</td>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess (Meals)</td>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exceptions:

b. Reconvene Friday 6/23, 8:30 a.m. or at the call of the Moderator.
c. No session Saturday evening.

All sessions of the Assembly open with the singing of a hymn and prayer.

A daily devotional service: 11:55 a.m. to 12:15 p.m., Thursday through Tuesday.

**LEADERS:**

- Thursday. – June 22 (SW) Nathan J. Hornfeld
- Friday – June 23 (CUS) Joseph A. Auksela
- Saturday – June 24 (C&NY) Richard R. Gerber
- Monday – June 26 (DK) Archibald A. Allison
- Tuesday – June 27 (M&O) Robert M. Van Manen
13. **DOCKET.** The docket up to this point was as follows:

1. Assembly convenes 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 21, 2006  
2. Sermon by the Rev. James L. Bosgraf, Moderator of the 72nd General Assembly  
3. Roll call  
4. Seating of corresponding members  
5. Report of the Committee on Arrangements  
6. Presentation of the Minutes of the Seventy-second General Assembly  
7. Election of Moderator  
8. Report of the Standing Committee on Arrangements  
9. Presentation of overtures, communications, complaints, and appeals  
10. Set times for convening, recessing, and reconvening  
11. Adoption of docket

On motion the remainder of the docket presented by the Stated Clerk was adopted in the following amended form:

12. Assignment of items of business to Advisory Committees  
13. Election of Advisory and Temporary Committees  
   a. Advisory Committees in accordance with Standing Rule Chapter IX, Sec. 5.b.  
   b. Temporary Committee on Arrangements, three members  
   c. Temporary Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records, twelve members  
   d. Temporary Committee to Examine Standing Committee Records, eight members (none to be a member of any Standing Committee)  
14. Report of Stated Clerk  
16. Appointment of Assistant Clerk  
18. Election of Statistician  
19. Election of the Stated Clerk for a three year term starting at the 74th GA.  
20. Greetings and addresses by Fraternal Delegates from other bodies to be at times agreeable to them and to the Moderator  
21. Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions  
22. Report of the Committee on Christian Education  
23. Report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension  
24. Report of the Committee on Coordination  
25. Report of the Special Committee on Financial Review  
26. Report of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries  
27. Report of the Committee on Pensions  
28. Report of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations  
29. Report of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints  
30. Consideration of all Overtures not already acted upon, 8:30 a.m., Monday, June 26, 2006  
32. Report of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Worship  
33. Report of the Historian  
34. Report of the Committee for the Historian  
35. Report of the Committee on the Doctrine of Justification 8:30 a.m. Saturday, June 24, 2006
36. Temporary Committees other than Presbyterial Records, Standing Committee Records, and those already completed in connection with earlier reports
37. Report of the Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records, 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 27, 2006
38. Report of the Committee to Examine Standing Committee Records, following item 37
39. Reports of the Temporary Committee on Arrangements as appropriate during the Assembly
40. Set Budgets for General Assembly purposes
41. Resolution of thanks
42. Unfinished Advisory Committee Business
43. Miscellaneous business
44. Reading and approval of Minutes (Note: Minutes are presented for approval following the lunch recess beginning on Saturday, June 24)
45. Dissolution of the Assembly (not later than noon, Wednesday, June 28, 2006)

14. REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE ASSEMBLY. The Stated Clerk reported that he had received a request from the organization, Word and Deed, to address the Assembly. In the absence of general consent to grant the request, the Moderator referred the request to a committee consisting of Messrs. Bosgraf (convener), Gidley, and Wilson (see §59)

15. TEMPORARY COMMITTEES ERECTED. On motion it was determined that the following temporary committees be erected, with reports, overtures, communications, complaints, and appeals referred to them as indicated (cf. §11), and that the commissioners named below be appointed to these committees and the name given in italics be the convener of the committee:

Advisory Committee 1 Total- 10
Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions
Supplemental Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions

Advisory Committee 2 Total- 10
Report of the Committee on Christian Education
Overture #3, 4
Communication #9, 10, 13

Advisory Committee 3 Total- 9
Members: Messrs. Browne, Curto, J. H. Johnson, D. King, Mathis, K. Smith, Tricarico, R. A. Thompson, Wagner
Report of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension
Overture #1, 4
Communications #1, 4, 6
Advisory Committee 4  Total- 9
Members: Messrs. Coie, Dengerink, deHaas, Galbraith, Hollister, D. Mahaffy, Sutton, D. Thompson, P. Wallace
Report of the Committee on Coordination
Report of the Committee on Financial Review

Advisory Committee 5  Total- 9
Members: Messrs. Hanna, Hornfeld, Igo, Jackson, Laurie, Nolder, Potter, L. Smith, Winsted
Report of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries
Report of the Committee on Pensions
Report of the Committee on Chaplains and Military Personnel
Communications #1, 4

Advisory Committee 6  Total- 10
Report of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations
Communications #2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18

Advisory Committee 7  Total- 10
Report of the Committee on the Doctrine of Justification

Advisory Committee 8  Total- 9
Members: Messrs. Allison, Bero, Dyer, Newton, Parker, Powers, Strange, Troxel, Watkins
Report of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship
Overture #2,
Communication #6
Communications concerning DPW #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11

Advisory Committee 9  Total- 10
Members: Messrs. Emmett, Feece, R. Johnson, Knox, Mazunik, Mortensen, Pontier, Shatzer, Vera, D. Wallace
Report of the Stated Clerk
Report of the Statistician
Report of the Trustees of the General Assembly
General Assembly Operations Fund Budget
Report of the Historian
Report of the Committee for the Historian
Journal

Advisory Committee 10
Total- 9
Members: Messrs. Auksela, Bjork, Campbell, Gelston, Jones, Miller, Pasarilla, Shallenberger, Westerveld
Report of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints
Appeal #1

Arrangements (#11) Total-3
Members: Messrs. Haney, Meeker, Muether
Communication #1

Temporary Committee to Examine Presbyterial Records (#12) Total-12
Members: Messrs. Arnaud, Gregg, Huntington, LaBriola, Lomonaco, McGowan, McNeill, McShaffrey, Richline, Selle, Watson, Welzien
Temporary Committee to Examine Standing Committee Records (#13) Total-8
Members: Messrs. Beezhold, Fincham, Hanson, Monaghan, Montemarano, Pirschel, Snyder, Trouwborst

16. RECESS. Following prayer led by the Moderator, the Assembly recessed at 8:26 p.m. for advisory committee meetings.

Thursday, June 22, 2006

17. DEVOTIONS. The order of the day having arrived, the Assembly reconvened for a devotional service at 11:55 a.m. It sang the hymn, “In Sweet Communion, Lord, with Thee.” Mr. Hornfeld read Ephesians 4:15-19 and delivered a message entitled “A Prayer for Every Christian.”

18. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Bube introduced the Rev. Messrs. Chong Soo Lim and Tae Jun, fraternal delegates of the Presbyterian Church of Korea, Kosin. By general consent they were seated as corresponding members and the order of the day was extended to allow for a fraternal address. Mr. Lim addressed the Assembly.

19. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 12:27 p.m. after Mr. Tyson led in prayer.

Friday Morning, June 23, 2006

20. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 8:30 a.m. It sang “O Lord Most High, with All My Heart,” and Mr. Arnaud led in prayer. Mr. Winsted began his attendance at the Assembly.

21. STATED CLERK’S REPORT. The Stated Clerk, Mr. Duff, presented his report (see pp. 86-90), with the following recommendation:
That the proposed amendments to the Book of Discipline be declared by the Moderator to be adopted and to go into effect on January 1, 2010. (See §23.)

22. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (Stated Clerk). Mr. Pontier reported for Advisory Committee 9 that the committee “notes with gratefulness to our Lord the superior work of our Stated Clerk. With regard to the report of the Stated Clerk, Advisory Committee 9 is silent.”

23. BOOK OF DISCIPLINE AMENDMENTS. The Moderator declared that amendments to the Book of Discipline II.B.2.e. and f. and g. proposed by the 72nd General Assembly (Minutes of the Seventy-second General Assembly, §178, pp. 34-35), had been adopted and would go into effect on January 1, 2010.

24. PARLIAMENTARIAN. The Moderator announced that he had appointed Mr. Jones as Parliamentarian.

25. INTRODUCTION OF FRATERNAL DELEGATES. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. Todd P. Joling, fraternal delegate of the United Reformed Churches, and the Rev. Roelf Christiaan (Karlo) Janssen and drs. Klaas Wezeman (Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (liberated). On motion they were seated as corresponding members.

26. TRUSTEES. Mr. Barker presented the report of the Trustees (see pp. 91-95), with the following recommendations:

1. In regard to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, that the following listed remuneration package for 2007 be adopted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$35,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Allowance</td>
<td>30,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA Reimbursement (1/2)</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension (6% of salary and housing) plus $1,030</td>
<td>4,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Insurance</td>
<td>933 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker’s Compensation Insurance</td>
<td>350 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,481</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including four weeks of paid vacation.

Note: Since the Clerk is covered by his spouse’s medical insurance he decided to drop the OPC plan. An additional $1,030 was added to the pension since there is no expense for health insurance.

2. Nominate the Rev. Donald J. Duff for the position of Stated Clerk for the term running from the 2007 General Assembly to that in 2010 (Note: the General Assembly Standing Rules require that the election occur at this Assembly).

3. The Trustees in accordance with the Standing Rules XI:2.e. (“propose to the General Assembly a budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund, and suggest a per capita contribution for payment of the assembly expenses”) propose the following budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund for 2007 and request the churches of the de-
nomination to contribute $14 per communicant member to the General Assembly Operation Fund in 2007. (see action on the GAOF Budget, §208)

27. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (Trustees). Mr. Pontier reported for Advisory Committee 9 with respect to the work of the Trustees and presented the following recommendation: "that GAOF Section 1 "Book Manager“ 2007 requested and budgeted be removed, and that $2000 be added to section 7 "Committee for Historian" 2007 requested and budgeted so that the total amount equals $16,750." The recommendation was referred to GAOF Budget, see §208.

28. STATED CLERK’S REMUNERATION. Recommendation 1 of the Trustees (§26) was adopted.

29. INTRODUCTION OF FRATERNAL DELEGATE. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. Charles A. Brown, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America. On motion he was seated as a corresponding member.

30. APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK. The Stated Clerk announced that pursuant to Standing Rule III.B.4.a., Mr. Mahaffy had consented to serve as Assistant Clerk.

31. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Trustees for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Minister: the Rev. Samuel H. Bacon; Ruling elder: Mr. Barker. In the absence of other nominations the Moderator declared Messrs. Bacon and Barker elected.

32. STATISTICIAN’S REPORT. Mr. Brown presented his report as Statistician (see pp. 96-99).

33. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (Statistician). Mr. Pontier reported the silence of Advisory Committee 9 with respect to the work of the Statistician.

34. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the office of Statistician. Mr. Brown was nominated. In the absence of other nominations the Moderator declared Mr. Brown elected.

35. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations for Stated Clerk for a three year term beginning in 2007. Mr. Duff was nominated. In the absence of other nominations, he was declared elected.

36. PRAYER. Mr. Pontier led in prayer for the work of the Stated Clerk, the Trustees, and the Statistician.

37. FOREIGN MISSIONS. Mr. Gaffin, President of the Committee on Foreign Missions, presented the report of the Committee (see pp. 100-167), including its Supplemental Report. The Supplemental Report included the following recommendation:

That, in response to Overture 2 to the 72nd (2005) General Assembly, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Missions by that Assembly, the 73rd (2006) General
Assembly, having received the report of its Committee on the matter referred to it, determine to inform sessions and presbyteries of the Church that:

1) Members of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church may associate together for specific purposes in the exercise of their common calling, bearing in mind, among other things, the several provisions of *Form of Government* XXX;

2) The 73rd (2006) General Assembly observes that: (i) neither it nor any previous general assembly has acted to give to the “Ad Hoc Committee for the Support of the OPC Japan Mission” the assembly’s approval to represent the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (*Form of Government* XXX.3), and (ii) the “Ad Hoc Committee for the Support of the OPC Japan Mission” is not subject to the jurisdiction and oversight of the general assembly (*Form of Government* XXX.3); and

3) The orderly ways in which Orthodox Presbyterian foreign missions are to be conducted are enumerated in *Form of Government* XXVII.1, that is, either “by the general assembly on behalf of the whole church, or by individual presbyteries and congregations acting in coordination with one another and with the general assembly.”

See §42, 48, 51, 142, 148 and 194 regarding the recording of the Supplemental Report.

Mr. Gaffin introduced Mr. Mark T. Bube, who supplemented the report of the Committee. Mr. Bube surveyed the fields and reported on the circumstances surrounding the accidental death of Matthew D. Baugh during his service as a missionary in Haiti and on arrangements for care of Mrs. Baugh and their children. Mr. Bube introduced Messrs. Curto and Hacquebord, who reported on their works in Ethiopia and the Ukraine, respectively.

38. **RECESS AND RECONVENE.** The Assembly recessed at 9:54 a.m. and reconvened at 10:25 a.m., and sang, “Blow Ye the Trumpet, Blow!” Mr. Montemarano led in prayer.

39. **FOREIGN MISSIONS (continued).** The report of the Committee on Foreign Missions continued. Mr. Tricarico reported on his labors in Uganda.

40. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 1.** Mr. Phillips presented the report of Advisory Committee 1 as follows:

Advisory Committee 1 met with Messrs. Bube (General Secretary of the Committee on Foreign Missions (CFM)), Clawson (Associate General Secretary of the CFM), Campbell (Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee for the Support of the OPC Japan Mission (AHC)), and Uomoto (former CFM missionary to Japan).

I. With respect to the Report of the CFM, Advisory Committee 1 is silent.

II. With respect to the recommendation in the Supplemental Report of the CFM, Advisory Committee 1 concurs.

III. **RECOMMENDATION**

That the General Assembly encourage presbyteries without foreign missions committees to form such, as suggested by the CFM in new Section 7.5 of its *Manual.*
Grounds:
1. The General Secretaries expressed to Advisory Committee 1 their concern that each presbytery have a functioning foreign missions committee.
2. The overall work of foreign missions by the entire OPC will be furthered by presbytery foreign missions committees putting into practice, as appropriate, the new portion of the Manual.

41. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATION. The recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Missions (§37) was adopted.

42. RECORDING IN MINUTES OF SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT. It was moved that the Supplemental Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions be recorded in the Minutes (Standing Rules V.8) (see §48).

43. DEVOTIONS. The order of the day having arrived, the Assembly sang, “Whate’er My God Ordains Is Right.” Mr. Auksela read Romans 4:1-8 and delivered a message entitled “Justification by Faith Alone.” He led in prayer.

44. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 12:17 p.m.

Friday Afternoon, June 23, 2006

45. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 1:30 p.m. and sang, “Lift Up, Lift Up Your Voices Now.” Mr. Martin led in prayer.

46. INTRODUCTION OF FRATERNAL DELEGATE. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. James K. Kim, fraternal delegate of the Korean American Presbyterian Church. On motion he was seated as a corresponding member.

47. RESOLUTION OF THANKS. The Moderator reported that he had appointed Mr. Phillips to draft a resolution of thanks.

48. RECORDING IN MINUTES OF RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT. It was moved to amend the main motion (§42) by adding at the end: “and to include with the Supplement the content of the report from the Ad Hoc Committee for the Support of the OPC Japan Mission.”

On motion the motion and the amendment were laid on the table.

At Mr. Duff’s request his negative vote was recorded on the motion to lay on the table.

49. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 1 (Presbytery Foreign Missions Committees). The recommendation of Advisory Committee 1 (§39.III) was adopted.

50. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Foreign Missions for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Ministers: Browne, Glenn D. Jerrell, Krabbendam, and Peterson; Ruling elders: R. A. Thompson and Winsted.
The Moderator declared Messrs. Thompson and Winsted elected. At a later time he announced the election of Messrs. Browne, Jerrell, and Peterson.

51. REFERRAL TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE 1. On motion the matter laid on the table was taken off the table (cf. §48). On motion the whole matter was referred to Advisory Committee 1 (see §142).

52. CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Mr. Gidley presented the report of the Committee on Christian Education (see pp. 168-192). He introduced the Rev. Danny P. Olinger, General Secretary of the Committee, who supplemented the report, the Rev. Rodney T. King, who reported on the opc.org website, and the Rev. Gregory E. Reynolds, who reported on *Ordained Servant*. Mr. Olinger introduced the Rev. Thomas R. Patete, Executive Director of Great Commission Publications. On motion Mr. Patete was granted the privilege of the floor. He addressed the Assembly on behalf of Great Commission Publications.

53. RECESS AND RECONVENE. The Assembly recessed at 3:18 p.m. and reconvened at 3:41 p.m. and sang, “O Zion Haste, Your Mission High Fulfilling.” Mr. Mathis led in prayer.

54. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. James K. Kim, fraternal delegate of the Korean American Presbyterian Church. Mr. Kim addressed the Assembly.

55. CHRISTIAN EDUCATION (continued). Mr. Olinger reported on the work of the Ministerial Training Subcommittee.

56. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2 (Christian Education). Mr. Nelson reported for Advisory Committee 2 with respect to the work of the Committee on Christian Education as follows:

Advisory Committee 2 met with Mr. James Gidley, Mr. Danny Olinger, and Mr. Rodney King of the Committee on Christian Education to discuss its report.

With regard to the report, the advisory committee is silent. However, the advisory committee recommends the following:

that the assembly increase the proposed 2007 budget of the Committee on Christian Education by $12,680.

*Ground:* the advisory committee believes that the Committee on Christian Education needs additional funding for the continued development of its Internet ministries.

57. ELECTION, MINISTERIAL TRAINING SUBCOMMITTEE. The floor was opened for nominations to the Subcommittee on Ministerial Training of the Committee on Christian Education for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Messrs. Allison, Auksela, Pontier, Tyson, and David Winslow, Jr. (Westminster). At a later time the Moderator announced the election of Messrs. Tyson and Winslow.

58. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. Charles A. Brown, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. Mr. Brown addressed the Assembly.
59. **REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE ASSEMBLY.** Mr. Bosgraf reported for the Committee on the request by Word and Deed to address the Assembly (§14). The Committee recommended that the request not be granted. The motion was adopted.

60. **HOME MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION.** At the request of the Moderator, Mr. Bosgraf assumed the chair. Mr. Hilbelink, President of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, presented the report of the Committee (see pp. 193-211), including the following recommendation:

The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension respectfully requests that the 73rd General Assembly express its sincere appreciation to the many members of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church who volunteered their time and energy to go to the hurricane-ravaged parts of the southern United States during the fall of 2005 to provide their help and to represent their Lord and their Church in offering that “cup of cold water” in Jesus’ name.

Mr. Hilbelink introduced home missionaries and a regional home missionary. He also introduced the Rev. Ross W. Graham, who reported further on the work of the Committee. He introduced Mr. David E. Haney, who showed a video presentation of the hurricane relief work which the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension had coordinated.

61. **RECESS.** The Assembly recessed at 5:12 p.m. Mr. Dyer led in prayer.

Friday Evening, June 23, 2006

62. **RECONVENE.** The Assembly was reconvened by the Moderator, Mr. Gerber, who had resumed the chair, at 6:41 p.m. and sang, “Let Us Love and Sing and Wonder.” Mr. Mazunik led in prayer.

63. **ELECTION, COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.** The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Christian Education for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Ministers: Allison, Dillard, Dyer, and Pontier; Ruling elder: Daryl G. Hart (Glenside). The Moderator declared Mr. Hart elected. At a later time the Moderator announced the election of Messrs. Allison and Dyer.

64. **HOME MISSIONS (continued).** Mr. Coie assumed the chair. Mr. Graham continued the report of the Committee.

65. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 3 (Home Missions).** Mr. D. King reported the silence of Advisory Committee 3 with respect to the report of the Committee. He presented the following recommendation of the Advisory Committee:

With regard to the recommendation at the end of the report, Advisory Committee 3 recommends that it be passed by the assembly in the following form:

“That the 73rd General Assembly expresses its sincere appreciation to the many members of the OPC who volunteered their time and energy to go to the hurricane-ravaged parts of the southern US during the fall of 2005 to provide their help and to represent their
Lord and their Church in offering that “cup of cold water” in Jesus’ name and that this appreciation be expressed in the minutes of the Assembly, the *New Horizons* magazine, the denominational website and the Stated Clerk’s follow-up letter to the sessions of the OPC.”

66. **PRAYER.** Mr. Nelson led in prayer for the work of the Committee on Christian Education.

67. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 3.** Mr. King reported for Advisory Committee 3 its silence with respect to Communication 4.

68. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 (Communication 4).** Mr. Igo reported for Advisory Committee 5 with respect to the recommendation of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension and Communication 4 as follows:

1. That the General Assembly request the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to undertake relief ministries on behalf of the GA in the event of a “major disaster” in North America.*

2. That the General Assembly request the Committee on Diaconal Ministries to budget annually $25,000 for “major disaster” relief preparedness in North America and channel these and any designated gifts for “major disaster” relief to the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension.

*As defined by the Committee on Diaconal Ministries in their report to the 63rd GA on pp. 222-224 (“A ‘major disaster’ is a calamity which arises suddenly and unexpectedly resulting from an identifiable natural or man-made event like an earthquake, volcano, flood, hurricane [or typhoon], famine caused by drought, or war, which directly injures the persons and property of tens of thousands of persons in a defined geographical area”).

69. **EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION.** The recommendation of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension (see §60 and 65) was adopted in the following amended form:

That the 73rd General Assembly expresses its sincere appreciation to the many members of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church who sacrificially gave their gifts and offerings, and those who volunteered their time and energy to go to the hurricane-ravaged parts of the southern US during the fall of 2005 to provide their help and to represent their Lord and their Church in offering that “cup of cold water” in Jesus’ name and that this appreciation be expressed in the minutes of the Assembly, the *New Horizons* magazine, the denominational website and the Stated Clerk’s follow-up letter to the sessions of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

70. **CHMCE AND RELIEF MINISTRIES.** Recommendation 1 of Advisory Committee 5 (§68) was adopted. Recommendation 2 was postponed indefinitely.

71. **RECESS.** The Moderator resumed the chair. The Assembly recessed at 8:35 p.m. Mr. Mortensen led in prayer.
Saturday Morning, June 24, 2006

72. **RECONVENE.** The Assembly reconvened at 8:30 a.m. and sang, “Christ Is Made the Sure Foundation.” Mr. Phillips led in prayer, including prayer for the work of the Committee on Foreign Missions.

73. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 7.** The Committee to Study the Doctrine of Justification deferred to the Advisory Committee for a procedural recommendation. Mr. Van Meerbeke presented the report of Advisory Committee 7 as follows:

Recommendation: That the Assembly suspend *Standing Rule* V.5.a. to allow the Study Committee up to 30 minutes for its presentation.

In addition, the advisory committee wishes to note for the record that during review of this report, Mr. Trouwborst presented himself to the advisory committee acknowledging his regret of acceding to the invitation to participate in the Federal Vision conference and requesting that he not be recognized as a proponent of the Federal Vision school as defined in this document.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee was adopted.

74. **COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.** Mr. VanDrunen presented the report of the Committee to Study the Doctrine of Justification (see pp. 212-337), including the following recommendations:

With the submission of the critique in this report, as mandated by the General Assembly, the committee also offers the following recommendations in order to promote the purity, peace, and unity of the church concerning the doctrine of justification.

**Recommendation 1.** That the General Assembly recommend that presbyteries include the following topics in the examination of candidates, with a view to ensuring each candidate’s fidelity to biblical and confessional teaching on justification and his ability to articulate that teaching:

1. The self-authenticating and self-interpreting nature of the Scriptures
2. The covenant of works
3. The covenant of grace
4. The definition of righteousness with reference to justification
5. The definition of the works of the law
6. The nature of union with Christ
7. The definition of faith
8. The difference between faith and works
9. The definition of justification
10. The instrument of justification
11. The ground of justification
12. The imputed active and passive obedience of Christ
13. The distinction between justification and sanctification
14. The nature of the sacraments as signs and seals of the covenant
Recommendation 2. That the General Assembly recommend that presbyteries, sessions, and pastors be proactive in addressing teachings of the New Perspective on Paul, and of the Federal Vision, and other like teachings that compromise the purity of the gospel.

Recommendation 3. That the General Assembly:
   a. Distribute this report to the presbyteries, particularly to their candidates and credentials committees, and to all sessions of the OPC, commending the report to them for study.
   b. Request the Committee on Christian Education: (1) to distribute this report to seminaries with which it has contact; (2) to post this report on our denominational website for easy access by interested parties; and (3) to consider publishing it separately for distribution.
   c. Request the Stated Clerk to mail copies of this report to those churches with whom the OPC has fraternal relations.

75. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 7. Mr. Van Meerbeke reported that Advisory Committee 7 was silent with respect to the report of the Committee to Study the Doctrine of Justification, and that the Advisory Committee would recommend that Recommendation 3 be voted on seriatim.

76. TIME FOR QUESTIONS EXTENDED. By general consent the time for questions was extended to 10:00 a.m. On motion it was determined to extend the time for questions for an additional 15 minutes following the recess.

77. RECESS AND RECONVENE. The Assembly recessed at 10:01 a.m. and reconvened at 10:21 a.m. It sang “Come, O Come Thou Quickening Spirit,” and Mr. Van Manen led in prayer.

78. QUESTION TIME. Messrs. Knox and Nolder requested that their affirmative votes be recorded on a failed motion to extend the time for questions by a second 15 minutes.

79. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS. Debate began on Recommendation 1 of the Committee to Study the Doctrine of Justification. An amendment was proposed. (See §84.)

80. DEVOTIONS. The order of the day having arrived, Mr. Gerber led a devotional service at 11:55 a.m. The Assembly sang, “Give to Our God Immortal Praise.” He read 1 Corinthians 9:19-27 and delivered a message entitled, “A Focused Ministry.” He led in prayer.

81. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 12:19 p.m.

Saturday afternoon, June 24, 2006

82. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 1:30 p.m. and sang, “Exalt the Lord, His Praise Proclaim.” Mr. Gregg led in prayer.
83. **MINUTES.** The Assistant Clerk presented the Minutes of the Assembly for Wednesday evening, §1-15, which were approved as presented.

84. **JUSTIFICATION (continued; cf. §74, 79.).** Debate continued on Recommendation 1 of the Committee. The recommendation was adopted. At the request of Mr. Knox his negative vote was recorded.

Recommendation 2 was adopted.

The recommendation of Advisory Committee 7 was adopted that Recommendation 3 be voted on *seriatim*.

Recommendation 3a was adopted in the following amended form:

That the General Assembly:
   a. Distribute this report to the presbyteries, particularly to their candidates and credentials committees, and to all sessions and ministers of the OPC, commending the report to them for study.

Recommendation 3b was moved. An amendment was proposed. On motion the amendment and recommendations b and c were referred to Advisory Committee 7 to report back to this Assembly (cf. §149).

85. **MOTION TO ADOPT.** It was moved “that the Assembly adopt the report,” and that the existing recommendations be renumbered.

It was moved to postpone indefinitely the pending question. On motion the entire pending matter was recommitted to Advisory Committee 7. (See §149.)

86. **RECESS AND RECONVENE.** The Assembly recessed at 3:19 p.m. and reconvened at 3:40 p.m. The Assembly sang “How Sweet and Awesome Is the Place,” and Mr. Krabbendam led in prayer.

87. **ELECTION.** The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Ministers: Mark R. Brown, Hilbelink, Lawrence Semel, and Dale A. Van Dyke; Ruling elders: Barker and Garrett A. Hoogerhyde (Whippany). The Moderator declared Messrs. Barker and Hoogerhyde elected. At a later time he announced the election of Messrs. Brown, Hilbelink, and Van Dyke.

88. **FRATERNAL ADDRESS.** Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. Todd Joling, fraternal delegate of the United Reformed Churches. Mr. Joling addressed the Assembly.

89. **COORDINATION.** Mr. Bosgraff presented the report of the Committee on Coordination, (see pp. 338-357) including the following recommendations:
1. The Committee recommends that the 73rd General Assembly approve the following Worldwide Outreach program for 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Committee Requests</th>
<th>COC Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>299,320</td>
<td>299,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>1,083,438</td>
<td>1,083,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>2,332,758</td>
<td>2,332,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>297,000</td>
<td>297,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Worldwide Outreach</td>
<td>2,879,758</td>
<td>2,879,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase over 2006 approved budget 8.59%

Less Folded in DMS support [China] -3.07%

Net Increase over 2006 approved budget 5.52%

2. That the 73rd General Assembly propose to the 74th General Assembly the amendment of Standing Rule X.2.i. by the deletion of the words “No voting member shall be eligible for reelection to any full or partial term which would extend his continuous service on the Committee beyond seven years.”

3. That, for the purposes of elections to the Committee on Coordination to the class of 2009, the 73rd General Assembly suspend the last sentence of Standing Rule X.2.i. which reads: “No voting member shall be eligible for reelection to any full or partial term which would extend his continuous service on the Committee beyond seven years.”

4. That without prejudice to recommendations coming to the 73rd (2006) General Assembly from the Special Committee on Financial Review, Instrument E of the Instruments of the General Assembly be amended by inserting a new subparagraph E.4.o.(2) (e), as follows:

(e) The continuation of the special relationship, whether or not support for the missionary has been folded back into the Worldwide Outreach combined budget or the field continues to qualify under paragraph o.(3)(b), for as long as the parties to that relationship so desire.

Mr. Bosgraf commented on the report of the Committee and introduced Mr. Haney, the Director of Finance and Planned Giving, who supplemented the report.
90. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 4 (Committee on Coordination). Mr. Coie reported for Advisory Committee 4 as follows:
1. In regards to Recommendations 1, 2, and 3 of the Committee on Coordination, the Committee is silent.
2. The Committee is silent in regard to the substance of Recommendation 4, but has a procedural recommendation concerning it.
3. RECOMMENDATION:
   That consideration of Recommendation 4 be postponed to immediately following consideration of recommendations by the Special Committee on Financial Review.

91. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 5:04 p.m. Mr. King led in prayer, praying for the work of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension.

On Sunday at 6:00 p.m. Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Orland Park, hosted a communion service for the combined Chicago-area churches and the commissioners to the 73rd General Assembly. The service was held in the chapel of Trinity Christian College. The Rev. Iain A. M. Wright led the service. The Rev. Richard R. Gerber led in the pastoral prayer. The Rev. William Shishko read 1 Timothy 1 and preached a sermon entitled “Biblical High Churchmanship.” The offering which was received following the communion service was designated for the Matt Baugh Family Diaconal Fund. At a later time the Moderator announced that the offering totaled $35,029.08. The service was concluded at 8:00 p.m.

Monday Morning, June 26, 2006

92. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 8:31 a.m. and sang, “Praise My Soul, the King of Heaven.” Mr. Browne led in prayer, including prayer for the work of the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension.

93. OVERTURE 1. Mr. King reported for Advisory Committee 3 and presented the following recommendation:
That the General Assembly respond to Overture 1 by electing a committee of three, and one alternate, to study the issue regarding the propriety of the reception of illegal aliens into membership in the OPC and to propose to the 74th General Assembly advice for presbyteries and sessions, and that the Assembly approve a budget of $1000 for the work of the committee.

It was adopted in the following amended form:
That the General Assembly respond to Overture 1 by electing a committee of three, and one alternate, to study the issue regarding the propriety of the reception of illegal aliens into membership in the OPC and to propose to the 74th General Assembly advice for presbyteries and sessions, and that the Assembly approve a budget of $1000 for the work of the committee.
94. **ELECTION.** The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee to Study the Propriety of the Reception of Illegal Aliens. The following were nominated: Messrs. Alonso F. da Cunha, Fesko, Charles K. Telfer, Tyson, Todd V. Wagenmaker, Wagner, David Winslow (Westminster). At a later time the Moderator announced the election of Messrs. Fesko, Wagenmaker (convener), and Winslow, with Mr. Telfer as alternate.

95. **OVERTURE 2.** By general consent it was determined to consider Overture 2 in connection with the report of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Worship.

96. **OVERTURE 3.** Mr. Nelson presented the report of Advisory Committee 2 as follows:

Advisory Committee 2 met with Mr. Larry Wilson of the Presbytery of Ohio, who answered questions with regard to Overture 3 from the Presbytery of Ohio.

The Advisory Committee recommends that the assembly respond to Overtures 3 and 4 and Communication 9 with the following:

That the assembly instruct its Committee on Christian Education to explore, together with Great Commission Publications, the need for and requirements of publishing a new Psalter Hymnal and report back to the General Assembly, no later than 2008.

97. **RECESS AND RECONVENE.** The Assembly recessed at 10:02 a.m. and reconvened at 10:20 a.m. It sang, “Jesus! What a Friend for Sinners!” Mr. Tavares led in prayer.

98. **INTRODUCTION OF FRATERNAL DELEGATE AND ADDRESS.** Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. David H. Schutter, fraternal delegate of the Presbyterian Church in America. On motion he was seated as a corresponding member. Mr. Schutter addressed the Assembly.

99. **RESPONSE TO OVERTURE 3.** The Assembly adopted the following in response to Overture 3:

That the 73rd General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church authorize its Committee on Christian Education to seek to develop a *Psalter-Hymnal* by 2011 (our 75th anniversary) — which includes musical settings of all 150 Psalms, in their entirety, with as much accuracy and as little archaic language and confusing syntax as possible — for use in our congregations; that it authorize the Committee on Christian Education to appoint a special Psalter-Hymnal committee; and that it grant this special committee a budget of up to $5000.

100. **COORDINATION (continued).** Recommendation 1 of the Committee on Coordination (§89) was moved.

101. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2 (Coordination).** Mr. Nelson reported for Advisory Committee 2 as follows (with the form of the recommendation modified slightly by general consent):
Advisory Committee 2 met with Mr. James Gidley, Mr. Danny Olinger, and Mr. Rodney King of the Committee on Christian Education to discuss its report. With regard to the report, the advisory committee is silent. However, the advisory committee recommends the following:

That the assembly increase the proposed Worldwide Outreach 2007 Budget by allocating an additional $12,680 to Committee on Christian Education.

_Ground:_ the Advisory Committee believes that the Committee on Christian Education needs additional funding for the continued development of its internet ministries.

The recommendation was adopted and the proposed Worldwide Outreach 2007 Budget was amended.

**102. RECOMMENDATIONS 1-3.** Recommendation 1 was adopted as amended by the previous action, showing the following Worldwide Outreach program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted WWO Budget</th>
<th>WWO Budget</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td>1,312,000</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>1,083,438</td>
<td>2,345,438</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>2,345,438</td>
<td>40.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>2,345,438</td>
<td>2,345,438</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Horizons* 250,000

*Coordination* 297,000

Total Worldwide Outreach 2,892,438

Increase over 2006 approved budget 9.07%

Less Folded in DMS support [China] -3.06%

Net Increase over 2006 approved budget 6.01%

Recommendations 2 and 3 (cf. §89) were adopted. The recommendation of Advisory Committee 4 was adopted that consideration of Recommendation 4 be postponed immediately following consideration of recommendations by the Special Committee on Financial Review. (See §141.)

**103. ELECTION.** The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Coordination for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: *Ministers:* Bosgraf and Broline; *Ruling elder:* Ted Weber (Oklahoma City). The Moderator declared Mr. Weber elected. At a later time he announced the election of Mr. Bosgraf.

**104. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REVIEW.** Mr. Broline presented the report of the Special Committee on Financial Review, (see pp. 358-400) with the following recommendations:

1. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that *Standing Rules X.2.i* be revised to read:
i. The Committee on Coordination shall consist of nine voting members, ministers and ruling elders. Three members shall be elected by the Committees on Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension, one from the membership of each committee; and six members shall be elected by the General Assembly, in three classes consisting of one minister and one ruling elder in each class, who shall be neither members nor employees of these three program committees. The General Secretaries of the three program committees shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Coordination without vote.

2. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4 d. and f. be revised to read:
   d. Obtain and review, yearly, the programs and budgets of the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the WWO programs separately from direct contributions to WWO programs.
   f. Implement a means of seeking annually from each session and/or congregation a statement of a goal for the support of the work of the program committees.

3. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the parenthesis in Instrument E 4.g.(1) be revised to read (including the costs of the operation of the Committee, the promotion, and solicitation activities of the Committee).

4. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the following be inserted as Instrument E.4.g.(3) recommendations for combined promotion and solicitation plans for the Assembly’s approval.

5. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the following be inserted as Instrument E.4 g.(4) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation activities of the past year of the program committees along with that of COC.

6. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the following be inserted as Instrument E.4.g.(5) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation plans for the ensuing year of the program committees along with that of COC.

7. RECOMMENDATION: That the parenthesis in Instrument E.3.a. be revised to read (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans).

8. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the parenthesis in Instrument E.4.c. be revised to read (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans).

9. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E4.h. be revised by adding the following paragraph [numbering the first paragraph (1)], as h.(2) so that this whole section would be revised to read:
   (1) Inform the churches of the programs (including budgets, promotion and solicitation plans) approved and commended by the General Assembly. (2) Provide the presbyteries and churches with quarterly updates reporting the progress in reaching the approved combined budget of the respective program committees directly to the presbytery clerks, sessions, and pastors via electronic mail (wherever possible).

10. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.i.(1) be revised to read:
   i. (1) Contributions designated for the attainment of the overall approved budget of all the program committees shall be allocated first to the funding of the Committee on Coordination and New Horizons, and then to the program committees in the proportion which each program committee’s budget bears to their combined budget; checks for this purpose shall be made payable to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” with the notation “Worldwide Outreach.”

11. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.i.(4) be deleted, and that E.4.i.(3) be replaced with the following:
The Committee shall annually report and recommend to the General Assembly how to address any shortfalls in the most recent year’s planned revenues (e.g., designated giving, undesignated giving, and DMS) of any program committee.

12. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.i.(5) be deleted and the section renumbered as (4) and be revised to read:

Funds received by bequest or from sources outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees.

13. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.l. be revised to read:

See to it (1) that each program committee provides to the churches an annual report including finances, and to the General Assembly an annual financial report subjected to a review engagement or an audit engagement by certified public accountants; (2) that each committee provides to the General Assembly its past year’s activities and its current plans for promotion and solicitation of funds.

14. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.o.(2)(a) be revised to read:

A commitment for an initial period of not less than two years to provide the financial support (with at least 50% in any given year being funded by the special relationship and the remainder being provided for as part of Committee on Foreign Mission WWO annual approved budget) for the missionary from sources that are over and above the participant’s regular giving to the Worldwide Outreach combined budget.

15. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that if the previous recommendation is adopted, that the general assembly direct the CFM and COC to prepare a plan to bring all existing relationships into compliance with the revision to Instrument E.4.o.(2)(a), within three years.

16. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the General Assembly direct the COC to present to the 74th General Assembly a specific set of goals for those things which the COC understands to be its assigned functions along with an evaluation of how these goals are to be, and are being, accomplished.

17. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the Special Committee for Financial Review be dissolved.

During the report of the Committee, the time for its report was extended by five minutes. Mr. Broline also showed the Assembly a visual presentation of the functioning of Worldwide Outreach.

105. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 4 (Special Committee for Financial Review). Mr. Coie presented the report of Advisory Committee 4 as follows:

I. The advisory committee met Thursday from 8:30 a.m. until 8:00 p.m. In order to gain a better understanding of both the current system and the proposed changes, the committee met with Mr. Haney, representatives of the special Committee on Financial Review, representatives of the Committee on Coordination, and the General Secretaries and other members of each of the three program committees. The advisory committee noted that the report of the special Committee on Financial Review was unanimous.

II. On Recommendation 1, regarding changing the structure of the Committee on Coordination by removing the 7-year term limit for elected members, the advisory committee is silent, noting that it is the same as Recommendation 2 from the Committee on Coordination.
III. On Recommendations 2-9 and 11-15, the advisory committee is silent.
IV. On Recommendation 10, the advisory committee is proposing a perfection.
V. RECOMMENDATIONS:
   1. That Recommendation 10 be amended to read:
      Contributions for the attainment of the total Worldwide Outreach budget shall be allocat-
      ed monthly, first to the funding of the Committee on Coordination and New Horizons, and
      then to the program committees in the proportion which each program committee’s bud-
      get bears to the total budget of the three program committees; checks for this purpose
      shall be made payable to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” with the notation “World-
      wide Outreach.”
      
      *Ground:*
      This is simply perfecting Recommendation 10.
   2. That Instrument E be amended as indicated below. (Underlining and
      strikeout shows committee changes; **bold** denotes advisory committee perfections)
      
      *Ground:*
      This is the substance of the committee’s recommendations (with perfec-
      tions), but the advisory committee believes it would be helpful for the assembly to consid-
      er the matter as a whole.

      [Note: The copy of Instrument E showing proposed insertions and deletions has not been
      reproduced in the Journal. The Instrument as amended is found in §134 below.]
   3. That the following be substituted for recommendation 16:
      That the assembly instruct the Committee on Coordination to:
      1) explore means by which the program committees themselves may
         reach new sources of funding within and without the OPC and methods of reaching them
         for advancing the Reformed cause represented by the OPC and to suggest means of im-
         plementation;
      2) consider how the WWO program may be greatly simplified; and
      3) report their findings to the 74th General Assembly
   4. That the following be substituted for recommendation 17:
      That the special Committee for Financial Review be dissolved with thanks.

106. DEVOTIONS. The order of the day having arrived, Mr. Allison conducted a de-
      votional service. The Assembly sang, “Bow Down Thine Ear, O Lord, and Hear.”
      He read Ephesians 5 and delivered a message entitled,
      “A Glorious Church.” He led in prayer.

107. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 12:25 p.m. Mr. D. Mahaffy led in prayer.

    Monday Afternoon, June 26, 2006

108. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 1:31 p.m. and sang,
      “Praise the Savior, ye who Know Him!” Mr. Hanna led in prayer, remembering Mr.
      Jones, who had been taken ill.

109. MINUTES. The Assistant Clerk presented the minutes for Wednesday night
      through Saturday morning (§16 to 73). They were approved as corrected.
110. INTRODUCTION OF FRATERNAL DELEGATES. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. R. Sherman Isbell, fraternal delegate of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing). On motion he was seated as a corresponding member. Mr. Peterson also introduced the Rev. Herman Van Stedum, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Church in the United States. On motion he was seated as a corresponding member.

111. PRAYER. Mr. Sutton led in prayer for the work and staff of the Committee on Coordination.

112. PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATION. By general consent the recommendation of Advisory Committee 4 was put in the form that, when the Assembly votes on the recommendations, it vote on Recommendations 2-15 as a body.

113. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 4. Mr. Coie reported for Advisory Committee 4. Recommendation 1 of Advisory Committee 4 was divided (cf. §105), which proposed revising the amendments to Instrument E, proposed by the Special Committee on Financial Review. The first paragraph of the recommendation was adopted, the second paragraph was defeated.

114. AMENDMENTS TO INSTRUMENT E. The Assembly began its consideration of the amendments to Instrument E proposed by the Special Committee on Financial Review.

115. QUESTION DIVIDED. On motion the question was divided, separating Recommendations 11, 14 and 15 from the rest of the proposal and considering these first.

116. RECESS AND RECONVENE. The Assembly recessed at 3:17 p.m. and reconvened at 3:37 p.m. It sang “For All the Saints,” and Mr. Snyder led in prayer.

117. CHAPLAINS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL. The order of the day having arrived, Mr. Needham presented the report of the Committee on Chaplains and Military Personnel (see pp. 401-414), including the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the 73rd General Assembly respectfully encourage the presbyteries to:
1. be prepared to aid churches where the pastor is mobilized,
2. encourage their positive involvement in processing calls presented to those either currently serving as chaplains or intending to serve as chaplains in the military reserves,
3. request that their churches without pastors consider utilizing approved chaplain candidates either as pulpit supplies or be utilized to assist the pastor in a manner that such candidates are enabled to fulfill their chaplain candidate ministry requirement of up to two years of ministry before endorsement.

Grounds:
(1) Pastors who serve in the reserves and National Guard are increasingly being mobilized in a time of war and the churches that they serve are in need of the care of their presbyteries.
(2) Being called up to serve their country in time of war should not jeopardize the pastoral relationship with the chaplain’s local church.
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(3) Chaplain candidates are increasingly being required to have two years of pastoral service before they can be endorsed for the Military Chaplaincy. Pulpit supply service and internships can provide for this requirement.

118. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 (Chaplains). Mr. Igo reported the silence of Advisory Committee 5 with respect to the report of the Committee on Chaplains and Military Personnel.

119. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATION. The recommendation of the Committee (§117) was adopted in the following amended form:

The Committee recommends that the 73rd General Assembly respectfully encourage the presbyteries to:
1. be prepared to aid churches where the pastor is mobilized,
2. encourage their positive involvement in processing calls presented to those either currently serving as chaplains or intending to serve as chaplains in the military reserves,
3. request that their churches consider utilizing approved chaplain candidates either as pulpit supplies or as interns in a manner that such candidates are enabled to fulfill their chaplain candidate ministry requirement of up to two years of ministry before endorsement.

120. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Chaplains and Military Personnel for the class of 2009. The following was nominated:

Minister: Richard M. Dickinson. In the absence of other nominations Mr. Dickinson was declared elected.

121. PRAYER. Mr. Igo led in prayer for the work of the Committee on Chaplains and for our Military personnel.

122. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. On motion Mr. Needham was granted the privilege of the floor. He introduced the Rev. Morris McDonald, fraternal observer of the Bible Presbyterian Church. Mr. McDonald addressed the Assembly.

123. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION 11 (§115). During debate the Moderator had ruled a proposed amendment out of order. Appeal was taken from the ruling of the Moderator. The ruling of the Moderator was sustained. At the request of Mr. Knox his negative vote was recorded on the motion to sustain. By general consent the Assembly proceeded to consider the proposed Recommendation 11.

124. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 5:02 p.m. Mr. R. Johnson led in prayer.

Monday Evening, June 26, 2006

125. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 6:30 p.m. and sang “All Hail the Power of Jesus’ Name!” and Mr. Ferguson led in prayer.

126. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. Karlo Janssen, fra-
ternal delegate of Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Liberated). Mr. Janssen addressed the Assembly.

127. COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REVIEW (continued). During debate the order of the day was extended to 9:00 p.m.

Recommendation 11 was adopted.

At their requests the negative votes of Messrs. Haney, Tavares, Tyson, Van Manen, and Willet were recorded

128. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 9:04 p.m. Mr. Meeker led in prayer.

Tuesday Morning, June 27, 2006

129. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 8:30 a.m. and sang, “God, My King, Thy Might Confessing.” Mr. Dengerink led in prayer.

130. PRESBYTERIAL RECORDS. Mr. Watson presented the report of the Committee as follows:

Minutes: Reviews of 2005 Minutes

1) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of Central U.S. be approved without notation and with the following exception:

2) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of Connecticut and Southern New York be approved without exception and without notation.

3) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of the Dakotas be approved with the notations listed by the committee and the following exception:

4) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of Michigan and Ontario be approved with the single notation listed by the committee and without exception.

5) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic be approved with the notations listed by the committee and with the following exceptions:
   a. Page 85, #18: A member removed from the roll of the regional church is not named and the church to which she went is not specified. FG XIII.8 (3); BD II.B.3.a.
   b. Page 91, # 10: No record of the particularization of a congregation or installation of the pastor after a call was extended and accepted. FG XXIII.11.

6) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of the Midwest be approved with the notations listed by the committee and with the following exceptions:
   b. Page 122, art. 10: No record of whether a committee recommendation was approved. Rule 12.a.
c. Pages 125, art. 2; 133, art. 3b: Churches represented by elders not indicated. Rule 7.b.

7) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of New Jersey be approved with the notations listed by the committee and without exception.

8) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of New York and New England be approved with notations listed by the committee and with the following exception:
   a. Page 06–1: The minutes have not been signed by the clerk pro tem. Rule 18.

9) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of Northern California be approved with notations listed by the committee and with the following exceptions:
   a. Page 4-90, art. 10: Business transacted in a special meeting not included in the call for the meeting. FG XIV.7; Rule 9.
   b. Page 4-104, art. 1: No indication that meeting was opened with prayer. FG XIV.8; Rule 10.

10) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of the Northwest be approved with the notations listed by the committee and without exception.

11) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of Ohio be approved with notations listed by the committee and with the following exceptions:
   a. Page 179, para. 5: Minutes tabled but not approved. Rule 11.

12) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of Philadelphia be approved with notations listed by the committee and with the following exceptions:
   a. Pages 643, 652, 665, 672, 683: On several occasions, the stated clerk did not sign minutes even though he was present at the meeting. Rule 18.

13) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of the South be approved with the single notation listed by the committee and without exception.

14) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of the Southeast be approved without exception and without notation.

15) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of Southern California be approved with the notations listed by the committee and without exception.

16) The committee recommends that the minutes of the presbytery of the Southwest be approved without exception and without notation.

Responses to Exceptions Taken by Previous Assemblies

1) The committee recommends that with respect to the minutes of the following presbyteries, their response to the exception to their minutes taken by the 72nd General Assembly be deemed sufficient:

   Dakota
   Midwest
   Northwest
   Ohio
   Philadelphia
   Southeast
   Southwest
2) The committee recommends that with respect to the minutes of the Presbytery of Southern California, their response to the exceptions to their minutes taken by the 72\textsuperscript{nd} General Assembly be deemed:

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] Sufficient with respect to exceptions a. and c.
\item[b.] Insufficient with respect to exception b. and inform the presbytery that this Assembly upholds the exception of the 72\textsuperscript{nd} General Assembly on the basis of rule 21 of the Rules for Keeping Presbyterial Minutes. This rule implies that General Assembly has a legitimate interest in determining if presbyteries follow their own by-laws.
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Recommendation:} That the General Assembly, through its Stated Clerk, respectfully remind the presbyteries that their responses to exceptions to their minutes taken by the General Assembly should indicate how the error has been corrected.

\textit{Ground:} The purpose of exceptions is to direct the attention of presbyteries to errors in their minutes, as defined by the Bible, the OPC’s secondary or tertiary standards, and the instruments of the General Assembly, so that 1) those errors may be avoided in the future, and 2) those errors may be corrected wherever possible, in order to make the records of presbyterial actions and history accurate for the good of the church and the honor of the name of Christ.

\textbf{Report:} The Committee on Presbyterial Records reports to the 73\textsuperscript{rd} General Assembly its acknowledgement, with thanks to our great God and Savior, Mr. Richard Barker’s 47 years of service as Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of New Jersey.

The recommendations were adopted.

\textbf{131. STANDING COMMITTEE RECORDS.} Mr. Snyder presented the report of the Committee as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] That the minutes of the following be approved without notations or exceptions.
   - The Committee on Arrangements,
   - The Committee on Appeals and Complaints,
   - The Committee on Christian Education,
   - The Committee on Pensions,
   - The Trustees of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.
\item[2.] That the minutes of the following be approved with notations and without exceptions.
   - The Committee of Diaconal Ministries,
   - The Committee on Foreign Missions,
   - The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension.
\item[3.] That the following minutes be approved with no notations and one exception.
   - The Committee on Chaplains and Military Personnel.
   \begin{itemize}
   \item[a.] The Committee failed to present their minutes to the 73\textsuperscript{rd} General Assembly (rule C. 19).
   \end{itemize}
\item[4.] That the following minutes be approved with notations and exceptions.
   - The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.
   \begin{itemize}
   \item[a.] Page 19, correspondence II, minutes of 2/14, 3/30, 4/20, 6/18, 9/13 of the previous year (2005) were approved at the second stated meeting of the following year instead of by the first meeting as required (rule C.11).
   \end{itemize}
\item[4.] That the following minutes be approved with notations and exceptions.
   - The Committee on Coordination.
\end{itemize}
Seventy-Third General Assembly

a. Page 410, article 18, motion 2, the phrase, “these special relationships”, needs to include either more historical data or a reference to a previous action (rule C.12).
b. Page 414, article 2 does not have the absentees listed (rule C.8).
c. Pages 414-415, are lacking an article stating that the secretary pro tem had been selected (rule C.6).

The Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations
a. Page 25, article 3, line 1 and article 10, line 1 mention the work and evaluation of the administrator of the committee but the administrator is not identified in the minutes (rule C.12).
b. Page 30, article 6, line 1 and article 10, line 1 and article 12, line 1 the administrator is never identified.

The Committee for the Historian of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.
a. Page 19, correspondence II, minutes of 2/14, 3/30, 4/20, 6/18, 9/13 of the previous year (2005) were approved at the second stated meeting of the following year instead of by the first meeting as required (rule C.11).

5. That the response to the exceptions taken by the 72nd General Assembly to the minutes of the Committee on Christian Education and the Committee on Diaconal ministries be accepted.

The recommendations were adopted.

132. PROTEST No. 1. Mr. Knox read the following protest:

The undersigned protests the decision of the 73rd General Assembly to uphold the ruling of the moderator to find “out of order” a motion to amend recommendation 2 of the Committee on Financial Review regarding Instrument E.4.d., by deletion of the words “Obtain and” and “the” (preceding the words “programs and budgets”), and by the insertion of the words “voluntarily provided” (following the word “yearly.”).

The portion of the RECOMMENDATION in question that was on the floor read as follows:

“The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.d…be revised to read:

d. Obtain and review, yearly, the programs and budgets of the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the WWO programs separately from direct contributions to the WWO programs.”

The particular portion of the RECOMMENDATION in question (item d.), as amended, would have read as follows:

d. Review, yearly, voluntarily provided programs and budgets of the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the WWO programs separately from direct contributions to the WWO programs.”

The undersigned believes the decision to find the proposed amendment “out of order” was in error on the following Grounds:

1. The decision had the effect of unjustly silencing presbyters on a legitimate matter of debate.
2. The report of the Committee on Financial Review has stimulated renewed study of Instrument E by the whole church. The mover of the proposed amendment to the recommendation on the floor stated that he sought to improve upon the recommendation as it related to the collection of information concerning programs and budgets from the whole church as that would impact the financial reporting of the whole church. Thus, the amendment was germane to the matter on the floor.
3. A motion to revise Instrument E.4.d. was properly on the floor.
4. The motion was definitely amendable; and the motion to amend, that was in question, was duly made and seconded.
5. Thus, the undersigned argues that the amendment was germane, and it was in order.
6. However, since the amendment was considered a new proposal and not germane to the pending recommendation, then Standing Rule VI.A.2. says that it, **shall be referred to an Advisory Committee.** Failure to do constitutes a violation of the Standing Rule, which is to deny justice and to unduly silence a brother who believes he spoke in a just cause.
7. Some presbyters offered the argument that the proposed amendment was out of order because it would have opened for discussion other portions of Instrument E or other instruments. That argument is unfounded and out of order, because the Instruments “shall be amended by a majority vote of any assembly” (Standing Rule XIII). The Instruments are open to review during the course of the Assembly, and they are amendable. Therefore, to deny the proposed amendment in question on the ground that it opened the door for further proposed revisions would have been a violation of the very Standing Rules of which the Instruments are a part. Presbyters do have the right to propose amendments to the Instruments, subject to the provisions of the Standing Rules. To deny that right is to deny justice and to unduly silence a brother who believes he spoke in a just cause; the Assembly decision deprived him of his right on the floor to address that cause.

Signed,

R. Daniel Knox

133. SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL REVIEW (continued, §104, 105).

Recommendations 2-10, 12, and 13 were put on the floor. They were adopted (with Recommendation 10 in the form proposed by Advisory Committee 4).

On motion it was determined to proceed to vote immediately on all recommendations of the Special Committee for Financial Review.

Recommendations 14 and 15 were adopted. Recommendation 16 was adopted in the form proposed by Advisory Committee 4 as follows:

   That the assembly instruct the Committee on Coordination to:

1) explore means by which the program committees themselves may reach new sources of funding within and without the OPC and methods of reaching them for advancing the Reformed cause represented by the OPC and to suggest means of implementation;

2) consider how the WWO program may be greatly simplified; and

3) report their findings to the 74th General Assembly

Recommendation 17 was adopted in the form proposed by Advisory Committee 4 as follows:

That the special Committee for Financial Review be dissolved with thanks.

134. FINAL FORM OF AMENDED INSTRUMENT E. The final form in which Instrument E was amended is as follows:

1. PURPOSE

There shall be a Committee on Coordination whose primary purpose shall be to recommend to the General Assembly a combined budget for the three pro-
gram committees (Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension) for the succeeding year so as to help the Church maximize the use of its resources for the fulfillment of its tasks, to support the ministry of the pastors and sessions in their responsibility to teach and encourage the practice of biblical stewardship in the church, and to help coordinate the promotion of the work of the three program committees in the development of support for their work.

2. STRUCTURE
The Committee shall consist of (a) one member each of the three worldwide outreach program committees above, elected by his representative committee; (b) six members at large, elected by the General Assembly (see Standing Rule X.2.); and (c) the General Secretaries of the three program committees as ex officio members without vote.

3. FUNCTIONS
The Committee shall seek to develop the financial support needed to achieve the short- and long-range goals set by the program committees.
To this end its functions shall include:
   a. reviewing the program (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans) desired by each program committee each year;
   b. recommending a combined budget for the program committees for submission annually to the General Assembly for its commendation and approval, and to the sessions and churches for their commendation and support;
   c. arranging for the orderly receiving and accounting of funds for the program committees;
   d. approving guidelines for promotion of the work and for development of support;
   e. developing and preparing programs to encourage the practices of good stewardship;
   f. acting as fiscal agent for the General Assembly in receiving, disbursing, and keeping account of receipts and disbursements of the General Assembly Operation Fund and making monthly reports to the Stated Clerk and the Trustees of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

4. OPERATION
The method of operation to carry out the functions of the Committee shall be these or similar activities:
   a. Elect its officers annually.
   b. Meet at least two times a year.
   c. Review, early in each year, the programs (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans) desired by each program committee for the ensuing year.
   d. Obtain and review, yearly, the programs and budgets of the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the WWO programs separately from direct contributions to WWO programs.
   e. Recommend to the next General Assembly a combined budget for the succeeding year reflecting the committee’s judgment as to the most desirable apportionment of the anticipated resources of the church.
   f. Implement a means of seeking annually from each session and/or congregation a statement of a goal for the support of the work of the program committees.
g. Report annually to the General Assembly. The report shall include (1) information concerning the Committee’s work (including the costs of the operation of the Committee, and the promotion and solicitation activities of the Committee); (2) recommendations for a combined budget for the program committees for the Assembly’s approval and commendation to the churches for their support; (3) recommendations for combined promotion and solicitation plans for the Assembly’s approval; (4) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation activities of the past year of the program committees along with that of COC; and, (5) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation plans for the ensuing year of the program committees along with that of COC.

h. (1) Inform the churches of the programs (including budgets, promotion and solicitation plans) approved and commended by the General Assembly; and (2) provide the churches with quarterly updates reporting the progress in reaching the approved combined budget of the respective program committees directly to the sessions and pastors via electronic mail (wherever possible).

i. (1) Contributions for the attainment of the total Worldwide Outreach budget shall be allocated monthly, first to the funding of the Committee on Coordination and New Horizons, and then to the program committees in the proportion which each program committee’s budget bears to the total budget of the three program committees; checks for this purpose shall be made payable to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” with the notation “Worldwide Outreach.” (2) Designated contributions shall be allocated to the causes designated by the donors.

(3) The Committee shall annually report and recommend to the General Assembly how to address any shortfalls in the most recent year’s planned revenues (e.g., designated giving, undesignated giving, and direct missionary support) of any program committee.

(4) Funds received by bequest or from sources outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees.

j. Arrange for the receiving of a Thank Offering each year for the worldwide outreach of the program committees.

k. Establish guidelines for promotion of and development of support for the work of the program committees, unitedly and separately, keeping the Church informed with regard to the progress and opportunities of their work.

l. See to it (1) that each program committee provides to the churches an annual report, including finances, and to the General Assembly an annual financial report subjected to a review engagement or an audit engagement by certified public accountants; and (2) that each committee provides to the General Assembly its past year’s activities and its current plans for promotion and solicitation of funds.

m. Encourage the enlargement of the work of the program committees and the procurement of support from individuals through both current and deferred giving, and from churches outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

n. Provide counsel, assistance, and literature aimed at increasing the commitment of each member in the use of his means, time, and talents in the work of Christ’s kingdom.
The purpose of this paragraph is to provide flexibility in the funding of support for new missionaries being sent to new foreign missions works, to promote closer ties of such missionaries with existing congregations, and to foster greater interest in the pursuit of foreign missions within the church as a whole.

(1) The Committee on Foreign Missions may, with the approval of the Committee on Coordination, undertake a special relationship with one or more session(s) or presbytery(s) (“the participant”) with respect to a missionary being sent to labor in a new foreign missions work.

(2) The contemplated special relationship includes:
   (a) A commitment for an initial period of not less than two years to provide the financial support (with at least 50% in any given year being funded by the special relationship and the remainder being provided for as part of Committee on Foreign Mission WWO annual approved budget) for the missionary from sources that are over and above the participant’s regular giving to the Worldwide Outreach combined budget;
   (b) The establishment of a committee by the participant to actively promote the work (and the “over and above” support therefore) of the missionary, to serve as the liaison between the participant and the Committee on Foreign Missions, and to be available for consultation and encouragement as major decisions are taken regarding that work;
   (c) An intention for the missionary to concentrate his activities for up to one-half of each furlough period among those with whom the Committee on Foreign Missions has undertaken a special relationship(s) with respect to his work; and
   (d) A review of each special relationship every five years by the Committee on Coordination to ascertain whether it is then possible to include support for the missionary within the Worldwide Outreach combined budget (which is the desired objective).

(3) The following rules shall apply:
   (a) Prior to seeking the approval of the Committee on Coordination under (1) above, the Committee on Foreign Missions shall certify that its current financial position is such that additional funding (beyond its portion of the Worldwide Outreach combined budget) must be developed in order to support the missionary through his first term of service;
   (b) The term, “new foreign missions work,” refers to a foreign mission field to which the Committee on Foreign Missions has been sending (without interruption) missionary evangelists for ten or fewer years;
   (c) Discussions regarding the undertaking of a special relationship may be initiated by either the Committee on Foreign Missions or by one or more sessions or presbyteries;
   (d) Funds received for the support of missionaries approved under (1) above shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees;
   (e) After its approval by the Committee on Coordination, the special relationship shall commence at a mutually agreeable date; and
   (f) All special relationships under this paragraph shall be reported to the General Assembly annually.
p. Champion and coordinate the promotion and development work of the Committee on Coordination and the three program committees.

5. STAFF
The Committee may employ a Director of Finance and Planned Giving and shall secure such clerical staff as needed to carry out its functions. The Committee may also engage the services of the necessary personnel for the purposes of promoting the work of and developing financial support for Worldwide Outreach. Costs shall be borne by the program committees in proportion to their General Assembly-approved budgets.

135. RECESS AND RECONVENE. The Assembly recessed at 9:59 a.m. after Mr. Powers led in prayer. The Assembly reconvened at 10:20 a.m. and sang, “Praise Ye, Praise Ye the Lord.” Mr. Parker led in prayer for work of the Special Committee for Financial Review.

136. PENSIONS. Mr. Huibregtse presented the report of the Committee on Pensions (see pp. 414-432), including the following recommendation--:

The Committee recommends that the 73rd General Assembly request the congregations to contribute $10 per communicant member to the Hospitalization Reserve Fund in 2007.

Mr. Huibregtse presented a video report on the work of the Committee.

137. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 (Pensions). Mr. Smith reported the silence of Advisory Committee 5 with respect to the report of the Committee on Pensions.

138. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATION. The recommendation of the Committee on Pensions was adopted.

139. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Pensions for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Minister: Broline; Ruling elders: Huibregtse and Stahl. In the absence of other nominations the Moderator declared them elected.

140. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. The Rev. Herman Van Stedum, fraternal delegate of the Reformed Church in the United States addressed the Assembly.

141. COMMITTEE ON COORDINATION (Recommendation 4; §89). Recommendation 4 of the Committee on Coordination was moved. The Moderator ruled the recommendation moot in view of previous actions of the Assembly. Appeal was taken from the ruling of the chair. The ruling of the moderator was sustained.

142. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 1 (Matters Referred; §42, 48, 51). Mr. Phillips presented the report of Advisory Committee 1 on matters referred to it as follows:

Advisory Committee 1 was given the assignment to bring back to the Assembly recommendations concerning the matter that was referred to them, namely, a main motion (“that the Supplemental Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions be recorded in the
Seventy-Third General Assembly

Minutes (cf. Standing Rule V.8))” and the amendment (“and to include with the Supplement the content of the report from the Ad Hoc Committee for the Support of the OPC Japan Mission”).

Advisory Committee 1 strongly urges:
1. That the Assembly consider first and pass the main motion (re. the Supplemental Report).
   **Grounds:**
   a. Standing Rule V.7. states: “All reports of standing committees…shall be included in the minutes…” (emphasis added).
   b. The 72nd General Assembly referred Overture 2 and its pending motions to the Committee on Foreign Missions, and the Supplementary Report is their response.
   c. Adopting the main motion becomes an “action or judgment of the judicatory” from which one who voted in dissent may protest (Book of Discipline VIII).

2. That the Assembly defeat the amendment (re. the report of the Ad Hoc Committee).
   **Ground:**
   Should any member of the assembly desire to register his disagreement with an action of the assembly, this is properly done by way of protest (BD VIII.2., “Any member of a judicatory may file a written protest stating his reasons for objecting to an action or judgment of the judicatory.”).

PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATION: That the main motion be voted upon first.

The Moderator ruled that the main motion would be voted upon first, namely, that the Supplemental Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions be recorded in the Minutes (Standing Rules V.8).

143. DEVOTIONS. The order of the day having arrived, Mr. Van Manen conducted a devotional service. He read 2 Chronicles 27 and delivered a message entitled, “Walking Steadfastly.” The Assembly sang, “Be Thou My Vision.”

144. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 12:19 p.m. after Mr. Ferrell led in prayer.

Tuesday Afternoon, June 27, 2006

145. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 1:30 p.m. and sang, “Not What My Hands Have Done.” Mr. Pierce led in prayer.

146. MINUTES. The Assistant Clerk presented the minutes for Saturday morning through Monday morning (§73 to 104). They were approved as presented.

147. LIMITATION ON LENGTH OF SPEECHES. The Moderator sought and received general consent to limit, for the duration of the Assembly, the length of speeches to five minutes for the first speech and three minutes for the second speech.

148. MOTION TO RECORD DEFEATED. The motion “that the Supplemental Re-
port of the Committee on Foreign Missions be recorded in the *Minutes (Standing Rules V.8)*” was defeated. At their requests the affirmative votes of Messrs. Bond, Brown, Curto, Duff, Galbraith, Huntington, Laurie, D. Mahaffy, J. Mahaffy, Parker, Pontier, L. Smith, Watson, Willet, and Winsted were recorded.

149. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 7 (Matters referred; §85). Mr. Van Meerbeke presented the report of Advisory Committee 7 on matters referred to it as follows:

With respect to the matters referred to it by the General Assembly on June 24, 2006, Advisory Committee 7 brings the following:

1. Advisory Committee 7 moves Recommendation 3b in the following form:
   Request the Committee on Christian Education: (1) to distribute this report to seminaries with which it has contact; (2) to post this report on our denominational website for easy access by interested parties; and (3) to consider publishing it separately for distribution; *thereby commending the report for study*. The General Assembly requests that the Committee on Christian Education write a prefatory statement to the report explaining: *(a) the reasons and context surrounding the origin of the report, including the republishing of the statement on Justification adopted by the 71st General Assembly, and (b) an explanation of what it means for the General Assembly to commend a report for study.*
   The motion was passed without dissent.

2. Advisory Committee 7 moves Recommendation 3c in the following form:
   Request the Stated Clerk to mail copies of this report *with the prefatory statement* to those churches with whom the Orthodox Presbyterian Church *has Ecclesiastical Fellowship or a Corresponding Relationship*.
   The motion was passed without dissent.

3. Advisory Committee 7 moves that the General Assembly thank the members of the Committee on Justification for their arduous labors and dismiss the Committee.

150. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS. The Assembly acted as follows with respect to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee:

Recommendation 3.b of the Study Committee (Recommendation 1 of the Advisory Committee) was adopted in the following amended form:

Request the Committee on Christian Education: (1) to distribute this report to seminaries with which it has contact; (2) to post this report on our denominational website for easy access by interested parties; (3) to consider publishing it separately for distribution; *thereby commending the report for study*. The General Assembly requests that the Committee on Christian Education write a prefatory statement to the report explaining: *(a) the reasons and context surrounding the origin of the report, including the republishing of the statement on Justification adopted by the 71st General Assembly, and (b) an explanation of what it means for the General Assembly to commend a report for study; and (4) to consider devoting an issue of New Horizons to providing popular critiques of the New Perspective on Paul and the Federal Vision to its readership.*

Recommendations 3.c. was adopted in the form proposed by the Advisory Committee. Recommendation 3 of the Advisory Committee was adopted.

151. DIACONAL MINISTRIES. Mr. Pierce presented the report of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries (see pp. 433-444), including the following recommendations:
1. That the General Assembly request the congregations to give at least half of their contributions by the end of May.

2. That the General Assembly remind the Presbyteries not to approve a call containing “free from worldly care” if they consider the call under consideration to be inadequate to provide for the minister’s livelihood, and to make certain that the call includes a provision for adequate retirement and for payment of hospitalization, surgical, and major medical insurance.

3. That the General Assembly request the Presbyteries to investigate whether all their ministers have adequate medical insurance coverage and retirement provision including looking into the sufficiency of co-pay and other alternatives.

4. That for the year 2007 the General Assembly request the churches of the OPC to support the work of this Committee at the suggested rate of $25.00 per communicant member.

152. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 (Diaconal Committee). Mr. Igo presented the report of Advisory Committee 5 including the following recommendation:

That the General Assembly instruct the Committee on Diaconal Ministries to provide in their future reports to GA a detailed explanation of all Foreign Ministry Disbursements with due regard for the safety and confidentiality of the recipients.

Grounds:
1. Better accountability will encourage prayer, rejoicing and generous benevolent giving by the church.
2. In order to be a good steward of the Lord’s money, the General Assembly needs a more detailed report to provide sufficient oversight of the committee.
3. The Committee on Diaconal Ministries currently provides a detailed explanation for Domestic Ministry Disbursements.

153. QUESTIONS. Mr. Leonard J. Coppes, Secretary-Treasurer of the Committee, and Mr. Pierce responded to questions from commissioners.

154. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS (§151). The Assembly took the following actions with respect to the recommendations of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries:

Recommendation 1 was adopted.

Recommendation 2 was referred to Advisory Committee 5 with an amendment pending (see §193).

Recommendation 3 was adopted in the following amended form:

3. That the General Assembly request the Presbyteries to investigate whether all their ministers have adequate medical and life insurance coverage and retirement provision including looking into the sufficiency of co-pay and other alternatives.

Recommendation 4 was adopted.

155. ACTION ON ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (§152). The recommendation of the Advisory Committee was adopted.

156. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Diaconal Ministries for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Ministers: Coppes and L. Smith; Deacons: John T. (Jack) Swann (Hatboro) and Robert J. Wright, Jr.
(Pole Tavern). The Moderator declared Messrs. Swann and Wright elected. At a later time he announced the election of Mr. Smith.

157. RECESS AND RECONVENE. The Assembly recessed at 3:15 p.m. and reconvened at 3:37 p.m. The Assembly sang, “The God of Abraham Praise,” and Mr. Igo led in prayer, remembering the work of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries.

158. APPRECIATION OF MR. AND MRS. COPPES. On motion the Assembly determined gratefully to recognize the 33 years of service of the Rev. Leonard J. Coppes, with the assistance of his wife, Diana, on the Committee on Diaconal Ministries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

159. ECUMENICITY AND INTERCHURCH RELATIONS. Mr. Tyson presented the report of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations (see pp. 445-477), including the following recommendations:

I The Committee recommends that the 73rd (2006) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church amend the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Ecclesiastical Relationships Policy as follows:


   A. Adding the following sentence to the end of Article II, so that, as amended, it would read as follows:

   II. That our fellowship with other churches consist in three categories. Decisions to enter into or withdraw from such fellowship shall be decided by each church on an individual basis. Because the undertaking of a bilateral relationship of either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations carries with it a commitment of substantial resources—in both time and expense—for its implementation, good stewardship of limited resources requires that these relationships ordinarily be reserved for situations in which the church seeking an ecclesiastical relationship with the OPC is either geographically proximate to the OPC (i.e., situated in North America), or has some other form of substantial contact or history with the OPC (e.g., missionary endeavors, transfers of members, etc.); other churches seeking an ecclesiastical relationship with the OPC are encouraged to seek membership in the ICRC and thereby also enter into a relationship of Ecumenical Contact with the OPC.

   B. Deleting Article II.C (pertaining to “Limited Contact”) in its entirety and replacing it with the following:

   C. Ecumenical Contact is that relationship in which mutual contact is maintained with other member churches of the International Conference of Reformed Churches (which have no congregations located in North America and with which the OPC does not presently have either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations), in keeping with
the second stated purpose of the Conference, “to encourage the fullest ecclesiastical fellowship among the member churches” (Constitution of the ICRC, Article III.2) and in fulfillment of our stated “responsibility to call all churches, including our own, to faithfulness in order to seek the unity of the whole church” (Biblical Principles of the Unity of the Church, IV.I). It shall be implemented, as appropriate, by:

1. Meetings, both formal and informal, of delegates to the quadrennial meetings of the Conference
2. Welcome of official observers at the broadest assemblies
3. Communication on issues of joint concern
4. Mutual labors as members of the Conference in discharge of the purposes of the Conference

2. That the names of the member churches of the ICRC with which the OPC does not have either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations be enrolled on the list of Reformed churches with which the OPC sustains a relationship of Ecumenical Contact, and that these two actions be communicated to the member churches of the ICRC and to the churches with which the OPC has either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations, for their review and comment.

2 The Committee recommends that the 73rd (2006) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church approve the membership of the Free Reformed Churches in North America in NAPARC.

Grounds:

1. The Committee has had close contact with these churches for several years.
2. Their confessional standards are the Three Forms of Unity. Their church order has been examined favorably by the Committee.
3. They hold membership in the ICRC
4. They are a “daughter” church of the CRCN with whom we are in a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship.

3 The Committee recommends that the 73rd (2006) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church respond to the request of NAPARC (Communication # 2) as follows:

That the 73rd (2006) General Assembly respectfully decline the request of the 31st (2005) annual Meeting of NAPARC to ratify a new formulation regarding women in combat, and suggest instead to NAPARC that NAPARC might respond to inquiries regarding “NAPARC’s position” on the matter by listing the relevant adopted statements of the member churches.

Ground:
The basis of NAPARC is set forth in Article II of its Constitution: “full commitment to the Bible in its entirety as the Word of God written, without error in all its parts and to its teaching as set forth in [the Three Forms of Unity] and [the Westminster Standards]. The nature and extent of its authority is prescribed in Article IV of the Constitution: “It is understood that all actions and decisions taken are advisory in character and in no way curtail or restrict the autonomy of the member bodies.” We do not believe that it is wise for NAPARC to embark on a course of making pronouncements for its member churches.

Mr. Tyson introduced Mr. Peterson, the Administrator for the Committee. Together they supplemented the report of the Committee.
160. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 6. Mr. Willet reported the silence of Advisory Committee 6 with respect to the report of the Committee and Recommendations 2 and 3. He presented the following recommendations:

1. Amend Recommendation 1 by the deletion of the word “also,” in the next to last line of II.
2. Refer to the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations Communications 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

161. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS. The three recommendations of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations were adopted in the form proposed by Advisory Committee 6. Recommendation 2 of Advisory Committee 6 was adopted.

162. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations for the class of 2009. The following were nominated: Messrs. Bube, Hilbelink, and Knight. In the absence of other nominations the Moderator declared them elected.

163. APPRECIATION FOR MR. WILLIAMSON. On motion the Assembly adopted the following:

On the occasion of the conclusion of the Rev. G. I. Williamson’s long tenures of service on the Committee on Christian Education, the Subcommittee on Ministerial Training, and the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, the General Assembly expresses its gratitude to God for the ways in which Mr. Williamson has been a gift to our church.

Mr. Williamson pastored Orthodox Presbyterian congregations for eighteen years, before and after a twenty-year sojourn in New Zealand. Throughout the years of his ministerial service he nurtured a generation of Orthodox Presbyterians in their comprehension of and devotion to the doctrinal standards of our church.

He mentored the officers of our church toward a deeper appreciation of our Presbyterian way of life through his fourteen years as editor of *Ordained Servant*. He ministered to our covenant youth in his labors as theological editor for Great Commission Publications and service on the GCP Board for sixteen years; He served for 23 years for the Committee on Christian Education and the Subcommittee on Ministerial Training; and seventeen years on the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations.

He represented the Orthodox Presbyterian Church at meetings of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod and the International Conference of Reformed Churches, and he delivered ecclesiastical greetings to many of our sister churches.

In these and many other ways, Mr. Williamson has given his life in service to the Lord, and we are thankful that in his faithfulness and devotion, he continues to give glory to our Sovereign God and encouragement to His people.

164. PRAYER. Mr. Muether led in prayer for Mr. Williamson and for the work of the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations.

165. FRATERNAL ADDRESS. Mr. Peterson introduced the Rev. R. Sherman Isbell,
fraternal delegate of Free Church of Scotland (Continuing). Mr. Isbell addressed the Assembly.

166. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2 (Communication 10). Mr. Nelson presented the report of Advisory Committee 2 regarding Communication 10 as follows:

After hearing testimony from Messrs. Bond and Johnson pertaining to Communication 10, the advisory committee recommends as follows:

That the assembly advise the Presbytery of the Southwest that the assembly does not object to the presbytery’s granting the exception to the educational requirements for the ordination of Mr. Phillip D. Hodson (Form of Government XXIII.3).

Ground: Mr. Hodson has served as stated supply at Christ the King Presbyterian Church (OPC) for 2 years as an intern of Tyler Presbyterian Church (OPC), has completed the MTIOPC course in Homiletics and has received supervised experience in practical ministry areas under Rev. John Johnson. Furthermore, the Session of Tyler OPC testifies that the ministry of Mr. Hodson has proven edifying to the church.

The recommendation was adopted.

167. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2 (Communication 13). Mr. Nelson presented the report of Advisory Committee 2 regarding Communication 13 as follows:

After hearing testimony from Mr. A. Craig Troxel pertaining to Communication 13, the advisory committee recommends as follows:

That the assembly advise the Presbytery of Philadelphia that the assembly does not object to the presbytery’s granting the exception to the educational requirements for the licensure of Mr. James A. La Belle (Form of Government XXI.6).

The recommendation was adopted.

168. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 5:00 p.m. after Mr. L. Smith led in prayer.

Tuesday Evening, June 27, 2006

169. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 6:30 p.m. and sang, “When in His Might the Lord.” Mr. Van Meerbeke led in prayer for the fruits of the labors of the Committee on the Doctrine of Justification.

170. APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS. Mr. Mallin reported for the Committee on Appeals and Complaints (see pp. 478-482), including the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION
That the Appeal be found in order and properly before the Assembly.

PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATIONS
That the Assembly:

1. Vote separately on whether the rights asserted in 5.E.i-viii have been abridged by presbytery. NB: BD VII.6: “... If the appellate judicatory sustains any spec-
ification of error, it shall determine whether the error is of such importance as to require a reversal or modification of the judgment. …”

2. Vote on Specification 1.C (cf. 2.B)
3. Vote on Specification 3 (assuming it is in order)

    Grounds:
    a. The accusation of bearing false witness constitutes a defense, which should not be entertained apart from separate charges (a “malignant defense”);
    b. Certain concerns which may be raised in connection with 1.E.i,ii., and iv. are addressed in Procedural Recommendation 1.

171. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 10—Vandervliet Appeal. Mr. Westerveld presented the report of Advisory Committee 10 as follows:

I. Advisory Committee 10 met with the following:
Messrs. Mallin and Jones (members of the Standing Committee), Messrs. Martin and Van Manen (representatives of the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario), Messrs. Ferguson and Peter Wallace (members of the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario), and Mr. Bosgraf (Regional Home Missionary of the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario).

    Note: Mr. Vandervliet will not be present at the Assembly but has sent along the communication that is attached to this report.

II. The Committee is silent with respect to the Report of the Standing Committee.

III. The Committee is silent with respect to Recommendation (D).

IV. The Committee is silent with respect to the procedure proposed in Paragraph E.

RECOMMENDATIONS
1. That Specification 3 be found in order.
2. That should the Assembly choose to adopt the Standing Committee’s Procedural Recommendation (E), the following procedure be adopted for addressing each specification:
   Presentation of the Advisory Committee (for up to 10 minutes)
   Response of the Presbytery (for up to 10 minutes)
   Questions from the Assembly for the Committees and the Presbytery (for up to 10 minutes)
   Debate on the specification
   Vote on the specification

3. a. With respect to Specification 5.E.i, when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.
   b. With respect to Specification 5.E.ii, when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote yes.

Ground: The Session of Grace Covenant OPC (Sheffield, Ontario) and the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario (in the appeal process) required the appellant to provide, in advance of the adjudication of his case, to the judicatory’s satisfaction, justification for his choice of potential witnesses and his possible line of questioning, which added to the requirements of BD IV.C.1.c.
c. With respect to Specification 5.E.iii., when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

d. With respect to Specification 5.E.iv., when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

e. With respect to Specification 5.E.v., when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

f. With respect to Specification 5.E.vi., when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

g. With respect to Specification 5.E.vii., when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

h. With respect to Specification 5.E.viii., when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

i. With respect to Specification 1.C, when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

j. With respect to Specification 3, when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

k. With respect to Specification 6, when the Moderator puts the question, “Shall the specification be sustained?” the recommendation of the Advisory Committee is that the Assembly vote no.

4. That should the Assembly agree to sustain only Specification 5.E.ii. the Committee advises that the GA determine that the error is not of such importance as to require a reversal or modification of the judgment (BD VII.6.).

172. APPEAL FOUND IN ORDER. The Moderator read the warning of the Book of Discipline IV.A.1.a., and reminded the members of the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario that they were not entitled to vote on matters relating to the appeal.

The recommendation of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints (§170) was adopted that the appeal be found in order and properly before the Assembly.

173. PROCEDURE ADOPTED (§170). The procedural recommendation of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints was adopted.

174. SPECIFICATION 3 IN ORDER. Recommendation 1 of the Advisory Committee was adopted, that Specification 3 be found in order (cf. §171).

175. FURTHER PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATION. Recommendation 2 of Advisory Committee 10 was adopted in the following amended form (cf. §171):

That should the Assembly choose to adopt the Standing Committee’s Procedural Recommendation (E), the following procedure be adopted for addressing each specification:
176. ACTION ON SPECIFICATIONS OF ERROR. The Assembly considered each of the specifications of error as listed in the report of Advisory Committee 10 (c.f. §171). The Assembly began to consider the specifications listed in the report as 3.a.-k.

It was determined to consider Specification 5.E.ii. before considering Specification 5.E.i.

177. RECESS AND ORDER OF THE DAY EXTENDED. On motion it was determined to recess for five minutes and to extend the order of the day until the completion of the appeal. The Assembly recessed at 8:29 p.m. and reconvened at 8:35 p.m.


179. SUBSTITUTE MOVED. Recommendation 4 of the Advisory Committee was moved.

The following was moved as a substitute: that the Assembly find that the specification of error is sufficiently weighty not to sustain the judgment of the presbytery so as to warrant remitting the case to the trial judicatory for a new trial.

The substitute was adopted and became the main motion (see §182).

180. RECESS. On motion it was determined to recess for the evening and to reconvene at 8:00 a.m. The Assembly recessed at 10:36 p.m. after Mr. Pirschel led in prayer.

Wednesday Morning, June 28, 2006

181. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 8:00 a.m. and sang, “Look, Ye Saints, the Sight Is Glorious.” Mr. Huntington led in prayer.

182. ACTION ON SPECIFICATION OF ERROR. The Moderator read the warning of the Book of Discipline IV.A.1.a. The pending motion (cf. §179) was adopted in the following amended form:

That the Assembly find that the specification of error is sufficiently weighty not to sustain the judgment of the presbytery so as to warrant remitting the case to the trial judicatory for a new trial. Furthermore, the Assembly requests and strongly urges the session of Grace Covenant OPC to provide Mr. Vandervliet with competent counsel; and the Assembly further requests and strongly urges Mr. Vandervliet to receive such counsel (Book of Discipline IV.A.3.a). Furthermore, the Assembly encourages the Presbytery of
Michigan and Ontario to offer its assistance to Grace Covenant OPC to augment the session for the purpose of conducting this trial (*Form of Government* XIII.10).

At their requests the negative votes of the following were recorded: Messrs. Arnaud, J. Johnson, Knox, Labriola, Moelker, Pasarilla, Shallenberger, J. Wallace, and Wagner.

183. **REMEMBER TO TRIAL JUDICATORY.** On motion it was determined that the General Assembly encourage the trial judicatory—when it reconsiders the case—to bear in mind that “informally suspending from the Lord’s Supper” is not a censure or imposition of judicial discipline found in the OPC’s *Book of Discipline*.

184. **APPEAL OF RULING AND DOCKET MODIFIED.** The Moderator ruled that the Assembly needed to deal with all the remaining specifications of error. His ruling was appealed. The ruling of the Moderator was not sustained.

On motion it was determined that if consideration of the Appeal is not completed by 9:45 a.m., the Assembly postpone further consideration of the Appeal until after the completion of other business as determined by the Stated Clerk.

185. **ELECTION.** The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Appeals and Complaints for the class of 2009. Messrs. Jerrell and Strange were nominated. At a later time the Moderator announced the election of Mr. Strange. At a later time Mr. Foh was elected as an alternate, see §192.

186. **HISTORIAN.** Mr. Muether presented his report as Historian (see p. 483), and supplemented his report.

187. **ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (Historian).** Mr. Pontier presented the report of Advisory Committee 9 as follows: Advisory Committee 9 notes with gratefulness to our Lord the work of our Historian. With regard to the report of the Historian, Advisory Committee 9 is silent.

188. **COMMITTEE FOR THE HISTORIAN.** Mr. D. K. Thompson presented the report of the Committee for the Historian (see pp. 484-486), including the following recommendation:

[See GAOF, §207]

That the following proposed budget for fiscal year 2007 be approved by the Assembly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>2006 Budget</th>
<th>2007 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historian’s Honorarium</td>
<td>$ 6,400</td>
<td>$ 6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Management</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Service</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>$ 2,250</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Project</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Anniversary Celebration*</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 20,650</td>
<td>$ 23,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: formerly referred to as “OPC History Project,” the $3,000 includes the $500 from that line item. The increase represents planning efforts for the 75th anniversary.

189. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (Committee for the Historian). Mr. Pontier presented the report of Advisory Committee 9 as follows: With regard to the report of the Committee for the Historian, Advisory Committee #9 notes the impending need for the provision of the OPC archives due to the deficiencies, both spatial and environmental, at the present location in Westminster Theological Seminary.

The Advisory Committee notes with great thankfulness the work of Grace Mullen who maintains the archives of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

190. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee for the Historian for the class of 2009. Mr. Bond was nominated. In the absence of other nominations the Moderator declared him elected.

191. PRAYER. Mr. Pontier prayed for the Historian and for the Committee for the Historian.

192. ELECTION (Appeals and Complaints, alternate). The floor was opened for nominations for an alternate to the Committee on Appeals and Complaints. Messrs. Foh and Jerrell were nominated. At a later time the Moderator announced the election of Mr. Foh.

193. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 5 (Matters Referred). Mr. Igo presented the recommendation referred to the Advisory Committee (§154) in the following form:

2. That the General Assembly remind the Presbyteries not to approve a call containing “free from worldly care” if they consider the call under consideration to be inadequate to provide for the minister’s livelihood, and to make certain that the call includes a provision for adequate retirement and for payment of hospitalization, surgical, and major medical insurance, and inquire as to whether the candidate has adequate life insurance. The recommendation was adopted.

194. PROTEST No. 2. Mr. D. Mahaffy read the following protest:

The undersigned respectfully protest the action of the 73rd General Assembly in declining to record the Supplemental Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions in its minutes for the following reasons:

1. By not including reports which provide background for actions taken by the Assembly and its committees, the Assembly may cause confusion in sessions and churches as they do not have the information used by the Assembly and its committees to arrive at its decisions.

2. Failing to record a report of a standing committee violates the spirit of General Assembly’s Standing Rule chapter V, paragraph 7: “All reports of committees... shall be recorded in the minutes....”

3. When the Assembly does not include committee reports in its minutes, the historical record is incomplete.
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D. Mahaffy, Curto, Duff, Jackson, Laurie, J. Mahaffy, McShaffrey, Newton, Parker, Pontier, L. Smith, Watson, and Winsted.

195. MINUTES. The Assistant Clerk presented the Minutes for Monday morning through Tuesday evening (§104-171).

196. RECESS. The Assembly recessed at 10:03 a.m. after Mr. Westerveld prayed for the work of the Committee on Appeals and Complaints.

197. RECONVENE. The Assembly reconvened at 10:20 a.m. and sang, “Now Thank We All Our God.” Mr. McNeill led in prayer.

198. RESOLUTION OF THANKS. Mr. Phillips presented the following resolution of thanks, which was adopted:

The 73rd General Assembly takes this opportunity to acknowledge the great goodness of our God in providing brothers and sisters in the Lord who have enhanced this Assembly by both upfront and behind the scenes service. We wish to especially mention the following:

For the hosting hospitality of Trinity Christian College, a serene oasis in the midst of the bustling Chicago megalopolis, we express our thanks to the Board and to President Dr. Steven Timmermans and his staff in various departments whose labors have so comfortably housed and fed us, and attended to our electronic and other needs, allowing our ecclesiastical purpose to be accomplished unhindered. Among them are Pete Hamstra (VP of Marketing and Admissions), Larry Humme (VP of Development), Ginny Carpenter (VP of Student Development), Jim Erickson (Director of Dining Services), Tim Timmons (Director of the Physical Plant), Jim Van Schepen (Director of Security), Bob Grotenhuis (Interim Director of Marketing), Mary Tambrini (Catering Coordinator), Dee Carranza (Dining Services Manager), Dave Jousma (A/V Coordinator), Kevin Jacobs (Computer Services Coordinator), Jan Kosmel (Facilities Coordinator), Cindy Sorice (Custodial Coordinator), Jeremy Junkin (Setup Coordinator), and the special presence of our lady-in-waiting, Joanne Gritters (Conference and Events Coordinator).

We appreciate the Session of Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Orland Park, Illinois, for hosting the communion service for combined Chicago-area churches and the Assembly commissioners, for the Pastor, Iain Alastair MacKay Wright, who coordinated many menial tasks and had general oversight, even chauffeuring commissioners…and, on the correct side of the road. And a special thanks to Covenant Church members John and Frank Voss, who volunteered to build the stage extension, and also contributed all the materials, not an insignificant donation.

The chore of sorting through stacks of paper ballots (some folded, some invalid, most submitted correctly) and distributing papers continued under the faithful leadership of David R. Heise. Joining him have been his grandson, Alexander D. Mollohan, Elijah DeJong, Grace DeJong, Joy Muether, Timothy Muether, Daniel Sawyer, Nathaniel Thompson, and David Veldkamp. We thank this crew of volunteers for their quiet, valuable assistance.

This year, again, the Committee on General Assembly Arrangements has fulfilled its mandate to “be responsible for arrangements before and during the meetings of the General Assembly that will enable the work of the Assembly,” and therefore we thank them.
Finally, we express our sincere thanks to the Rev. Richard R. Gerber, Moderator of the 73rd General Assembly, for patiently guiding us through our docket, to Stated Clerk Donald J. Duff and Assistant Clerk John W. Mahaffy in keeping an accurate record of the Assembly, and to David E. Haney for his work as projectionist...one among the many hats he wears at the Assembly.

To God be the glory for these named and unnamed, who served their Lord with gladness.

199. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS. Mr. Haney presented the report of the Committee on Arrangements as follows:

Mr. Haney presented the following committee recommendations:

[Recommendation 1 had been adopted earlier, cf. §8]

2. That those commissioners who did not arrive in time to attend the first session of the Assembly because of delays of public transportation be excused with the loss of none of their travel compensation per Standing Rule XII.5.a.

3. That Wayne Feece be excused from the afternoon and evening sessions of the Assembly on June 23, 2006 to attend the graduation of a close family friend with the loss of none of his travel compensation per Standing Rule XII.5.a.

4. That John Mazunik be excused from the morning session of the Assembly on Wednesday, June 28, 2006 to attend to responsibilities of employment with the loss of none of his travel compensation per Standing Rule XII.5.a.

5. That the Assembly approve the following rules for travel compensation:

That commissioners who submitted valid travel vouchers by 6:30 p.m. on Friday, June 23, 2006 be reimbursed for their expenses for one round trip to the General Assembly, room and meals in the amount calculated by the following schedule:

a. Those traveling by public conveyance be reimbursed the cost of their fare as reported to the nearest dollar up to the maximum of $400.00.

b. Those traveling by private conveyance as drivers be reimbursed to the nearest dollar at the rate of $0.35 per mile for the first 500 miles and $0.05 per mile thereafter, plus $0.05 per mile for each person who is eligible to receive travel compensation, plus tolls and parking fees, with the exception that the driver and passengers not receive a combined amount greater than the combined costs of economy airfares for the driver and his passengers.

c. Those traveling by private conveyance as passengers be reimbursed at the rate of $0.05 per mile.

d. Commissioners who apply for it be reimbursed up to $255.00 for room and meal expenses incurred off campus, in conjunction with the Assembly.

6. That the General Assembly request presbyteries and committees to notify the Stated Clerk of names, addresses, telephone numbers and e-mail addresses of representatives to the Assembly by March 1, 2007.

7. That the Assembly grant Covenant, Orland Park, $500.00 for expenses incurred as host for the 73rd General Assembly.

8. That the Assembly request the Grace Reformed Session of Des Moines to assume responsibility for a worship service during the 74th GA on Sunday afternoon/evening, June 17, 2007.

9. That the General Assembly request that the churches contribute to the General Assembly Travel Fund for 2007 at the rate of $10.00 per communicant member.

10. Tentatively, that the 75th General Assembly convene at Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington, beginning at 7:00 p.m. July 9, 2008 with a terminus no later than 12:00 p.m., July 16, 2008.
11. Tentatively, that the 76th General Assembly convene at Kuyper College (formerly called Reformed Bible College), Grand Rapids, Michigan beginning at 7:00 p.m. May 27, 2009, with a terminus no later than of 12:00 p.m. June 3, 2009.

The Temporary Arrangements Committee requests a budget item of $6,000.00 for 2007.

Recommendations 2-11 were adopted.

Mr. Haney presented the following financial report for the Assembly’s Travel Fund:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at the end of the 72nd GA</td>
<td>82,241.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net receipts</td>
<td>126,920.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available to 73rd GA</td>
<td>209,162.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit for 2011 Assembly</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Available to 73rd GA</td>
<td>199,162.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 73rd GA expenses</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance for the 74th General Assembly</td>
<td>99,162.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200. ELECTION. The floor was opened for nominations to the Committee on Arrangements for the class of 2009. Mr. Meeker was nominated. In the absence of other nominations the Moderator declared him elected. On motion it was determined to elect an alternate to the Committee. Mr. Muether was nominated. In the absence of other nominations, the Moderator declared him elected.

201. PROTEST No. 3. Mr. Willet read the following protest:

The undersigned protest the actions of the 73rd General Assembly remitting the case of the Vandervliet appeal for the following reasons:

1. The Assembly, as an appellant court, did not give due deference to the decisions of the lower court;
2. The Assembly imposed upon a lower court duties that exceed the requirements of the BD, namely in strongly urging the lower court to provide counsel as a positive duty;
3. The grounds for remission before the Assembly did not meet the standard of “requiring” a reversal of the judgment (BD VII.6), noting that the appellants defense and purpose for calling witnesses consisted in essence of accusations of wrongdoing against others;
4. The appeal itself and supporting documents spoke inappropriately of men of good standing in the church, including in the statement of the appeal that “the Session has openly borne false witness to Presbytery” and in the statement of appellant reference to “a rogue minister’s bullyings.” In addition, the appellant in his defense charges that “It is the session which broke their part in our vows.” The Assembly offered no objection to such inappropriate statements.

Respectfully submitted,
S. Scott Willet, Arnaud, J. Johnson, Knox, LaBriola, Pasarilla, Selle, Shallenberger, Wagner, and Winsted.

202. REVISIONS TO THE DIRECTORY FOR WORSHIP. Mr. Cottenden presented the report of the Committee (see pp. 487-508), including the following recommendations:
1. That for the discussion and question period following the presentation of the Committee’s Report(s) and Report(s) of the Advisory Committee, Standing Rule V.5.e be suspended and in its place the following procedure be adopted:

   a. That the commissioners may, for up to 60 minutes
      (1) Ask questions about the report(s)
      (2) Discuss portions of the report(s) not related to a recommendation
      (3) Discuss matters raised in any overtures or communications relating to the work of the Committee

   b. During this period, a commissioner shall, after having been recognized, announce whether he is asking a question(s) about the report(s), discussing a portion(s) of the report not related to a recommendation, or discussing an overture or communication from a presbytery; discussion of portions of the report(s) related to a recommendation is out of order. A questioner may have up to one minute to ask his question and a speaker may have up to three minutes to make his speech. No speaker may speak twice if another is seeking the floor.

2. That the 73rd General Assembly postpone to the 74th General Assembly consideration of the Amended Proposed Revised Version (APRV) and contingent changes to the Book of Discipline and Form of Government.

3. That the 73rd General Assembly refer to the Committee on Revisions all overtures and communications relating to the revision of the Directory for Public Worship received from presbyteries prior to June 21, 2006, requesting the Committee to consider the suggested amendments contained therein, to make any amendments to the APRV that it deems warranted by such consideration, and to organize the remaining suggested amendments in such a way as to facilitate their consideration by the 74th General Assembly; and further, that the Assembly direct the Committee not to consider any suggested amendments received after the above deadline.

4. That the 73rd General Assembly request the Committee on Revisions to complete its work and post on the OPC website by December 31, 2006 the form of the APRV that it plans to propose to the 74th General Assembly.

5. That the 73rd General Assembly instruct the Stated Clerk to include in the docket for the 74th General Assembly a full day to allow for consideration of the Amended Proposed Revised Version (APRV) and contingent changes to the Book of Discipline and Form of Government along with any related matters.

6. That the 73rd General Assembly instruct the Stated Clerk to include in the printed minutes of the present Assembly the Report of the Committee but not the APRV itself nor the contingent proposed amendments to the Form of Government and Book of Discipline (Appendices 1-3).

7. That the 73rd General Assembly approve including in the Suggested Forms for the Book of Discipline the forms for the imposition and removal of censure. (Appendix 4)

8. That the 73rd General Assembly elect an alternate member of the Committee to serve until the 74th General Assembly.

203. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 8 (Revisions to the Directory for Worship). Mr. Watkins reported the silence of Advisory Committee 8 with respect to the report and supplemental report of the Committee on Revision to the Directory for Public Worship, and presented the recommendation of the Advisory Committee that the 73rd General Assembly request the alternate member to attend committee meetings as an observer.

204. ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS. The Committee did not move Recom-
mendation 1. Recommendations 2-6 and 8 were adopted. At the Committee’s recommenda-

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee was adopted (cf. §203).

205. ELECTION OF ALTERNATE. Nominations were opened for an alternate member of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship. Mr. Olinger was nominated. In the absence of other nominations he was declared elected.

206. PROTEST No. 4. Mr. Pasarilla read the following protest:

The undersigned do protest the decision of the 73rd General Assembly to distribute outside the OPC the Report of the Committee to Study the Doctrine of Justification (Recommendation 3b & c). We do so for the following reasons:

1. The Report, by being distributed by the highest court of the OPC, has the de facto effect of accusing ministers in good standing in fraternal churches, as well as other ministers who subscribe to the Westminster Standards and the Three Forms of Unity, of being unfaithful to their subscription vows without due process (e.g., filing a judicial charge). Though the Committee’s oral report before the GA stated that this was not the intent, this is not stated in the Report itself.

2. The Report, by not being submitted to those critiqued in it before being presented to the GA for commendation and distribution, was inconsistent with the Report’s own standard that “the ordinary process of publication requires material [e.g., the Report] to be read and critiqued by others,” “… receiving valuable feedback, as wisdom, humility, and love require” (1601, ll. 35-39).

3. The distribution outside of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church of the Report by the General Assembly is inconsistent with the Assembly’s decision not to print the Committee on Foreign Missions’ Supplemental Report because it had concerns that the latter misconstrued the actions and words of fellow ministers. We believe a similar standard should have been applied to the distribution of the Report.

Michael D. Pasarilla, McManus, Nolder, Powers, and Wagner

207. PRAYER. Mr. Watkins led in prayer for the work of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship.

208. ADVISORY COMMITTEE 9 (GAOF). Mr. Pontier reported for Advisory Committee 9. The recommendation proposed by the Trustees was adopted in the following amended form:

The Trustees in accordance with the Standing Rules XI:2.e. (“propose to the General Assembly a budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund, and suggest a per capita contribution for payment of the assembly expenses”) propose the following budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund for 2007 and request the churches of the denomination to contribute $14 per communicant member to the General Assembly Operation Fund in 2007:
### Proposed Budget for GAOF for 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAOF request per comm.</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>189,881</td>
<td>189,881</td>
<td>182,022</td>
<td>133,757</td>
<td>133,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>164,029</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Ads</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Minutes</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>179,297</td>
<td>172,100</td>
<td>175,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Honoraria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk</td>
<td>62,953</td>
<td>62,953</td>
<td>64,527</td>
<td>66,140</td>
<td>66,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension, etc.</td>
<td>10,523</td>
<td>10,668</td>
<td>11,038</td>
<td>11,341</td>
<td>11,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Clerk</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Manager</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Honoraria</strong></td>
<td>85,276</td>
<td>83,441</td>
<td>85,465</td>
<td>87,581</td>
<td>87,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Staff/Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff/Office</strong></td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>7,761</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip/Post/Supplies</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office</strong></td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>21,746</td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>23,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Insurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. General Assembly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes print/Distrib.</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,481</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda print/Distrib.</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Arrangement</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Delegates</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,408</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GA</strong></td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>18,912</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPARC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Chaplains Commission</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assessments</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,583</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeals and Complaints</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Historian</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>7,352</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>16,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIR</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>28,991</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision DPW</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of The OPC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. for Financial Review</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. on Doc. Of Justification</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. on Illegal Aliens</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. on Psalter Hymnal</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Committee</td>
<td>49,850</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>54,850</td>
<td>55,350</td>
<td>56,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenses 214,576 187,156 220,365 222,481 229,981

Receipts minus Expenses (52,576) (7,859) (48,265) (54,881)

Ending Balance 137,305 182,022 133,757 78,876

209. COMMITTEE TO RESPOND APPOINTED. On motion it was determined that the Moderator appoint Messrs. Fesko, Strange, and VanDrunen to respond to the protest against the Assembly’s decision to distribute the Report of the Doctrine of Justification (Protest No. 4).

210. MINUTES. The Assistant Clerk presented the Minutes for Tuesday evening through Wednesday morning (§171-198). He read the remaining Minutes for Wednesday morning.

211. RESPONSE TO PROTEST No. 4. Mr. Fesko reported for the Committee to respond as follows:

In response to the protest we respond by noting that the protest was entered very late in the Assembly: and (1) appears to have an inadequate understanding of what constitutes a judicial charge; (2) misconstrues the line quoted and fails to understand that the Committee was under no obligation to submit its report to those critiqued; and (3) this point is not germane to the distribution of the Committee’s report.

On motion the Assembly adopted the response to the protest.

212. MINUTES AS A WHOLE APPROVED. On motion the Minutes as a whole were approved.

213. DISSOLUTION AND NEXT ASSEMBLY. On motion the Assembly was dissolved. The Moderator led in prayer. The Assembly sang the hymn, “Jesus, with Thy Church Abide.” The Moderator pronounced the Apostolic Benediction. Mr. Gerber made the following declaration: “By virtue of the authority delegated to me by the church, let this General Assembly be dissolved, and I do hereby dissolve it, and require another general assembly, chosen in the same manner, to meet at Dordt College, Sioux Center,
mittee was under no obligation to submit its report to those critiqued; and (3) this point is not germane to the distribution of the Committee’s report.

On motion the Assembly adopted the response to the protest.

212. MINUTES AS A WHOLE APPROVED. On motion the Minutes as a whole were approved.

213. DISSOLUTION AND NEXT ASSEMBLY. On motion the Assembly was dissolved. The Moderator led in prayer. The Assembly sang the hymn, “Jesus, with Thy Church Abide.” The Moderator pronounced the Apostolic Benediction. Mr. Gerber made the following declaration: “By virtue of the authority delegated to me by the church, let this General Assembly be dissolved, and I do hereby dissolve it, and require another general assembly, chosen in the same manner, to meet at Dordt College, Sioux Center, Iowa, beginning at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 13, 2007, with a terminus no later than noon, Wednesday, June 20, 2007.” The 73rd General Assembly was dissolved at 12:04 p.m.
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OVERTURES

Overture 1
The Presbytery of Southern California February 4, 2006

The Presbytery of Southern California respectfully overtures the 73rd General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to provide advice to the presbyteries and sessions regarding the reception of illegal aliens into membership in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Grounds:

1) With estimates of over 10,000,000 illegal aliens residing throughout the United States, the reception or denial into membership of such individuals and families is a matter that affects the whole church touching on the proper standard for reception into membership of the OPC. The church should have some measure of agreement on the issue, or, if divided, lay out some clear parameters for her conduct. As a matter that concerns the whole church this is an issue that would best be addressed by the General Assembly (FG 12:2).

2) The reception or denial into membership of illegal aliens is a matter touching on the spiritual and ethical character of the church with its witness to the world, and raises doctrinal and disciplinary questions which would best be addressed by the General Assembly as it seeks to advance the witness of the whole church (FG 15:6).

3) This is a highly charged issue given the diversity of views held among the ministers and elders of the OPC as to whether or not the reception illegal aliens into membership is consistent with: 1) a credible confession of faith on the part of the individual seeking membership, 2) a proper submission to the civil authorities on the part of the church and, 3) the biblical injunctions to show kindness to strangers. The purity, peace, and unity of the church would therefore best be preserved and promoted by the General Assembly providing advice to the presbyteries and sessions.

Donald G. Buchannan, Stated Clerk

Overture 2
The Presbytery of Presbytery of Ohio April 8, 2006

The Presbytery of Ohio respectfully overtures the Seventy-Third (2006) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church:

2) That proposed amendments to Amended Proposed Revised Version be sent by the presbyteries and to the other presbyteries, with a copy to the Committee on Revisions, by April 20, 2007.

3) That the Seventy-Fourth (2007) General Assembly vote on whether to approve the proposed revision and send it to the Presbyteries for approval.

4) That the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly announce at the Seventy-Fifth (2008) Assembly whether the proposed revision to the Directory for the Public Worship of God has or has not been approved.

Grounds:

(1) According to the Church’s constitution, revisions to the Book of Church Order of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church may not go into effect until January 1, 2010 (Form of Government XXXII.2). The delay of one year does not hinder any revision to the Book of Church Order.

(2) The delay allows the presbyteries to continue to interact with the Committee in order to perfect the document.

Nevertheless, if the General Assembly does not adopt the overture, the Presbytery of Ohio recommends that the Assembly approve the APRV with the following amendments to help perfect it:

Stated Clerk’s note: For this part see Communications Concerning the Directory for the Public Worship of God (Printed in The Agenda but not in the Minutes.)

Everett C. DeVelde, Stated Clerk

Overture 3

The Presbytery of Presbytery of Ohio

On April 7, 2006, the Presbytery of Ohio determined to overture the Seventy-Third General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as follows:

Overture:

That the 73rd General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church instruct its Committee on Christian Education to seek to develop a Psalter-Hymnal by 2011 (our 75th anniversary) — which includes fresh musical settings of all 150 Psalms, in their entirety, with as much accuracy and as little archaic language and confusing syntax as possible — for use in our congregations; that it authorize the Committee on Christian Education to appoint a special Psalter-Hymnal committee; and that it grant this special committee a budget of up to $5000.

Grounds:

(1) Orthodox Presbyterian congregations ought to have all 150 Psalms available for singing.
   A. God inspired the Psalms for singing.
   B. Singing the Psalms is a historical Christian practice.
C. Singing the Psalms is a historical Presbyterian and Reformed practice. The metrical Psalter is widely regarded as the great contribution of Calvinism to Christian worship. Singing the Psalms with understanding conveys the theology, piety, and ethos of the Protestant Reformation.

(2) Providing an OPC Psalter-Hymnal may contribute to greater continuity in worship from congregation to congregation within the OPC.

A. Many Orthodox Presbyterian congregations supplement the *Trinity Hymnal* with a Psalter, but using multiple songbooks has proved to occasion unnecessary confusion.

B. Each congregation choosing its own songbooks has contributed to a situation of discontinuity in worship from OP congregation to OP congregation.

(3) Moreover, currently available versions of the metrical Psalms are deficient.

A. Many of our churches use *The Book of Psalms for Singing* (RPCNA). While *The Book of Psalms for Singing* does have the strength of setting the Psalms to music in a usable hymnal format, we judge that it has the following weaknesses:

(1) The Psalms are not kept intact. Most Psalms are broken into smaller selections, often without adequate sensitivity to the outline of the Psalm itself, which militates against singing with understanding (contra 1 Corinthians 14:14–15).

(2) Many of the settings use archaic language and difficult syntax, which militates against ease of understanding in singing (contra 1 Corinthians 14:14–15).

(3) Some of the settings are overly paraphrased.

B. Many of our churches use *The Trinity Psalter* (Crown and Covenant). While *The Trinity Psalter* does have the strength of keeping the Psalms intact, we judge that it has the following weaknesses.

(1) Even more than is true in *The Book of Psalms for Singing*, many of the settings use archaic language and difficult syntax, which militates against singing with understanding (contra 1 Corinthians 14:14–15).

(2) The Trinity Psalter is text-only, which militates against congregational singing, particularly singing in harmonious parts.

(3) The Trinity Psalter does have an Accompanist’s Edition with the music, but we judge that it has the following weaknesses:

   (a) It is not bound durably enough and it is too expensive to provide copies for entire congregations.

   (b) Only one stanza of each Psalm is set with the music. Consequently, it is actually a side-by-side format.

   (c) Most of the selections are pitched too high for comfortable singing by average congregations.

(4) Developing a Psalter-Hymnal would fulfill a desire that the Orthodox Presbyterian Church expressed.

A. On motion, the 52nd General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (1985) requested its Committee on Christian Education to inform the Hymnal Revision Planning Committee that the Assembly desires that all 150 Psalms in some form for singing be included in the revision of *Trinity Hymnal* (Minutes of the Fifty-second General Assembly (1985), 12).
B. That desire was not satisfied. It is true that a large number of Psalms are included throughout the *Trinity Hymnal*. But many of the metrical Psalms which are included are hampered by antiquated vocabulary or stilted grammar. Forty-six Psalms are entirely excluded from the hymnal. Dozens of the selections that are included are only portions of Psalms. Many of the selections that are included are versions or paraphrases that are more or less based on the Psalms.

(5) The Orthodox Presbyterian Church has a unique opportunity to provide such a Psalter-Hymnal at this time.

A. A local church session-appointed committee has been preparing a book of Psalms and hymns to supplement the Trinity Hymnal. They already have a draft which includes all 150 Psalms that could supply initial material for developing a new OPC Psalter Hymnal.

B. That committee adopted the following principles of selection:

1. **METRICAL PSALMS**
   (a) The translation should be in good, clear, modern English. Archaic vocabulary and grammar should be avoided wherever possible.
   (b) The Name of God should usually be translated LORD. Occasionally the older “Jehovah” may be used where the meter requires it.
   (c) Rhyme, while not a feature of Hebrew poetry, is still generally used in English-speaking hymnody. Therefore most metrical Psalms should rhyme. Consistency within a single Psalm, however, is the chief goal.
   (d) Each Psalm should be set to one tune, so that the congregation may sing through the entire Psalm (except Psalm 119, which is clearly designed as 22 separate songs). Few Psalms can be easily divided, and any division of the Psalm tends to lose sight of the meaning of the Psalm as a whole.

2. **HYMNS**
   (a) Hymns should be faithful to the teaching of the Scripture. This means more than “the absence of error.” They should inculcate the apostolic teaching.
   (b) Songs should be appropriate for worship. Some hymns are perfectly correct statements of Christian piety and devotion, but don’t really fit anywhere in the worship service (e.g., campfire songs like “King Jesus Is All”). We do not distinguish between “traditional” and “contemporary” songs, because in spite of claims to the contrary, the difference between 19th century “hymns” and 20th century “praise songs” is quite minimal.
   (c) The hymns should in a certain respect be modeled after the Psalms. The Psalms provide a divinely-approved example of the sorts of songs in which God delights.
   (d) The hymnal should include the “best of the best” of all ages. There are thousands of quite decent hymns which cannot be included due to constraints of space.

3. **MUSIC**
   (a) The tune should, above all, fit the words and hopefully aid the message.
   (b) Most tunes should be four-part. Unison tunes are acceptable only when the tune simply cannot be passed up.
The origin of the tunes should be fairly balanced. There should be some older tunes (such as the Genevan tunes) and some newer tunes, but the majority of the tunes should be familiar.

One tune should not be used for many texts. A tune may be used for 2-3 texts at most.

Familiar hymn tunes may be used with the Psalms, but usually only when the Psalm has the same basic theme as the hymn (e.g., Luther’s Ein’ Feste Burg with Psalm 46).

Everett C. DeVelde, Stated Clerk

Overture 4

The Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario May 31, 2006

The following are the items from the May 06 Presbytery of MI/ON meeting that are pertinent for the GA:

33. CONCURANCE WITH OVERTURE. On motion the presbytery concurred with the Presbytery of Southern California regarding its overture regarding illegal aliens.

34. CONCURANCE WITH OVERTURE. On motion the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario concurred with the Presbytery of Ohio in its overture regarding the development of a Psalter Hymnal, with the following amendment: “That the 73ed General Assembly of the OPC instruct its Committee on Christian Education to work together with Great Commission Publications to develop a Trinity Psalter Hymnal by 2011.”

Grounds:

(1) GCP published the first Trinity Hymnal in 1961, the 25th anniversary of the OPC. It would be fitting for the Trinity Psalter Hymnal to complete the restoration of the Psalms to our hymnody on the fiftieth anniversary of that production.

(2) The current project is presently under the oversight of the session of Michiana Covenant Presbyterian Church (PCA). The Presbytery of Ohio’s overture would (perhaps unintentionally) cut the PCA entirely out of the process. This amendment would provide for both the Presbytery of Ohio’s desire to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the OPC (the CCE would be an active party in developing the Trinity Psalter Hymnal) and the inclusion of those from the PCA who have expressed great interest in being involved in the process.

Alan M. Flowers, Stated Clerk
COMMUNICATIONS

Communication 1
First Presbyterian Church (PCA) in Picayune, Mississippi October 7, 2005

Dear OPC Brothers & Sisters in Christ,

Thank for your support in the form of supplies, work crews, administrative aid, and
general brotherly love you have provided in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Through your
love, the Lord has ministered to and through us. I, especially, want to thank you for the
way in which you have been so willing to work through Mission to North America’s
Disaster Relief system and in cooperation with the local church here.

Your assistance has enabled us to better serve many who have felt the destruction of
Katrina most acutely. As believers, Katrina has reminded us that the God who harnesses
hurricanes is a God who directs all things toward his own glory. And we have especially
been reminded that the love of God which sent Christ to Calvary is manifested most
visibly and tangibly among and through his people in times such as these. Your loving
concern for us is most appreciated.

Stanley E. Layton, Pastor

Communication 2

Greetings in the name of our Lord.

The 31st annual Meeting of NAPARC, held at Bon Clarken Assembly (ARPC) Flat
Rock, NC, November 1-2, 2005, voted to adopt the following statement regarding Women
in the Military subject to the ratification of the member churches of NAPARC at their next
regular assembly or synod:

*The Word of God gives no warrant expressed or implied that women are to be
conscripted in or employed for military combat roles but rather they are to be
defended by men and kept from harms way that they might fulfill their biblical
callings and duties under God.*

This statement is an amended version of recommendation #2 contained in the 2003
report of the NAPARC Committee on Women in The Military. That 2003 report summarized
the positions taken by the NAPARC churches which studied the subject of women serving
in the military. I have appended the 2003 report for your information since it serves as the
background for the amended statement that NAPARC voted to adopt at its 2005 meeting.

Please advise me of the outcome of your assembly vote

Respectfully, Rev. Ron Potter, Secretary
NAPARC Coordination Committee on Women in the Military
Report to the 29th Meeting of NAPARC

Monday, October 20, 2003

Esteemed Brethren:

Your Committee herein reports on its labors to the 29th Meeting of NAPARC.

I. Committee History:

At the 25th Meeting of NAPARC in 1999 the following action was taken: That NAPARC request the member churches studying the issue of women in the military to include in their study reports a series of propositions to be considered for presentation to, and adoption by, the NAPARC churches, and that NAPARC appoint a committee of two to coordinate and facilitate the interchange. (Messers Potter and Wisdom were appointed to this committee). (Minutes XIX:B)

At the 26th Meeting of NAPARC in 2000 the following is recorded in the Minutes: The RCUS has sent in a finished report. The OPC and the PCA General Assemblies took no action as yet on their reports. The committee of two, established last year; to coordinate and facilitate the interchange on this subject is continued. (Minutes XVII:B)

At the 27th Meeting of NAPARC in 2001 the following is recorded in the Minutes: Ronald Potter reported that this Committee has received resolutions on Women in the Military from only one denomination, and therefore had no report. It was suggested that the Committee contact each denomination to get this information. (Minutes XIII.B)

At the 28th Meeting of NAPARC in 2002 the following is recorded in the Minutes: That the Coordination Committee on Women in the Military be continued. (Minutes XII. 1.)

II. Committee Report:

Your Committee in accordance with its mandate herein reports on the action taken by the RCUS, the RPCNA, the OPC and the PCA.

A. Reformed Church In the United States:

Adopted: 250th Session of Synod (1996), Minutes XIV. F. (Abstract of the Minutes, p.67-68)

a. The 250th Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, upon due examination of Holy Scripture in both the Old and New Testaments, finds no biblical warrant for women serving in enforced military service, but on the contrary, finds that women are to be protected from enforced military service that they might fulfill their callings and duties under God as set forth in the order of creation. Further, women are not to serve in combat roles.

b. That member churches of the Reformed Church in the United States make this study available to its members as part of the teaching of the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:27; 2 Timothy 3:16, 17).
The full study on Women in the Military is published in the Abstract of the Minutes of the 250th Synod of the RCUS pp. 60-68.

B. Reformed Presbyterian Church In North America.

The following resolution was passed by the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America in its regular session on Thursday, June 10, 1998:

Therefore, be it now resolved:

1. That, while recognizing the right and duty that women have to self defense, which may involve physical violence (Judges 9:53), it is our conviction that Biblical teaching does not give a nation warrant to employ women for military combat
2. That we direct all presbyteries and sessions to instruct their congregations in this regard.
3. That we urge any of our female members who are considering or presently engaged in military service to take counsel of their sessions as to the teaching of God’s Word in this matter.
4. That the Clerk of Synod send a copy of this resolution to the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) and to the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), and to our military chaplains.
5. That the Moderator of Synod be directed to assign a representative to present a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

C. Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Adopted: 68th General Assembly (2001) Minutes #144, #145, p.33

That the 68th GA declare that the use of women in military combat is both contrary to nature and inconsistent with the Word of God.

Grounds:

(1) This is a ministerial declaration of what is revealed in Holy Scripture, cf. 1 Corinthians. 11:14; report 1, Sections II-IV (see pp. 265-269).
(2) This provides the Biblical counsel requested by the PRJC without making any further pronouncements that would, presumably cause the church to “intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth: in a matter that some would say is not yet an extraordinary case, cf. Westminster Confession of Faith 31.4

D. Presbyterian Church In America.


1. Acknowledging that the child in the womb is “a person covered by Divine protection” (Statement on Abortion, Sixth General Assembly); and that women of childbearing age often carry unborn children while remaining unaware of their child’s existence; and that principles of just war require the minimization of the loss of life-
particularly innocent civilians; the PCA declares that any policy which intentionally places in harms way as military combatants women who are, or might be, carrying a child in their womb, is a violation of God’s Moral Law.

2. This Assembly declares it to be the biblical duty of man to defend woman and therefore condemns the use of women as military combatants, as well as any conscription of women into the Armed Services of the United States.

3. Therefore be it resolved that the Thirtieth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America adopts the above as pastoral counsel for the good of the members, the officers, and especially the military chaplains of the Presbyterian Church in America.

4. Be it further resolved that the Presbyterian Church in America supports the decision of any of its members to object to, as a matter of conscience, the conscription of women or the use of women as military combatants.

In fulfillment of its mandate:

That NAPARC request the member churches studying the issue of women in the military to include in their study reports a series of propositions to be considered for presentation to, and adoption by, the NAPARC churches. Your Committee herein reports that the resolutions and statements adopted by the various Synods and Assemblies, as stated above, constitute the propositions sought by NAPARC. It is to be understood that these resolutions and adopted statements do not constitute all that the participating denominations have to say on the subject of Women in the Military but constitute the various Synod/Assembly responses to particular overtures before them. The full study papers of each denomination, which serve as the exegetical basis for these resolutions and adopted statements, ought to be considered by any NAPARC church considering this subject of Women in the Military.

III. Committee Observations:

In its perusal of the resolutions and adopted statements of the RCUS, the RPCNA, the OPC and the RCA, your committee makes the following summary observations:

• We observe that that the basis for these resolutions and adopted statements is the Word of God (RCUS, RPCNA, OPC, PCA).
• We observe that these resolutions and adopted statements, in sum, find no biblical warrant for women to serve as military combatants (RCUS, RPCNA, OPC, PCA).
• We observe that these resolutions and adopted statements have the force of instruction, advice or counsel to be given to the members of the various churches as the situation warrants (RCUS, RPCNA, OPC, PCA) and to military Chaplains serving in those denominations (OPC, PCA).
• We observe that two denominations (RCUS, PCA) directly address the matter of enforced military service (conscription) and oppose it on biblical grounds.

IV. Committee Recommendations:

Your Committee unanimously proposes the following recommendations:

Recommendation #1: That those NAPARC churches who have not studied and adopted positions relative to Women in the Military, be encouraged to do so and to consider the work of the four NAPARC churches who have already adopted positions opposing women in military combat.
Your Committee also proposes the following though it is to be noted that while there is Committee agreement to submit this recommendation to NAPARC as it stands, Rev. Wisdom would have his “NO” vote entered on the record.

Recommendation #2: That NAPARC adopt the following statement That it is the conviction of the member churches of the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council that the Word of God gives no warrant expressed or implied that women are to be conscripted into or employed for military combat roles but rather they are to be defended by men and kept from harms way that they might fulfill their biblical callings and duties under God.

Respectfully.
Rev. Ron Potter (Chairman), Rev. Chris Wisdom.

Communication 3

Presbytery of Michigan & Ontario February 13, 2006

The presbytery requested that I report to you regarding the matter between the Providence OPC session and Mr. William Carson which was addressed at the last General Assembly. At the end of our meeting a brief report was given by a member of the committee to meet with the Providence session and Mr. Carson. In this report the presbytery was informed that the session and Mr. Carson have reconciled. We rejoice in God’s grace in this matter.

Timothy L. Bero, Stated Clerk

Communication 4

Committee on Diaconal Ministries March 16, 2006

The Committee on Diaconal Ministries meeting on March 3, 2006 informs the General Assembly of the following actions:

1. That we report to CHMCE and the GA that we concur with the CHMCE in reporting to the GA, “That the CDM has determined to report to CHMCE and to the 73rd General Assembly that it has requested the CHMCE to serve as the responsible agent by which information concerning a truly major disaster may be conveyed to the Committee and through which gifts of money, material, or volunteer help may be coordinated, administered and disbursed, under a general plan outlined by that Committee and found agreeable to the CDM.”

2. We recommend to the 73rd GA that in development of a possible “truly major disaster relief” plan that funds budgeted by the CDM for disaster relief and not spent in a calendar year, continue to be held by the CDM.

3. The CDM apologizes to the 73rd GA that we did not include a copy of our bylaws in our minute book submitted to the 72nd GA and report that it is included in our current submission.

Respectfully in Christ, Leonard J. Coppes
Communications

Communication 5
Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church
April 17, 2006

Greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Your faithfulness in the gospel of Jesus is an encouragement to us and it is our strong desire to be faithful as well. In Christ we are one body and one people. We are grateful for the fellowship we can enjoy when we live and labor as near neighbors, but we are joined as one even when we are more distant. I have greatly enjoyed the warm fellowship and encouragement in Christ I have found from your men in the meetings of NAPARC the ICRC.

In the last year, our Synod’s emphasis has been “Nurturing and Equipping the People of God.” In it we have emphasized how the basics of the faith, (the means of grace etc.) convert people and build them up to be more like Jesus. This is our great desire to make and nurture disciples of Jesus Christ.

Worship is one of the most important things that we do. As with several of our sister denominations (you included) we have been studying and reviewing our Book of Worship. We anticipate this to continue for a few more years. We expect this study to be fruitful to our understanding as we seek to worship God in spirit and truth.

We have a new Director of World Witness (our foreign missions agency), Rev. Frank van Dalen. Through his work, we are trying to sharpen our focus in foreign missions. This includes strengthening our relationships with our sister synods in Mexico and Pakistan and our missions in “post-Christian” Europe. Our Director of Outreach North America (Rev. Alan Avera) is in his second year and is also working to refocus our church planting and revitalizing efforts. We are beginning to use the “Embers to a Flame” program developed by Dr. Harry Reeder.

I do not have our statistics yet for 2005, but our membership for 2004 was 35,418 communicant members and 5,379 non-communicant members for a total of 40,797 members. The number of our congregations increased from 264 to 268.

President John Carson of our synod’s schools (Erskine College and Seminary) has retired. We continue to look for a replacement who will lead the college in the good direction it has been going. In the meantime, Dr. Luder Whitlock is ably serving as interim president.

May the Lord richly bless you in your deliberations during your Assembly and give you sweet fellowship in Christ together.

I am yours in our Lord Jesus Christ,
Rev. John Howard Dawson, Chairman of the Inter-Church Relations Committee
Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church.

Communication 6
Presbytery of the Dakotas
April 22, 2006

1. The Presbytery of the Dakotas at its April 2006 meeting passed the following motion:
That the Presbytery of the Dakotas does not favor the adoption of the Amended Proposed Revised Version of the DPW and sends the following committee report to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, the other presbyteries, and the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship.

2. The Presbytery of the Dakotas at its April 2006 meeting voted to concur with the overture from the Presbytery of Southern California regarding advice on receiving illegal aliens as members in the OPC.

3. The Presbytery of the Dakotas did not concur with the amendments proposed by the Presbytery of the Midwest to the DPW.

Sincerely in Christ,

Archibald A. Allison, Stated Clerk

Communication 7

Christian Reformed Churches of Australia April 19, 2006

I thank you very much for your invitation to be represented at your forthcoming Assembly. I wish that I were able to accept the invitation! I recall attending your Assembly in 1995 and have very positive and pleasant memories of that occasion.

If we had known of your assembly much earlier, we may have been able to arrange things in such a way that a delegate could have been present. However, plans for attendance at the assemblies of other churches overseas during June and July make it impossible to be present at the OPC Assembly. I really regret that and trust that you will understand. Fortunately there are no contentious issues between us that would require our presence. Even so, we will do our utmost to be there next time.

Be assured that we value our mutual relationship. We are grateful for the OPC, what it stands for, its love of truth and its commitment to the Scriptures and the spread of the Gospel as well as its concern for justice. We benefit enormously from your publications and we are often blessed through the work that you do, particularly in the area of mission. We have a long relationship of mutual caring and mutual concern. And even though at present we find it difficult to give concrete shape to our relationship, we are truly churches of like mind and heart. If it were not for the geographical distance we would be as one!

We wish you a blessed Assembly and pray that your deliberations may indeed advance the cause of God’s Kingdom and be an encouragement to the whole denomination to be involved in the progress of the Gospel.

Sincerely yours in Christ, on behalf of the Christian Reformed Churches of Australia,

Rev. Dr. Hendrik DeWaard, Ecumenical Secretary
Communication 8

The Presbytery of Gran Colombia of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in Colombia, April 12, 2006

Dear Brethren in Christ,

May the grace and peace of God our Father and our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ be with you.

And now, this 12th day of April of 2006, comes the Presbytery of Gran Colombia of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in Colombia, to ask you, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in the United States and Canada, to receive us as a part of your church.

We are presently made up of seven churches and missions. It is our desire to be a constituent part of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, with all of the respective rights and responsibilities.

We wish to do this because the church is the body of Christ, and it is the desire of Christ that we should be one, as He and the Father are one (John 17:19-21). This unity should be seen both in doctrinal unity (John 17:19) as well as in practice (Ephesians 4:15). We believe that this unity should be seen as well across national borders, so that all of the body of Christ might work in unity (Ephesians 4:16). We believe that the churches in Colombia, as well as the churches in the United States, can build each other up to grow in Christ, and so, we ask you to receive us as a part of your church.

We hope for a favorable response from you, brothers, with the desire that our God will bless you in everything.

Yours in the service of Christ,

Hner Sanjuin Uribe, Moderator of the Presbytery
Jose Antonio Rios, Stated Clerk of the Presbytery

Communication 9

The Presbytery of Presbytery of the Southeast May 3, 2006

Be it hereby known that the Presbytery of the Southeast (OPC) at its spring stated meeting held on April 28-29, 2006 in New Bern, NC voted to add its support to the Overture from the Presbytery of Ohio to the 73rd General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, which requested the General Assembly to:

“instruct its Committee on Christian Education to seek to develop a Psalter-Hymnal by 2011 (our 75th anniversary)—which includes fresh musical settings of all 150 Psalms, in their entirety, with as much accuracy and as little archaic language and confusing syntax as possible—for use in our congregations; that it authorize the Committee on Christian Education to appoint a special Psalter-Hymnal committee; and that it grant this special committee a budget of up to $5000.”

The Presbytery of the Southeast concurs with the Presbytery of Ohio regarding the benefits this resource would have for our denomination and believes it would promote a
more conscientious and frequent use of psalm singing in public worship, which accords with the Word of God (Colossians 3:16, Ephesians 5:19, and James 5:13), *The Westminster Confession of Faith* (Chapter 21, Section 5) and *The Book of Church Order of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church* (Directory for Worship III: 6).

Respectfully submitted and duly attested,
Hank L. Belfield, Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of the Southeast

**Communication 10**

**The Presbytery of the Southwest** May 19, 2006

At its spring stated meeting, held on May 4-5, 2006, the Presbytery of the Southwest took actions in the case of licentiate Phil Hodson, a candidate for the gospel ministry in this presbytery, including determination to ask advice of the 73rd General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, as reflected in the following excerpts from the minutes of that meeting:

1. **ADVICE REQUESTED FROM GA REGARDING HODSON’S COURSE OF STUDY.** On motion, presbytery, with a view toward the ordination of Mr. Phil Hodson, determined to report the whole matter of Mr. Hodson’s examinations, including the exception with regard to a deficiency in the formal educational requirement, to the 73rd General Assembly, seeking its advice regarding waiving this requirement (FG XXIII.3).

2. **MODERATOR TO APPOINT A COMMISSIONER TO REPRESENT HODSON EXCEPTION TO GA.** On motion, presbytery requested the moderator to appoint a commissioner to represent the Presbytery of the Southwest before the 73rd General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church concerning this exception. Mr. J. Johnson prayed for Mr. Hodson and the work in Longview. The moderator appointed Mr. Bond to represent Mr. Hodson at the General Assembly. [Presbytery of the Southwest, Minutes of May 4-5, 2006, page 06-16, paragraphs 63 and 64]

Mr. Hodson received a B.S. Degree in Biblical Studies/History from Dallas Baptist University in 1998, and an MAR (2 year) Degree from Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, PA, in 2001. He was licensed by the presbytery at the 2003 Fall Stated Meeting. He has served as stated supply at Christ the King Presbyterian Church (OPC) for 2 and 1/2 years, as an intern of Tyler Presbyterian Church (OPC).

At the Spring 2006 Stated Meeting of Presbytery, the congregation of Christ the King Mission Work petitioned to be organized as a particular church, with elders being ordained. Presbytery granted their request. The congregation also gave a call to Mr. Hodson to serve as Pastor. Presbytery approved the call and placed it in Mr. Hodson’s hands.

While Mr. Hodson completed a two-year degree from a theological seminary and audited an additional seven Masters or Ph.D. level courses from the seminary, he lacks "an adequate course of study in a theological seminary equivalent to that required for a regular three-year theological degree," as required by FG XXIII.3. To remedy that deficiency, Mr. Hodson completed the MTIOPC course in Homiletics and has received supervised experience in practical ministry areas under Rev. John Johnson during his time.
as a licentiate of our Presbytery working as stated supply for the Longview mission work. Also, by correspondence education from Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA, Mr. Hodson has completed two and is enrolled in the third of the six courses required for a Th.M. degree, and states that he plans to complete the Th.M. degree.

The Presbytery has appointed Mr. Chad Bond to represent the Presbytery and Mr. Hodson to the General Assembly.

In accordance with FG XXIII.3, the Presbytery respectfully requests the advice of the General Assembly.

Rev. Joseph A. Keller, Stated Clerk

Communication 11

The Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland

Greetings in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. I wish to thank you for the invitation to the Reformed Presbyterian Church to send a fraternal delegate to the meetings the General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Unfortunately we will not be able to send a delegate this year.

Please convey to your Assembly the greetings of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland. We appreciate the links we have with you and the mutual encouragement we can be to one another. We pray that your work in the Lord will prosper under the direction of His sovereign will and that you will know much blessing during your meetings. We live in an age when more and more we must speak directly and clearly of our Holy and all powerful God to a disobedient people. Our prayer is that you will be enabled to address the issues confronting you always upholding the truth of God’s word and the Kingship of Jesus Christ over every part of life.

We do look forward to maintaining and strengthening our fellowship Christ the Lord in the coming years.

Yours in Christ, E. M. McCollum (Clerk of Synod)

Communication 12

Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland

Thank you very kindly for your invitation to send a fraternal delegate to your forthcoming General Assembly. This year it is not possible to send a delegate. Therefore we want to express our warm sympathy with you and your Assembly by means of this letter.

We hope the Lord will grant you an up building and blessed Assembly. In our times many questions live within the churches and have to be discussed in the meetings. But let us not forget the most important question: how shall we honour God? How shall we be the bride of Christ? In this way, the church will also be of great importance for the world around.

May the Lord guide and bless you in all the meetings of the General Assembly. And may the decisions that will be taken, build up the church and glorify the Triune God.

Rev. Bort de Graf, Interchurch Relations Committee
Communication 13

Presbytery of Philadelphia

May 25, 2006

The Presbytery of Philadelphia has examined James A. La Belle for licensure, and he has sustained all of the examinations, including the theological examination. However, Mr. La Belle does not possess a bachelor of arts degree, or its academic equivalent, in accordance with Form of Government XXI.3. The Presbytery of Philadelphia is reporting this exception in accordance with FG XXI.6. The Presbytery of Philadelphia has not yet licensed Mr. La Belle.

Mr. La Belle has completed 68 credits/hours of undergraduate work towards a bachelor degree from courses he completed at Olympic College (Bremerton, Washington), The Master’s College (Santa Clarita, California) and Western Washington University. His coursework at Olympic College consisted of introductory courses in Sociology, Philosophy, Cultural Anthropology, Logic, Western Religions, the Liberal Arts, and courses in Western Civilization, Beginning and Intermediate Algebra, Critical Thinking, Speech and Composition with a 3.5 G.P.A. At The Master’s College, James took Christian theology along with survey courses in Old Testament and New Testament with a 3.63 G.P.A. And at Western Washington University James completed a lone course in Introductory Study of the English Language for which he received a 4.0.

He has received the M.Div. degree from Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA. He has served the Church in a number of ways: On the mission field in Africa, as a ruling elder in the PCA., as a summer intern for two OPC churches, and currently as a year long intern at Faith OPC, Pole Tavern, N.J.

The Rev. A. Craig Troxel, Ph.D., is the Chairman of the Presbytery’s Candidates and Credentials Committee, and is a commissioner to the 73rd General Assembly. He is available to answer any questions the Assembly or its Advisory Committee may have.

In Christ,
Thomas A. Foh, Stated Clerk

Communication 14

Confederation of Reformed Evangelical Churches

June 10, 2006

On behalf of the CREC, I wanted to communicate to you that the following resolution was passed at the 2005 CREC Council Meeting:

In celebration and grateful acknowledgment of the seventieth anniversary of the formation of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church [OPC] at its First General Assembly in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on 11-14 June 1936, the first General Council meeting of the Confederation of Reformed Evangelical Churches hereby resolves:

That 11 June 2006 shall be proclaimed a day of celebration and prayer in our various churches; that we thank God for the OPC’s seventy years of confessional adherence to the Reformed faith, and for that body’s steady witness of the Gospel against unbiblical pietism and liberalism; that we thank God for the many faithful teachers and pastors of that body from whom we in the CREC have learned so much; and that we petition God for his continued protection and blessing upon our brethren in the OPC—for their continued peace, reformation, and faithfulness to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ for generations to come.
Appendix

We will be praying for you and giving thanks to God for the OPC this Lord’s Day in all of our churches.

Your fellow servant,
Pastor Randy Booth, CREC Council Moderator

Communication 15

Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) June 12, 2006

I append an extract minute for your attention.

At Edinburgh and within Liberton Kirk there on Tuesday 23rd May 2006, which day the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) being met and constituted:

*Inter alia:*

The General Assembly then called for the Report of the Committee on Ecumenical Relations......
It was moved, seconded and agreed that ............... 

12. The General Assembly note with much appreciation the brotherly interest and support shown to us by the Orthodox Presbyterian Church of North America, which have shown us much kindness in our difficulties of recent years .........................

There was submitted a letter from Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

It was moved, seconded and agreed that

The General Assembly thank the Orthodox Presbyterian Church for their letter and the presence of Rev. Jack Peterson at their Assembly. They reciprocate Christian greetings and appoint Rev. R. Sherman Isbell, as their Delegate to the forthcoming 73rd General Assembly of the OPC due to meet in Palos Heights, Illinois, in June 2006.

Extracted from the Records of the General Assembly by John MacLeod Assembly Clerk

==========================================================================

Received on June 15, 2006

I append a further Extract from the proceedings of the recent General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing).

The Assembly learned with great sadness of the death of Matt Baugh.

As you will see from the extract minute, Assembly interrupted proceedings to commend Mrs Baugh and their children, together with the cause in Haiti, to the Almighty in prayer.
Please convey to Mrs Baugh and to their children the prayerful sympathy of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing).

At Edinburgh and within Viewforth Church there on Wednesday 24th May 2006, which day the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) being met and constituted

Inter alia:

The General Assembly having been informed by the Orthodox Presbyterian Church delegate of the recent tragic loss of their Missionary in Haiti, the Moderator called upon Rev. John A. Gillies to commend all those affected to the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort.

Extracted from the Records of the General Assembly by John MacLeod Assembly Clerk

Communication 16

Evangelical Presbyterian Church Northern Ireland June 16, 2006

The Evangelical Presbyterian Church is delighted to receive your invitation to send a delegate to your impending General Assembly, but regrets that due to time and expense she is unable to do so. We would, however, very much like to assure you of our greetings at this time and to rejoice that our two churches have, in the grace and mercy of God, been able to maintain their stand for the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. We do trust that you will enjoy a fruitful and happy assembly and that God’s richest blessing will be upon you. It was a particular joy for our Moderator to have fellowship with Rev Jack Peterson on his recent visit to Edinburgh.

With our sincere greetings in the Gospel, Rev Stephen Roger, Clerk of Presbytery

Communication 17

Presbyterian Church in Japan June 17, 2006

Warm greeting in Christ to you from the Presbyterian Church in Japan.

Thank you for your invitation to the 73rd GA of OPC. I apologize to you for the delay of our reply-mail.

I am Takao Nakadai, the current chairman of the church-related commission of PCJ. (I was the former moderator of GA of PCJ and the delegate to your GA two years ago.) Unfortunately, we cannot send our delegate to your GA this year. We regret having to give up answering your invitation. The current moderator Rev. Toshihiko Yamazaki got sick this January, and doesn’t recover his health well enough. Please pray for him. Because of that, we got behind in many of our works of GAPCJ.
Appendix

We PCJ greatly appreciate your having a good fellowship and cooperation with us especially in Japan mission field. We hope you’ll have a wonderful GA. Also we hope that the fellowship between OPC and PCJ will become stronger year after year.

May God bless you richly.

Takao Nakadai,
Pastor of Nishi-Funabashi Christian Church, PCJ, the Chairman of church-related commission of GAPCJ.

Communication 18

Free Church of Scotland

The Free Church of Scotland sends cordial greetings to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church at this time of their 73rd General Assembly. Regretfully we are unable to have a delegate present with you on this occasion but send you through this letter our most sincere prayer that the Lord will bless you in your Assembly and give you the wisdom that is from above as you deal with the business before you.

The Free Church of Scotland continues to value highly the warm relations that exist between us. We were most happy and encouraged to have had Rev Jack Peterson as your delegate at our recent Assembly and were truly sorry to hear of the circumstances preventing Mr. Mark Bube from accompanying him as planned. Please be assured that we pray with you that God will bring blessings of joy and hope out of the darkness of this tragedy in your mission field. We share with you in bearing the bereaved family before the throne of grace.

Brethren, we wish to be of encouragement to you in supporting you in your work for the Lord and thank you for your support of us. In an age when the gospel message is needed on such a large scale throughout the world and when so many alternative systems of belief are regarded as of equal or superior worth, we are required to “stand fast in one spirit contending as one man for the faith of the gospel” knowing that it is still “the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believes.”

With kind regards in the Lord,

Yours sincerely,

James Maciver (Rev)
Principal Clerk of Assembly
APPEALS

Appeal 1 (John Vandervliet)

To Mr. Donald Duff, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church:

And now, this 30th day of June, A.D. 2005, comes John Vandervliet and appeals from the decisions of the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario in not sustaining the appeal brought to them regarding the judgment of the Session of Grace Covenant OPC regarding the judgment of slander and breaking of the fourth vow in the case of John Vandervliet, and in support of said appeal sets forth the following specifications of error:

1. The Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario erred in not investigating the conduct of the trial by the Session of Grace Covenant Church, Sheffield.
   A. The Presbytery did not require of the Session the documentation of their preliminary investigation, (BD, ch. III, sect. 7 a.)
      i) The Presbytery ruled on the charges without reference to all the incidents involved; since the defendant was disallowed to make a defense before the Session, and was disallowed the witnesses he requested, and was disallowed to cross-examine witnesses concerning the issues of the truth of the allegations upon which the charges were laid, (contrary to BD, ch IV, sect. 1 c. )
   B. The Presbytery dismissed the impropriety of the trial itself, claiming that procedural errors cannot effect the rulings of the Session,
   C. The Presbytery did not deal with the substance of the appeal of this case, namely that the Session did not deal with the reason for the alienation between myself and Living Hope OPC, not removing the obstruction to fellowship.
   D. Presbytery erred in not requiring full disclosure of the records of the trial:
      i) the minutes of the trial meeting, dated June 21, 2004, under subsection 5), clearly state that the trial was being taped.
      ii) Jennefer Vandervliet, the wife of the defendant, is witness to the fact that all the meetings except the last two were taped.
      iii) I approached the moderator of Presbytery privately to ask if I may mention the tapes. He looked into the report and noted that the minutes of the trial clearly and explicitly mentioned the taping of the proceedings. Therefore, he told me, it was properly before Presbytery. Therefore the onus was on Presbytery, not on me.
   E. Presbytery erred in not recognizing that the Session has openly borne false witness to Presbytery:
      i) the Session did not disclose the tapes of the trial to the defendant,
      ii) the Session did not disclose the tapes of the trial to Presbytery,
      iii) the Session acknowledged using the term “the devil has a hold on you”, and has refused to acknowledge any fault in that.
      iv) and Presbytery did not require an accounting of the trial’s records in reference to that incident.

2. The Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario erred in not sustaining the appeal regarding the charges of slander and breaking the fourth membership vow.
   A. The Presbytery ruled on the charges without reference to all the incidents involved; since the defendant was disallowed to make a defense before the Session, and
was disallowed the witnesses he requested, and was disallowed to cross-examine witnesses concerning the issues of the truth of the allegations upon which the charges were laid, (contrary to BD, ch. IV, sect. 1 c.)

B. The Presbytery did not deal with the substance of the appeal of this case, namely that the Session did not deal with the reason for the alienation between myself and Living Hope OPC, not removing the obstruction to fellowship.

3. The Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario erred in not sustaining the appeal regarding the proposed censure of excommunication.

4. The Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario erred in judging to uphold the rulings of the Sessional judicatory:
   A. The Presbytery did not acknowledge that Mr. Emmanuel’s actions were opposed to Church order
   B. The Presbytery did not acknowledge that I am commanded by that very same order not to be subservient to any authority that is illicit, that replaces God’s Word with man’s doctrines, and that hinders and refuses the participation of members who do not adhere to those doctrines of man.

5. The Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario erred in not acknowledging that I am in full rights of my confessional membership to refuse submission to abuse of the Word, to abuse of the offices, and to the misappropriation of justice. The confessional standard allows me to oppose any authority that imposes as God’s Word what is clearly only the teachings of man, and to call that an apostasy (Galatians 1: 8, 9):
   A. The defendant has a right not to subscribe to Reconstructionism,
   B. The defendant has a right to full participation in the congregation, to not have these teaching imposed upon him, and is not to be excluded from the life of the church because of non-adherence to these personal views of the pastor or other members. He also has a conscience that is freed to obey the Word on these matters,
   C. The defendant has a right to oppose the uses of the pulpit and the office of minister of the Word, when these are used to mandate or impose these teachings of man,
   D. The defendant has an obligation to oppose these abuses when they clearly transgress the limitations of office, as stipulated by the OPC, listed in the appendix of the appeal to Presbytery,
   E. The defendant has a right to a fair trial.
      i) - right to cross-examine in direct relationship to the truth of the charges;
      ii) - the right to witnesses according the Book of Discipline;
      iii) - the to give testimony for the sake of presenting a defense;
      iv) - the right to know with specification as to why those things I am alleged to have said are chargeable directly in light of the circumstances;
      v) - the to the records of the trial in preparing a defense;
      vi) - the right to have that same record before the Presbytery for appeal,
      vii) - the right to have the Presbytery look into the procedural issue as consequential to the charges themselves, in that the charges were not properly stated in relation to the circumstance of the minister imposing his views, culminating at ante-room meeting, and that the denial of presenting all the facts unnecessarily curtails justice; and
      viii) - the right to have the Presbytery know of the Presbytery’s being misled as to the full facts of the case, since the trial itself curtailed the exposure of the facts,
6. The Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario erred in omitting to rule that no officiating member of the OPC has any claim to submitting others to their own personal views on matters the Confession does not necessitate. Presuppositionalism and

A. Reconstructionism are nothing more than opinions of men; they are not Biblical doctrine. Mr. Emmanuel was in error to press these views from his office and from the pulpit; the Session was in error in not removing these obstructions to unity and fellowship; and the Presbytery was in error in not taking this crucial issue into consideration in the appeal.

Therefore these actions are unjust. I request that the charges be dismissed, or remanded back to the lower judicatory along with stipulations insuring fairness and objectivity.

appellant,
John Vandervliet

The Charges

Statement of Charges Against Mr. John Vandervliet
As Presented by the Session of Grace Covenant OPC

1. The Session of Grace Covenant OPC charges you, John Vandervliet, with the sin of slandering Tristan Emmanuel, the Presbytery-appointed Gospel Minister serving as Stated Supply of Living Hope OPC. This is a serious sin as it is a breach of the ninth commandment (Exodus 20:16) and violates the teaching of the Westminster Standards.

Pertinent Scripture Passages

Deut.19:16-20 “If a false witness rise up against any man to testify against him that which is wrong; Then both the men, between whom the controversy is, shall stand before the LORD, before the priests and the judges, which shall be in those days; And the judges shall make diligent inquisition: and, behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother; Then shall ye do unto him, as he had thought to have done unto his brother: so shalt thou put the evil away from among you. And those which remain shall hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit no more any such evil among you.”

Psalm 15:1,3 {A Psalm of David.} “LORD, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill?...He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour.:

Psalm 34:13 “Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile.”

Psalm 52:4,5 “Thou lovest all devouring words, O thou deceitful tongue. God shall likewise destroy thee for ever, he shall take thee away, and pluck thee out of thy dwelling place, and root thee out of the land of the living.”

Proverbs 6:16,19 “These six things doth the LORD hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto him...A false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren.”

Proverbs 11:9 “An hypocrite with his mouth destroyeth his neighbour.”
Luke 6:45 “A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh.”

Ephesians 4:31 “Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice.”

Titus 3:1,2 “Put them in mind...to speak evil of no man.”

Jude 1:8 “Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.”

Revelation 21:8 “But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.”

Pertinent Quotations from Our Standards

WLC Q.144 What are the duties required in the ninth commandment?

A. The duties required in the ninth commandment are, the preserving and promoting of truth between man and man, and the good name of our neighbour, as well as our own; appearing and standing for the truth; and from the heart, sincerely, freely, clearly, and fully, speaking the truth, and only the truth, in matters of judgment and justice, and in all other things whatsoever; a charitable esteem of our neighbours; loving, desiring, and rejoicing in their good name; sorrowing for, and covering of their infirmities; freely acknowledging of their gifts and graces, defending their innocency; a ready receiving of a good report, and unwillingness to admit of an evil report, concerning them; discouraging tale-bearers, flatterers, and slanderers; love and care of our own good name, and defending it when need requireth; keeping of lawful promises; studying and practising of whatsoever things are true, honest, lovely, and of good report.

WSC Q.78 What is forbidden in the ninth commandment?

A. The ninth commandment forbiddeth whatsoever is prejudicial to truth, or injurious to our own or our neighbour’s good name.

Specifications

   • John Vandervliet refers to his experiences at Living Hope under Tristan’s ministry, by saying, “…we will never again allow ourselves to come under false teachings.” (Doc. A. p.7)

   • John Vandervliet explains his behavior at Living Hope OPC as follows: “Tristan’s teaching was rightly rejected as unfaithful and schismatic.” (Doc. B. p.1, paragraph 6)
   • John Vandervliet admits, “Our own mistakes did not help things any,” but qualifies this statement with the words: “…yet these mistakes took nothing away from the odious nature of the teaching.” (Doc. B. p.1, paragraph 3)
   • Mr. Vandervliet states: “…the main issue here is that my family has been alienated from the church fellowship because we would not bend away from sound teachings.” (Doc. B. p.1, paragraph 2)
   • “Reconstructionism was rammed down our throats, and our cherished faith was demeaned and unwelcome.” (Doc. B. p.1, paragraph 2)
John Vandervliet expresses his refusal to return to worship services at Living Hope, and gives the reason why: “We cannot and will not rejoin them to be *complicit in the spread of error and schism.*” (Doc. B. p.1, paragraph 6)

John Vandervliet describes that congregation as a place where “*error held sway.*” (Doc. B. p.1, paragraph 10)

Speaking of Living Hope he also states: “We will not willingly rejoin to be a part of a church while a false gospel holds sway.” (Doc. B. p.2, paragraph 1)

Regarding his departure from Living Hope, John Vandervliet claims: “*my family has been wrongly excluded and silenced.*” (Doc. B. p.2, paragraph 1) In another place, “we were alienated and eventually tossed out.” (Doc. B. p.2, paragraph 2).

3. May 12, 2003. A meeting between two Session members of Grace Covenant OPC (Bill Kroesbergen and Barry Everts) and Mr. John Vandervliet. John Vandervliet states that he will not call the men of Living Hope (including Pastor Emmanuel) “brothers in Christ.”


- John Vandervliet again asserts that Pastor Emmanuel is an unbeliever.
- When encouraged to spend time with Mr. Emmanuel in order to begin to heal the wounds of the relationship, Mr. Vandervliet appealed to Paul’s words in I Corinthians 5:11 as a justification for his refusal to seek reconciliation with Mr. Emmanuel: “Now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one not to eat.”

- At this meeting, John Vandervliet continued, despite abundant counsel to the contrary from those present, to claim that he was the victim in his departure from Living Hope. John Vandervliet asserted to the Session of Grace Covenant that he and his family were “kicked out” of Living Hope OPC.

2. The Session of Grace Covenant OPC charges you, John Vandervliet, with breaking the Fourth Vow of OPC Church Membership, in your failure to submit to Christ’s appointed ecclesiastical authorities. This is a serious sin as it is a breech of the Fifth Commandment (Exo.20:12), stands against the order established for the Church in the Scriptures, and violates the teaching of the Westminster Standards.

*Pertinent Scripture Passages*

**Proverbs 12:15** “The way of a fool is right in his own eyes: but he that hearkeneth unto counsel is wise.”

**Proverbs 15:32** “He that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that heareth reproof getteth understanding.”

**Proverbs 19:20** “Hear counsel, and receive instruction, that thou mayest be wise in thy latter end.”

**Acts 20:28** “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”

**Romans 13:1** “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.”

**1 Timothy 5:17** “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.”
Hebrews 13:17 “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.”
1 Peter 5:1,2 “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof…”
II Peter 2:9,10 “The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished: But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous are they, selfwilled, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.”
Jude 1:8 “Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.”

Pertinent Quotations from our Confessional Standards
WLC Q.45 How doth Christ execute the office of a king?
A. Christ executeth the office of a king, in calling out of the world a people to himself, and giving them officers, laws, and censures, by which he visibly governs them…
WLC Q. 126 What is the general scope of the fifth commandment?
A. The general scope of the fifth commandment is, the performance of those duties which we mutually owe in our several relations, as inferiors, superiors, or equals.
WLC Q.127 What is the honour that inferiors owe to their superiors?
A. The honour which inferiors owe to their superiors is, all due reverence in heart, word, and behaviour; prayer and thanksgiving for them; imitation of their virtues and graces; willing obedience to their lawful commands and counsels, due submission to their corrections; fidelity to, defense, and maintenance of their persons and authority according to their several ranks, and the nature of their places; bearing with their infirmities, and covering them in love, that so they may be an honour to them and to their government.
WLC Q.128 What are the sins of inferiors against their superiors?
A. The sins of inferiors against their superiors are, all neglect of the duties required toward them; envying at, contempt of, and rebellion against, their persons and places, in their lawful counsels, commands, and corrections; cursing, mocking, and all such refractory and scandalous carriage, as proves a shame and dishonour to them and their government.

Specifications
1. November 4, 2001. Meeting at Living Hope OPC. (Witnesses: Pastor Tristan Emmanuel, Mr. Doug Bylsma, Mr. Dave Bylsma, and Mr. Ray Hildebrandt)
   • Due to growing unease and division at Living Hope OPC revolving around certain doctrinal issues (specifically apologetics and eschatology), Pastor Tristan Emmanuel, after a particularly unpleasant “blow up” over these issues, asks the men of Living Hope to set aside discussion of said matters. John Vandervliet flatly refuses to adhere to Pastor Emmanuel’s request, as testified by several witnesses. (cf. Docs. C and D, affidavits from Messrs. Ray Hildebrandt and Doug Bylsma respectively)
   • Prior to this date, the men of Living Hope had already been asked by Pastor Emmanuel to cease discussing such divisive issues. This date’s reaffirmation of the same request finds its root in John V.’s refusal to submit to this earlier plea from Pastor Emmanuel.

- The Session of Grace Covenant OPC (Messrs. Bill Kroesbergen, Cope Jonkman, Barry Everts, and Edward W. Ludt) endeavors to encourage John Vandervliet to recognize and repent of his slanderous and divisive actions during his tenure at Living Hope OPC. He is repeatedly admonished to seek forgiveness from and reconciliation with that congregation. He consistently rejects the counsel of his Session in this matter. Despite repeated admonition and rebuke from the Scriptures, John Vandervliet refuses to seek the forgiveness of Tristan Emmanuel and his brothers at Living Hope, and rejects any demand that he reinitiate Christian comradeship with them.

January 14, 2003. Phone conversation between Deacon Ray Halma and Mr. John Vandervliet.

- Responding to the suggestion that Elder Barry Everts accompany John Vandervliet in his seeking the forgiveness of certain of his customers which the Session felt he had wronged in his business practices, John Vandervliet expressed distaste for this idea to Mr. Ray Halma, stating to Mr. Halma that “his customers were more godly than Barry Everts.” (Doc. E)

March 22, 2003. A letter from Mr. Vandervliet to Mr. Everts.

- John Vandervliet accuses Elder Barry Everts of sitting “idly by while things like what happened at Living Hope continue.” (Doc. B, p.1, paragraph 8).


- Mr. Vandervliet states: “If you ask me whether I trust you [speaking of Elder Everts], I do not.” (Doc. F) Parenthetic explanation added.

November, 2003. A meeting at the Vandervliet home with the Session of Grace Covenant OPC (Bill Kroesbergen and Barry Everts), their ministerial advisor (John Ferguson), and their Pastor Elect (Edward Ludt).

- John Vandervliet raises his voice to a body of Elders and Pastors in his home who were addressing his sins of slander and divisiveness against Tristan Emmanuel and Living Hope, as well as his sin in other matters not connected with this case. On several occasions, the mere “raising of voice” becomes intense shouting.


- After presenting his findings concerning the Vandervliet departure from Living Hope (cf. Doc. G), Pastor Ludt spends several minutes exhorting John Vandervliet to see his great sin in the matter, to seek the forgiveness of Tristan Emmanuel, to reconcile with this brothers at Living Hope, and to trust the judgment of his Session. Mr. labels what Pastor Ludt has said to him as a “diatribe.”

- John Vandervliet reaffirms his comparative innocence concerning the matters which occurred at Living Hope, placing the blame once again on Pastor Emmanuel’s behavior and theology.

---

1 It should be noted that the Session of Grace Covenant did not lay down the stipulation for Mr. Vandervliet that he, with his family, once more begin attending services at Living Hope. Though this would be ideal, both spiritually and geographically, we did not want to set the line too high for Mr. Vandervliet. When we speak of “reconciliation, we speak of a relational reunion, not an ecclesiastical one.
• John Vandervliet labels the efforts of Grace Covenant’s Session to promote his repentance and reconciliation with Living Hope as a “witch hunt.”
• John Vandervliet tells the Session of Grace Covenant to “get off his back” in regard to his ongoing slander of Tristan Emmanuel and the matters which occurred at Living Hope.

• After the meeting of March 2, 2004, Mr. Vandervliet was given three or four weeks to consider whether or not he would, at last, seek the forgiveness of and reconciliation with Tristan Emmanuel and the people of Living Hope. In a letter received April 4th, he again placed the burden of sin on Tristan Emmanuel and the folk of Living Hope, stating that he and his family were “disfellowshipped” from that congregation. (Doc. H)
• A few days later, in order to gain a clear answer as to his intent, we contacted him by phone (Elder Bill Kroesbergen). In no uncertain terms he stated his refusal to seek the forgiveness of Mr. Emmanuel and Living Hope and to pursue reconciliation with them.

Pastor Edward W. Ludt (Moderator)
Elder Cope Jonkman (Clerk)

Date: Monday, April 26, 2004
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I INTRODUCTION

This is the fourteenth year in which the present Stated Clerk has served in the office of Stated Clerk of the General Assembly. He works out of the Orthodox Presbyterian Administration Building at 607 N. Easton Road in Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

II GENERAL ASSEMBLY DOCKET

A. Appeals

The Clerk has received one appeal for the 73rd General Assembly.

B. Time Schedule

The time schedule in the proposed docket is somewhat different than the one followed in 2005. The assembly is to start on Wednesday an hour earlier than it has in recent years and the plan is to go through the docket up to item 14 on that opening evening. This will allow the advisory committees to start right away on Thursday morning. The proposed docket for the rest of the time largely follows the times used in 2005 which allowed for a more relaxed schedule than had been followed in the recent years. Assuming two and half hours of business on Wednesday evening and not counting time assigned to devotions and recesses (four hours), there are thirty-seven and a third hours of time for the assembly meeting in full sessions in the proposed docket. Essentially the day would go from 8:30 a.m. until 8:30 p.m.

III AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO THIS ASSEMBLY
A.  **Book of Church Order (BCO)**

There were three proposed amendments to the *Book of Church Order* proposed by the 72nd General Assembly to the presbyteries. They are as follows: (see *Minutes of the Seventy-Second General Assembly*, §178, pp. 34–35)

That the 72nd General Assembly propose to the presbyteries that the Book of Discipline be amended as follows:

a. BD II.B.2.e be amended to read: Unbaptized covenant children whose parent(s) are communicant members of the congregation may be received only by baptism.

b. BD II.B.2.f be amended to read: Baptized covenant children ordinarily shall be received with their parents.

c. BD II .B.2. be amended by the addition of a new part g to read: Noncommunicant members of the congregation may be received into communicant membership only by approval of the session and public profession of faith as in part d above. (Note: BD II .B.2. was listed as BD II .B. on p. 35 of the *Minutes of the Seventy-Second General Assembly*.)

Twelve presbyteries have notified the Stated Clerk that they approve all of the amendments. One presbytery voted “no” on all of the proposed amendments and two voted “yes” on a. and b. but “no” on c. Since a majority of the sixteen presbyteries have voted in the affirmative for these amendments the Moderator should declare that they are adopted and will go into effect on January 1, 2010.

| Central US | YES | Northern California | YES |
| Connecticut S. New England | YES | Northwest | YES |
| Dakotas | NO | Ohio | YES |
| Michigan & Ontario | YES | Philadelphia | YES |
| Mid-Atlantic | YES | South | YES |
| Midwest | YES | Southeast | YES on a & b NO on c |
| New Jersey | YES | Southern California | YES on a & b NO on c |
| New York and New England | YES | Southwest | YES |

B.  **Standing Rules (SR)**

There are no proposed amendments to the *Standing Rules* to be considered.

C.  **Instruments**

There are no proposed amendments to the *Instruments* to be considered.

IV  **WORK OF THE STATED CLERK**

A.  **Overview**

The Clerk has endeavored to keep up with the correspondence this past year. Letters were written soon after the General Assembly in connection with the work and actions of the Assembly. The editing and publication of the *Minutes* and the *Directory*, along with the preparation of the *Agenda*, require a great deal of time.

The Clerk receives requests from all over the country and the world for information about the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. There are those, both within the church and outside, who request information about various study papers which are found
in the *Minutes* of the general assemblies. Many of these reports are on the website, but there are still reports that must be looked up and copied for those who ask for them.

For eight years there has been an OPC web page (http://www.opc.org). There is more reported on this matter in the report of the Committee on Christian Education. The Clerk has had very little to do during the year with regard to the website. The Clerk has spent some time supplying updates to the *Orthodox Presbyterian Church Directory*. The Clerk does do a lot of his work using e-mail. Every day questions are asked of the Clerk through e-mail, or he in turn uses e-mail to ask others questions. Several reports for the General Assembly have been received by e-mail, and a lot of the notification concerning commissioners and data for the Assembly has been received through this means.

One thing that the Clerk has done from time to time is send out notices by e-mail of what seems to him to be significant matters of interest or concern to people in the church. The Website Subcommittee of the Committee on Christian Education has asked the Clerk to use his judgment concerning what is to be sent out. This task is not in the job description of the Stated Clerk and there are no particular guidelines to be followed. The Clerk tries to be careful not to send a lot of things and to be very careful that what is sent is significant. It must be kept in mind that the Clerk only hears of many events in a round about way and, if someone thinks a matter should have gone out, it may well be that the Clerk was unaware of it.

In working out of the office in Willow Grove, the Clerk seeks to serve the committees of the church, such as the Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations or the Committee on Appeals and Complaints, in the flow of information and in support of their work.

The Clerk is very appreciative of the many busy men (pastors, stated clerks of sessions or presbyteries, general secretaries, writers of reports, the Historian, and the Statistician) who give of their time and effort to make the Clerk’s job possible. The Clerk also must acknowledge the helpful support of the staff in the office in Willow Grove. Several people have provided very helpful volunteer labor such as Mr. and Mrs. Robert Meeker and Miss Martha Kopecky in helping to mail the *Minutes*.

The Clerk is responsible ultimately to the General Assembly for his work, but he recognizes that the Trustees of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church are charged by the *Standing Rules* with the task of reviewing his performance as the Stated Clerk. The Clerk has submitted reports on his labors and a job description to the Trustees of the General Assembly. He has attended the meeting of the Trustees to report in person. The Clerk will make his report to the Trustees available to the advisory committee which considers this report. One of the things that was discussed with the Trustees and was new in the budget for the GAOF for 2002, is increased funding for secretarial work for the Stated Clerk. The 70th General Assembly passed the following: “That the 70th General Assembly encourage the Trustees and the Stated Clerk to employ secretarial help as budgeted in order to ease the clerical burdens of the Clerk’s office.” (*Minutes* p. 11 §32) The Clerk has used Mr. Christopher Spiker in formatting the *Minutes* for publication. Dr. James Scott did a lot of work in setting up the *Directory*.

B. Publications

1. Minutes  
   a. The

   *Minutes of the 72nd General Assembly* were 458 pages compared to 493 pages for the *Minutes* of the previous year. The *Minutes* were delivered on November 17, 2005.
Appendix

b. Cost: Printing and distribution of the *Minutes* in 2005 cost $10,481.11. One needs to realize that there is more expense in editing and copying. The 62nd General Assembly set the policy that the Stated Clerk has been following for the distribution of the *Minutes*, namely, that the *Minutes* are sent to all ministers and sessions of the church with a request to contribute $15 per copy to cover the cost of printing. The *Minutes* were sent out as directed. Many sent in a contribution of $15, which has been a big help. Contributions and sale of the Minutes amounted to $3,440.50 in 2005. The *Minutes* are mailed to churches with which the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has ecclesiastical relations and are sold to some twenty libraries that have requested them.

2. OPC Directory
   a. The *2005 OPC Directory* was printed in a 6-inch by 9-inch booklet form with double columns. It was sent in final form to the printer on January 25, 2005, and 9500 copies were received on February 10, 2005. They were distributed to the churches. The cost of printing them was $4,890. The Stated Clerk solicited advertising for the *2005 OPC Directory* in the amount of $5,650.
   b. **PLEASE NOTE**: It is imperative that, when there are changes to be made to the Directory, those changes be sent to the Stated Clerk. The Clerk collects changes throughout the year and often gets them only because he has heard of a possible change by word of mouth.

3. Book of Church Order (BCO)
   A new edition of the *Book of Church Order* has been printed with all the amendments that took place in accordance with FG XXXII. 2 on January 1, 2005. The book is published in hardback and includes an index. The Committee on Christian Education has taken on the task of publishing the book, which is a great help to the Clerk’s office. The BCO can be ordered through the Committee on Christian Education or through Great Commission Publications. Do note that the BCO can also be found on the OPC web page (see above).

4. Certificates for licensure and ordination are available to stated clerks of the presbyteries for their use.

C. Finances

1. The Clerk has sent out notices to all the churches concerning the amount requested from each church for the General Assembly Operation Fund. A letter was sent to all the sessions on June 23, 2005, concerning the actions of the General Assembly, including the request for funds for the General Assembly Operation Fund. Along with that letter, forms were sent to help in determining what each church should contribute to the General Assembly Operation Fund. The churches supported the fund very well. (See the Report of the Trustees.)

2. The Clerk prepared vouchers in 2005 for expenses charged to the General Assembly Operation Fund.

3. 2007 GAOF Budget: Under the provisions of the *Standing Rules*, the Clerk has met with the Trustees of the General Assembly and has prepared with them a proposed budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund for 2006. This proposed budget is to be found in the Report of the Trustees.

4. Expenses for the General Assembly Operation Fund in 2005 were $31,041.21 less than had been budgeted for 2005. Expenses in 2005 exceeded receipts by $6,777.01 (Please note: For 2004 the General Assembly asked for $14 per communicant
member and the budget had a built in deficit of $35,461. There remained $182,021.80 in the General Assembly Operation Fund at the end of 2005.

V RECOMMENDATION

1. That the proposed amendments to the Book of Discipline be declared by the moderator to be adopted and to go into effect on January 1, 2010. (See III.B. above.)

Respectfully submitted,
Donald J. Duff
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I. MEETING

The Trustees of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church met for the regular annual meeting on March 14, 2006. The elected officers of the Trustees are: Martin L. Dawson, Sr., President; Richard A. Barker, Vice-president; Samuel H. Bacon, Secretary; Bruce A. Stahl, Treasurer.

II. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

A. The Employer Identification Number (EIN) of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church is 23-7001990. This number is to be used only by the Trustees for matters related to the denomination and the tax-exempt status of the corporation.

B. It should be remembered that:

1. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church and its member churches are certified by the Internal Revenue Service as exempt from filing Federal income tax returns under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Internal Revenue Service assigned The Orthodox Presbyterian Church the EIN 23-7001990 for this purpose. Donors may deduct, on their federal income tax returns, contributions to the denomination and/or member churches under Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code. This certification of exempt status is also useful to any member church in obtaining permission to mail through the U.S. Postal Service at special third-class rates. A certificate of a church’s membership in the denomination and/or a copy of the IRS certification letter may be obtained from the Secretary of the Trustees of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

2. The tax-exempt status detailed above has no relationship with exemption from state sales taxes. Each state that has a sales tax has its own rules for making tax-
exempt purchases for the church’s use. For these details contact the Department of Revenue of the state in which the church is located.

3. **Under no circumstances may any congregation or agency of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church use the reference number stated in Sections “A” and “B-1” above as its EIN or Tax Identification Number (TIN) in its dealings with the Internal Revenue Service with regard to payrolls, social security taxes, withheld Federal income taxes, etc.** This reference number is exclusively for the Trustees of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church for the purposes stated in Sections “A” and “B-1” above. If advice to the contrary is received, please do nothing before contacting the Secretary of the Trustees. You can reach the Secretary of the Trustees at bacon.1@opc.org

III. **EIN/TIN NUMBERS FOR CONGREGATIONS**

To receive an EIN for a congregation, call 1-800-TAX-FORMS (829-3676) and request Form SS-4, Application for Employer Identification Number. You may also apply for one online at [www.irs.gov](http://www.irs.gov) under “Small Business/Self-employed.” After applying, the IRS will notify you of the number assigned. The Trustees urge each congregation and mission work of the denomination to apply for an EIN.

IV. **LEGAL CONSULTANT**

The Trustees have asked Mr. Timothy Ferguson, an attorney, to be a legal consultant to ministers, churches, presbyteries and committees in the event of a lawsuit filed against them. Mr. Ferguson has agreed to provide such consultation without requiring a retainer. Mr. Ferguson is a deacon of Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Bellmawr, NJ. He is licensed to practice law in several states including New Jersey and Pennsylvania. He will provide his services at a rate of $150 an hour. He has experience in civil, criminal, corporate and family law. He has provided legal advice to ministers and sessions in regard to church discipline cases, and has represented the Presbytery of New Jersey’s Boardwalk Chapel in matters with the State of New Jersey and the City of Wildwood as well as corporate matters. Mr. Ferguson can provide representation or legal advice. He will also provide referrals to other attorneys in matters outside his expertise or outside the states in which he is licensed to practice.

V. **STATED CLERK**

The Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, the Rev. Donald J. Duff, submitted his report to the Trustees per the Job Description and Form for Performance Evaluation previously adopted. Mr. Duff was evaluated on the basis of these documents and the evaluation was deemed to be “superior.”

VI. **TRUSTEES’ REPRESENTATIVE TO THE 73rd GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Trustee Barker was delegated to present the Report of the Trustees to the 73rd General Assembly.
VII. ELECTIONS

The present Trustees are:

Class of 2008:
Stephen L. Phillips and Bruce A. Stahl

Class of 2007:
Martin L. Dawson, Sr., and Edward K. Tress

Class of 2006:
Samuel H. Bacon and Richard A. Barker

The terms of the following trustees expire at this assembly: Class of 2006: Samuel H. Bacon (minister) and Richard A. Barker (elder). One minister and one ruling elder or deacon are to be elected to the class of 2009.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1) In regard to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, that the following listed remuneration package for 2007 be adopted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$35,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Allowance</td>
<td>30,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA Reimbursement (1/2)</td>
<td>5,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension (6% of salary and housing plus $1030. See note below)</td>
<td>4,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Insurance</td>
<td>933 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker’s Compensation Insurance</td>
<td>350 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$77,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including four weeks of paid vacation.

Note: Since the Clerk is covered by his spouse’s medical insurance he decided to drop the OPC plan. An additional $1,030 was added to the pension since there is no expense for health insurance.

2) Nominate the Rev. Donald J. Duff for the position of Stated Clerk for the term running from the 2007 General Assembly to that in 2010 (Note: the General Assembly Standing Rules require that the election occur at this Assembly).

3) The Trustees in accordance with the Standing Rules XI:2.e. (“propose to the General Assembly a budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund, and suggest a per capita contribution for payment of the assembly expenses”) propose the following budget for the General Assembly Operation Fund for 2007 and request the churches of the denomination to contribute $14 per communicant member to the General Assembly Operation Fund in 2007:

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR GAOF FOR 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAOF request per comm.</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>133,757</td>
<td>133,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>189,881</td>
<td>189,881</td>
<td>182,022</td>
<td>133,757</td>
<td>133,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>164,029</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory Ads</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Minutes</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>162,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>179,297</strong></td>
<td><strong>172,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>175,100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

#### 1. Honoraria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk</td>
<td>62,953</td>
<td>64,527</td>
<td>66,140</td>
<td>66,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension, etc.</td>
<td>10,523</td>
<td>11,038</td>
<td>11,341</td>
<td>11,341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Clerk</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Honoraria</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,276</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,465</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,581</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,581</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Staff/Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff/Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip/Post/Supplies</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,250</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. General Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes print /Distrib.</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda print/Distrib.</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Arrangement</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Delegates</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GA</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPARC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Chaplains Commission</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Committee Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeals and Complaints</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Historian</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td>16,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEIR</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>28,991</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision DPW</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of The OPC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. for Financial Review</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. on Doc. Of Justification</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,045</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,350</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>214,576</strong></td>
<td><strong>187,156</strong></td>
<td><strong>220,365</strong></td>
<td><strong>217,981</strong></td>
<td><strong>218,981</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts minus Expenses</td>
<td>(52,576)</td>
<td>(7,859)</td>
<td>(48,265)</td>
<td>(43,881)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>137,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>182,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>133,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,876</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IX. ESTIMATED EXPENSE**

The Trustees estimate their costs for the next year to be $100.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin L. Dawson, Sr.
President
REPORT OF THE STATISTICIAN

This report provides a summary of statistics for the Orthodox Presbyterian Church for the year 2005. The Yearbook contains a tabulated summary of statistics for the whole church, the regional churches, and local congregations, the statistical reports of the presbyteries, and a recapitulation of membership totals since 1938.

I SUMMARY

During 2005 the number of local churches in the OPC grew by three to 255, and the number of unorganized mission works increased by three to 63. Thus, the total number of congregations reached 318 at the end of the year. Total membership was 27,989 at the end of 2005 with a decrease of 155 members (-0.5 percent) for the year. Morning worship attendance increased by 261 persons (1.1 percent) to 23,217 as measured in November. Sunday school attendance increased by 7 persons to 12,712 in November. Total offerings were $40.7 million, an increase of 5.3 percent over 2004. Giving increased in every area: general offerings by 4.6 percent, benevolence giving by 5.4 percent, contributions for capital improvements by 18.1 percent, and average giving per communicant member by 5.5 percent. Overall, 2005 was a year of mixed results statistically, with added congregations despite some losses, and moderate increases in giving, yet with little overall change in membership and attendance.

II CHURCHES AND MISSION WORKS

The total number of local churches at the end of 2005 stood at 255, representing a net increase of three churches during the year. Seven mission works were organized as new and separate churches, and three congregations were received into the OPC as organized churches, while four churches were dissolved and three churches withdrew from the OPC. The total number of unorganized mission works increased by 3 to 63, with twelve new ones started, less seven that were organized as churches and two that were terminated. The changes that occurred are listed below with their respective regional churches.

Church Additions (10)  
Organized as new and separate churches from mission works  
Cedar, Hudsonville, Mich.  
Ketoctin Covenant, Purcellville, Va.  
Covenant Reformed, Evansville, Ind.  
New Covenant Fellowship, Independence, Iowa  
Elkhorn, Helena, Mont.  
Redeemer, Carlisle, Pa.  
Providence, Kingwood, Tex.  
Received into the OPC  
Covenant, Roberts, Wis., from independency  
OPC, Momence, Ill., from independency  
Westminster, Corvallis, Ore., from independency  
Regional Church  
Mich. & Ontario  
Mid-Atlantic  
Midwest  
Midwest  
Northwest  
Philadelphia  
Southwest  
Midwest  
Midwest  
Northwest
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Church Reductions (7)

Dissolved
- Berea, Harrisonburg, Va.
- Living Hope, Nutley, N.J.
- First, Greenville, S.C.
- Redeemer, Denton, Tex.

Withdrew from the OPC
- Pilgrim, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Covenant, Forest, Miss.
- New Life, La Mesa, Cal.

Mission Work Additions (12)

Started or received into the OPC as mission works
- Living Hope, Clarksville, Md.
- De Kalb, Ill.
- Mission OPC, St. Paul, Minn.
- Immanuel, Medford, N.J.
- Neuva Esperanza, Vineland, N.J.
- Mt. Rose, Reno, Nev.
- Redeemer, Danville, Pa.
- Providence Reformed, Mifflinburg, Pa.
- Covenant Community, Greenville, S.C.
- Iglesia Nueva Vida, Phoenix, Ariz.
- Mid Cities, Bedford, Tex.

Mission Work Reductions (9)

Organized as new and separate churches
- Cedar, Hudsonville, Mich.
- Ketoctin Covenant, Purcellville, Va.
- Covenant Reformed, Evansville, Ind.
- New Covenant Fellowship, Independence, Iowa
- Elkhorn, Helena, Mont.
- Redeemer, Carlisle, Pa.
- Providence, Kingwood, Tex.

Terminated
- Hope, St. Cloud, Fla.
- Christ, New Orleans, La.

III MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

The total membership of 27,989 persons at year’s end consisted of 449 ministers, 19,965 communicant members, and 7,575 baptized children (non-communicants). This represents a decrease of 155 persons (0.5 percent) from 2004’s adjusted total of 28,144 members. This membership decrease is comprised of the net gain of 9 ministers and loss of 33 communicant members and 131 baptized children. Communicant membership change included 748 professions of faith and 650 re-affirmations of faith. Offsetting these gains were losses from deaths (122), net transfers (710), and discipline & erasures (599). The reduction in non-communicants (baptized children) came as the result of additions by 538 baptisms and 521 children received with parents, and of
reductions by professions of faith (309), deaths (6), children dismissed with parents (596), and erasures (279).

Attendance at morning worship in November averaged 23,217, which is 83.0 percent of total membership. This is an increase of 261 persons (1.1 percent) from a year earlier. Sunday school attendance in November averaged 12,712, which is 45.4 percent of total membership. This is just 7 persons more than in 2004.

IV CONTRIBUTIONS

Total giving in 2005 increased by 5.3 percent from the previous year to a total of $40,736,400. Average giving per communicant member (per capita giving) increased 5.5 percent to $2,040. The $40.7 million contributed to support all aspects of the ministry of the OPC in 2005 is divided into three categories for the statistical report. General offerings for local church expenses grew by 4.6 percent to $32,363,900 or 79.4 percent of giving. Benevolence offerings (for missions, outreach, and diaconal ministry) increased by 5.4 percent to $6,215,800 representing 15.0 percent of total contributions. Offerings designated or used for capital improvements totaled $2,156,700, or 5.3 percent of total giving. Finally, bequests totaled $239,800.

V ORDAINED OFFICERS

There were 449 ministers in the OPC at the end of 2005, representing a net increase of nine ministers on the rolls of OPC presbyteries. Fourteen men were ordained as ministers and five other ministers were received into the OPC, while ten ministers were removed from the rolls of presbyteries for reasons summarized below. Dates and details are reported in the Yearbook.

Ministers Added to the Roll (19) Presbytery

Ordained
Paul T. Berghaus Midwest
Glen A. Clary New Jersey
Timothy W. Flora Mid-Atlantic
James H. Ganzevoort Southeast
Kenneth R. Golden Midwest
Dale T. Hanaoka So. California
C. Mark Jenkins Midwest
Peter Y. Lee Mid-Atlantic
Brett A. McNeill Northwest
Benjamin W. Miller Conn. & So. N.Y.
C. Adam Ostella Southwest
David S. Phillips N.Y. & New England
Peter H. Sim So. California
Jason J. D. Stewart Philadelphia

Received into the OPC
Ronald L. Beabout, from independency Midwest
David A. Corson, from independency Conn. & So. N.Y.
John Currie, from another denomination Philadelphia
J. Glenn Ferrell, from the Evangelical Pres. Church Northwest
Kim M. Kuhfuss, from independency Midwest
Ministers Removed from the Roll (10)

Dismissed from the OPC
- Nicholas T. S. Ganas, to PCA So. California
- Edward N. Gross, to PCA Philadelphia
- Patrick W. Malone, to PCA New Jersey
- George C. Miladin, to PCA So. California
- Marcus J. Serven, to RPC, GA So. California
- Michael R. Shipma, to PCA Southwest
- Mark T. Smith, to PCA South
- Robert H. Tanzie, to PCA N.Y. & New England
- Charles M. Wingard, to PCA N.Y. & New England

Erased
- Lyman M. Smith, renounced jurisdiction of OPC Mid-Atlantic

In addition to these changes, eight ministers transferred between OPC presbyteries in 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvin K. Cummings, Jr.</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian L. DeJong</td>
<td>Mich. &amp; Ontario</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Y. Eckardt</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell J. Hamilton</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>N.Y. &amp; New Eng.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Matossian</td>
<td>So. California</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Puglia</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell L. Rockey, Jr.</td>
<td>N.Y. &amp; New England</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of ruling elders in the church grew by three to 1025, with 766 (75 percent) currently serving on sessions. The total number of deacons declined by 7 to 752, with 569 (76 percent) actively serving. In all, with ministers included, there are 2,226 ordained officers in the church.

Respectfully submitted,
Luke E. Brown, Statistician
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
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I. INTRODUCTION

The Committee on Christian Education (CCE), together with the Committees on Home Missions and Church Extension (CHMCE) and Foreign Missions (CFM) in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC), seeks to obey Jesus’ Great Commission: “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you” (Matt. 28:19-20). The CCE provides resources and training for teaching disciples to observe all that Jesus has commanded. In keeping with these ends, the stated objectives of the CCE are to encourage, equip, and assist:

1. The members of the OPC to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ—as individuals, as families, and as congregations.
2. The ministers and prospective ministers of the gospel for faithful and effective ministry.
3. The officers and prospective officers of the church for the faithful and effective discharge of their responsibilities.
4. The OPC to reach out to unbelievers with sound, biblically Reformed evangelism.
5. The OPC to serve un instructed and misinformed believers in the church catholic.
II. PROFILE OF THE CCE

A. Structure

The CCE is divided into two subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Ministerial Training (SMT) and the Subcommittee on Resources for the Churches (SRC). The former, composed of six members, is elected by the General Assembly; the latter is composed of the other members of the CCE. The members of the Great Commission Publications (GCP) Board of Trustees and the Finance Subcommittee are drawn from the entire CCE.

B. Officers

President—Dr. James S. Gidley
Vice-President—The Rev. Alan D. Strange
Secretary—Mr. Paul S. MacDonald
Treasurer—Mr. David Winslow, Jr.

C. Staff

General Secretary—The Rev. Danny E. Olinger
Publications Coordinator and Managing Editor of *New Horizons*—Dr. James W. Scott
Office Secretary—Mrs. Patricia Clawson
Website Manager—The Rev. Stephen A. Pribble
Website Design and Technical Associate—The Rev. Barry A. Traver
Website Assistant—Mrs. Vickie Swann
Editor of *Ordained Servant*—The Rev. Dr. Gregory E. Reynolds
Administrator of the Ministerial Training Institute of the OPC (MTIOPC)—Dr. James H. Thomas, Jr.

D. General Secretary

The Rev. Danny E. Olinger serves as General Secretary of the CCE and as *ex-officio* member of all subcommittees. Mr. Olinger’s duties as General Secretary include the following:

1. General Administration of the work of the CCE.
2. Editing *New Horizons*.
3. Directing the Intern Program.
4. Serving as an ex-officio member of the Board of Trustees of GCP.
5. Representing the work of the CCE to the congregations and presbyteries of the OPC.
6. Serving as Director of MTIOPC.
7. Supervising CCE special projects and publications.
8. Supervising CCE conferences and seminars.

III. RESOURCES AND MINISTRIES

A. New Horizons
The General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has entrusted *New Horizons* to the Committee on Christian Education for the purpose of informing OPC members and others about OPC ministries, and of instructing and propagating central matters which reflect the position of the OPC standards concerning Christian faith and life. The General Secretary of the CCE, Mr. Olinger, serves as editor. Dr. James Scott serves as managing editor. Mrs. Patricia Clawson and Mrs. Ali Knudsen are proofreaders and Mr. Christopher Tobias is the cover designer. The SRC of the CCE serves as the editorial board.

1. Editorial Leadership
   
   In the January 2005 issue of *New Horizons*, Mr. Olinger put forth his vision as editor. He wrote: “I am guided by what appeared in the independent magazine that preceded *New Horizons*, *The Presbyterian Guardian*. The *Presbyterian Guardian* was known for its defense of historic Christianity, but this defense was never presented in a vacuum. Rather, in the pages of the *Presbyterian Guardian*, one could see doctrine and life together. I keep this pattern in mind as I edit *New Horizons*. I want the magazine to instruct and inform, educate and promote, defend and advance.” In that same issue, Mr. Olinger also stated, “The pages of *New Horizons* during the past twenty-five years have given evidence of a love for Jesus Christ and that particular expression of the Savior’s church that is the OPC. Please pray that, by God’s grace, *New Horizons* will continue to do that.”

2. 2005 Issues
   
   a. January – Celebrating 25 Years
   b. February – James and Justification by Faith
   c. March – Laughing with God at the Empty Tomb
   d. April – Worldwide Outreach
   e. May – Covenant Nurture
   f. June – Signed, Sealed, and Delivered: The Message of the Lord’s Supper
   g. July – Making Space for a New Church
   h. Aug/Sept. – Report on the 72nd General Assembly
   i. October – Luther and the Reformation
   j. November – Thanks Be to God for His Inexpressible Gift
   k. December – OPC Disaster Response

3. Circulation
   
   The current circulation of *New Horizons* is approximately 14,000. The magazine is produced monthly, except for an August/September double issue, and is sent free of charge to OPC members and friends. The CCE is dependent on clerks of sessions or pastors in order to keep the mailing list current. Changes to the mailing list of *New Horizons* can be sent to Mrs. Clawson (ccesec@opc.org or 215-830-0900).

B. Internet Ministries

1. OPC.ORG
   
   The CCE maintains internet ministries through the *OPC.ORG* website. It is under the supervision of the Subcommittee on Internet Ministries (SIM) of the CCE. Mr. Stephen A. Pribble serves as website manager and Mr. Barry A. Traver serves as website design and technical associate. Mrs. Vickie Swann serves as website assistant.
2. Redesign

In 2005, the SIM undertook the project of redesigning OPC.ORG. Included in the redesign was not only a new color scheme and look, but also web building, designing, programming, and data base construction. By providing accurate and extensive public information about the OPC, the website has become an important arm of the ministry of the Committee on Christian Education.

The new visible architecture of the website is designed to give easier access for users of all levels of Internet ability to the extensive resources of the website. A major “invisible” feature of the new design, which will make the maintenance of information much easier, is the use of databases. The information will all reside in one place, so that updates by authorized personnel will only need to be made once. Regularly changing features on the homepage, such as the “Questions and Answers” and the “Daily Devotional,” will also be updated automatically, once the data is entered into the system.

One main change to the homepage is the addition of a prominent “Feature” article at the center of the site. This feature allows maximum flexibility to call attention to important ministries or events. Also on the homepage are the periodicals, New Horizons and Ordained Servant. There are direct links to the current issue of New Horizons, archived issues, and the ability to “pose a question” to the editor directly from the homepage. Ordained Servant can be directly accessed with the most recent issue, archived issues, selected articles from 1992 onward, and new articles beginning in late 2006 or early 2007.

A “Daily Devotional” message has also been included with the new design on the homepage. The Rev. John Skilton’s Think on These Things and the Rev. David Freeman’s “Lift Up Your Heart” have appeared. An evangelistic tract for inquirers is available under “Find Eternal Life.” Our history is made more visible in the upper right-hand corner with a picture of J. Gresham Machen and a link to a Machen page, which has been updated through consultation with Dr. D.G. Hart. The regular account of important dates in church history gives special attention to OPC history. Visitors can also order books on OPC history from the Committee for the Historian. Under “Resources,” book reviews are posted from the pages of New Horizons and updated regularly, with an archive of past reviews listing them in chronological order and in alphabetical order by author and title.

3. OPC.ORG Statistics

The most accessed areas of the website from the month of March are in order of popularity:

1. Trinity Hymnal  (hits) 29,456
2. Questions and Answers 24,760
3. Home page 18,315
4. New Horizons Articles 16,145
5. Local congregation locator 10,433
6. Book reviews 6,280
7. Directory to congregations 4,007
8. Devotional 2,709
9. Confession and Catechisms 2,606
10. Today in Presbyterian Church History 2,521
11. News 2,049
12. Ordained Servant 1,794
13. Publications 1,098
14. Committee page
C. Ordained Servant

1. History and Purpose

In September 1989, the CCE appointed a special subcommittee with the title and task of “Equipping Ordained Officers.” Heeding the recommendation of this subcommittee, the CCE established a denominational journal, *Ordained Servant*, to provide materials to help in the training and effective functioning of ministers, elders, and deacons in the church. The intention of the journal is to point the way to more effective leadership in the church by its officers.

2. Publication

The CCE ceased publication of *Ordained Servant* in its present form at the end of 2005 and determined to publish *Ordained Servant* in electronic form on OPC.ORG and annually as a print journal on a trial basis for years 2007 – 2009.

3. Editor

In October 2005, the Rev. G.I. Williamson retired as editor of *Ordained Servant* after 13 years of faithful service. Succeeding Mr. Williamson as editor is the Rev. Dr. Gregory E. Reynolds. Reprinted here is Dr. Reynolds’s inaugural editorial in the January 2006 *Ordained Servant* on OPC.ORG.

GALVANIZED IRON

A Tribute to G. I. Williamson
For His Pioneering Work on *Ordained Servant*
Editorial – January 2006

My copy of G. I. Williamson’s classic study guide to the *Westminster Confession of Faith* was signed by him in 1985, when he preached in our church in Mount Vernon, as part of a Bible conference held in Franklin Square OPC. G. I. had recently returned from New Zealand. I had purchased a first edition of this informative book in its academic blue cover (standard fare for the old Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company), now with duct tape on the spine, at Covenant College in 1974, during a time when I was becoming a Presbyterian and was learning the reformed faith under the ministry of George Miladin, and the professorships of Gordon Clark, Lou Voskuil, John Sanderson, Reggie McClelland, and Henry Krabbendam. G. I. was, unwittingly, one of my earliest mentors.

WHAT G.I. BROUGHT TO HIS EDITORSHIP

G. I. was born Gerald Irvin Williamson in Des Moines, Iowa on May 19, 1925. After being graduated from Drake University in 1949 (the year I was born) and Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary in 1952 with that wonderfully antique degree, the B.D. (bachelor of divinity), he was ordained on June 1, 1952 by the Presbytery of Des Moines in the United Presbyterian Church of North America. He served UPCNA churches in New
Bedford, Pennsylvania, and Fall River, Massachusetts. In 1954 he was received into the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, where he served in Monticello, Arkansas. In 1955 he was received into the Presbytery of New York and New England of the OPC. His article “What’s So Special about the OPC?” tells why he came into the OPC. For the next seven years G. I. served Grace OPC in Fall River, Massachusetts. From 1963 to 1983, he served two churches in the Reformed Churches of New Zealand; along with a four-year stint in a Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America in Park City, Kansas.

Finally in 1983 G. I. returned stateside for good, both his and ours. He served the OP churches in Carson and Lark, North Dakota until his “retirement” in 1993. Well, it may have been a retirement from the pastorate, but certainly not from serving his Lord’s church. From 1993 to 1995 G.I. helped plant a church in Hull, Iowa. In 1995 the congregation joined with the newly formed United Reformed Church. It was in 1992 that G.I. began editing a new OPC periodical, *Ordained Servant* (which was only made possible by the willing assistance of God’s people in Bethel OPC in Carson, N.D.) And now after publishing his fifty-third issue in his eighty-first year, he has handed over the reins.

His extensive experience in various reformed churches solidified his firm commitment to historic confessional Presbyterianism. Thus his passion has been to instruct the church in its confession and catechisms, and to inculcate that faith in the worship and life of the church through the ministry of an active, pastorally-oriented eldership. These twin passions are evident in the pages of fourteen years of *Ordained Servant*.

Like his soldier namesake, G. I. stands for “galvanized iron.” In every aspect of his ministry G. I. has proved to be a “good soldier of Jesus Christ”—stalwart, steadfast, and reliable. The original meaning of *galvanize* is “to stimulate as if by electric shock.” Its figurative meaning is “to arouse to awareness or action.” Having come from churches that did not take their historic confession tradition seriously enough, G.I.’s appreciation for our secondary standards as a vital part of the faith and life of the church has moved him to stimulate the church to a renewed consciousness of them. Early in his ministry, G. I. sought to recover “with certainty the rich heritage of the Reformation Faith.” In 1964 he published the first edition of *The Westminster Confession of Faith for Study Classes*. In 1970 he published another study guide entitled *The Shorter Catechism*, in two volumes. His publication of a commentary on the *Heidelberg Catechism* (1993) is a testimony to his Reformed ecumenical instincts. His years of service on the Committee on Ecumenicity and Intercurch Relations expanded his ecumenical experience. This, too, is evident in the pages of *Ordained Servant*.

His writings have further displayed the range of his interests as he has sought to teach the implications of confessional orthodoxy for every aspect of the church’s life. For G. I., the academy served the interests of the church. Thus, he has published books on worship (*The Singing of the Psalms in the Worship of God*, 1967); ethics (*Wine in the Bible and the Church*, 1976); apologetics (*Understanding the Times*, 1979); and Biblical exposition (*The Song of Songs*, 1981).

It is one of the great honors of my ministry to follow in the footsteps of G. I. Williamson as editor of *Ordained Servant*. I hope to continue his fine efforts to cultivate confessional consciousness in the mind of the church through the faithful ministries of its officers, that Scripture may be understood and lived to the glory of God.

**HOW I INTEND TO BUILD ON G.I.’S WORK**

On October 5, 2005 the Committee on Christian Education (CCE) approved the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Resources for the Churches that the CCE cease publication of *Ordained Servant* in its present form, and publish it in electronic
form on OPC.ORG throughout the year, and annually as a print journal on a trial basis from 2007 to 2009. The new editor will, in consultation with the General Secretary, solicit new articles to appear on the OPC website beginning in 2007.

This year I will be redesigning both the content and the look of *Ordained Servant*. I would like to hear comments from you, the church officers of the OPC. If we are to make a good thing better, we must hear from those whom we are seeking to serve. While I do not intend to lead by consensus, I wish to do everything within my power to make future issues of *Ordained Servant* a blessing to you. I want to grow into this position so that we can each grow together in fulfilling our offices in the church as servants of the great Servant of the Lord.

During this new year of 2006, we will be posting a sampling of the best of past issues from our archives. As part of our tribute to G. I. Williamson we begin with one of his editorials that, more than anything I have read, sums up his principled love for the Orthodox Presbyterian expression of our Lord’s church.

The General Secretary and the CCE have given me considerable latitude in redesigning *Ordained Servant*. This will be my main concern in 2006. One aspect of my work will be identifying and recruiting writers for new articles to be published beginning in 2007. I may also add some articles and reviews during this calendar year. I hope to use editorial space to continue the work of encouraging, informing, and equipping church officers. At the end of 2007, we will begin publishing all of the new articles in a single annual volume.

Along with continuing to print articles and reviews that cover the range of the past fourteen years of *Ordained Servant*, I intend to expand the scope of the magazine’s focus. Exploring the implications of ministering in a digital world is an example of this expansion. The combination of digital and print publication represents a frontier for *Ordained Servant*, its new editor, and I suspect the library and periodical publishing worlds. This month I will be attending a lecture and discussion by David Seaman titled “Electronic Books, Digital Readers, and the Future of America’s Libraries,” at the Boston Athenaeum. I hope to add material on the effect of electronic communication on the ministries of church officers. The challenge is to balance the efficiency and accessibility of the web with the more enduring and thoughtful quality of a printed journal. There are benefits and liabilities to each medium. This topic has been of intense interest to me since I bought my first computer, an Apple IIC, and began a doctor of ministry project (both in 1990) on preaching in the electronic age.

It is also my conviction that officers need to understand more deeply the battlefield on which we find ourselves engaged in a fierce conflict. So I hope to include thoughtful analyses of different aspects of our culture, so as to better minister within it and to it.

I intend to seek high quality writing in the form of articles and book reviews in order to stimulate clear thinking and the consistent practice of historic, confessional Presbyterianism. I will seek to bring new books to your attention through a combination of brief and article length reviews. I am working on developing submission standards and a style sheet. The look will fit the content, as I will seek to develop a layout and typography that communicate the seriousness of our endeavor.

I will continue building on G. I.’s pastoral and confessional themes, as these form the core of our focus. As a church planter I have grown to appreciate the importance of sound doctrine, worship with reverence and awe, passionate expository preaching, and the training of gifted elders who fulfill their pastoral callings. The latter is the key to implementing everything else. For anyone interested I have written several articles in each of these areas.
Finally, I would like to propose our own J. Gresham Machen as a model of piety, doctrinal integrity, and intellectual cultivation. Many men in the OPC, both living and dead, have followed in Machen’s footsteps. Our own “Galvanized Iron” Williamson is a fine example of such a Christian soldier. I hope to explore those riches that are right under our noses. Machen is particularly useful because he lived in the same world we inhabit. He excelled in understanding the modern world and engaging it from a distinctly confessional perspective.

There are two things in particular about Machen’s Christianity I hope to see mirrored in *Ordained Servant*. First, he was able to communicate profound ideas with cogency and clarity. Such clear thinking and its excellence of expression in print is what we will aim at. Second, I hope to imitate his strong convictions, which were always held as a true Christian gentleman. He was not afraid to disagree passionately but he always also did so compassionately. I wish to continue promoting this tone in *Ordained Servant*, and thus “avoid foolish and ignorant disputes, knowing that they generate strife.” “A servant of the Lord must not quarrel but be gentle to all, able to teach, patient…” (2 Timothy 2:23-24 nkjv). Let’s grow together in imitating Machen, Paul and our Lord Jesus in these and all things.

Brothers, I earnestly solicit your prayers and suggestions as I take up this new, and in my eyes formidable, challenge.

Gregory Edward Reynolds

D. Literature

1. CCE publications

   The CCE publishes and sells postpaid a number of books and booklets.

   - *The Book of Church Order*, 2005. Issued by the stated clerk of the General Assembly and produced by the CCE, this volume contains the standards of government, discipline, and worship of the OPC.
   - *The Confession of Faith and Catechisms*. The Confession of Faith and Catechisms contains the Confession of Faith, the Larger Catechism, and the Shorter Catechism of the OPC, with the General Assembly-approved proof texts written out at the bottom of the page. It also contains a Scripture index.
   - *Taking Heed to the Flock* (Peter Y. De Jong) discusses the principles and practices of family visitation.
   - *Professing Your Faith* (G.I. Williamson) is an in-depth study of the four OP church membership questions.
   - *What is the OPC?* provides information about OP history, doctrine, government, General Assembly decisions, and denominational ministries, with appendices on people to contact, sources of further information, local churches, and how to join the OPC.
   - *What is the Reformed Faith?* is an introduction to Calvinism that covers Reformed principles (including the Five Points of Calvinism), practice, church government, and worship.
• *God or Mammon?* (Tom D. Tomer) challenges us to live for Christ in an affluent, materialistic culture.

• *We invite You* is an 8-page brochure that discusses what church membership is, why people should be members, and the responsibilities and privileges of membership.

• *Get to Know Us Better* is a full-color, highly illustrated glossy that folds out to twelve panels of friendly information about the OPC. The back panel is reserved for information to be stamped in about your local church.

All of these publications may be ordered by email ([CCEsec@opc.org](mailto:CCEsec@opc.org)) or phone (215-830-0900).

2. Future Plans

The CCE through its SRC has initiated plans of producing new tracts and booklets. A consistent format and “look” for these publications is being developed. Among the topics that will be pursued are ecclesiology, polity, means of grace (sacraments, prayer, preaching), evangelism, apologetics, and theology. The SRC believes that these topics are helpful not only to the OPC, but also to the broader Reformed and Evangelical world. Lord willing, the CCE plans to produce material under the new design before the end of the 2006 calendar year.

E. Great Commission Publications (GCP)

1. Shared Ministry

GCP is a joint ministry of the CCE of the OPC and the Christian Education and Publication Committee of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA).

2. Administration

GCP has a twelve-member Board of Trustees, six from the Committee on Christian Education and Publications (CE&P) of the PCA and six from the CCE of the OPC. Members of the Board serve in three-year terms and may be reelected. The CCE General Secretary and the CE&P Coordinator sit as *ex officio* members. The current president of the GCP board of Trustees is the Rev. E. Marvin Padgett. The Rev. Alan D. Strange is the vice-president. Mr. Paul S. MacDonald serves as the secretary. The OPC Trustees function as a subcommittee of the CCE, reporting to the entire CCE. The present roster of GCP trustees is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of 2006</th>
<th>OPC</th>
<th>PCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Paul S. MacDonald</td>
<td>Rev. Richard W. Tyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. G.I. Williamson</td>
<td>Rev. Willard G. LaRose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2007</td>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. David Winslow, Jr.</td>
<td>Rev. George W. Mitchell III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. Alan D. Strange</td>
<td>Rev. Don Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2008</td>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John R. Muether</td>
<td>Mr. Steve Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. Gregory E. Reynolds</td>
<td>Rev. E. Marvin Padgett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>PCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. Danny E. Olinger</td>
<td>Rev. Charles H. Dunahoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternates are appointed to serve in case regular members cannot. The Rev. Thomas Tyson and the Rev. Rodney King are the current OPC alternates. The Board convenes in two stated meetings each year in April and October.

The Rev. Thomas R. Patete, a PCA minister, serves as Executive Director of the Board. Mr. Patete has faithfully served and given commendable leadership as Executive Director for 28 years. Mr. Williamson and Mr. Thomas E. Tyson (OPC) and the Rev. William Smith (PCA) serve as theological editors of GCP.

3. Editorial Statement

GCP’s editorial statement, which guides the writing of its material, is as follows: “Under the conviction that the Word of God is verbally inspired and infallible, we seek to handle Scripture as a whole and each individual passage with great care—not adding or deleting, not speculating or embellishing, emphasizing both by content and means of teaching that these are God’s words and not ours.”

4. Show Me Jesus

GCP produces covenantal, Christ-centered Sunday school materials built upon a high view of the Bible as God’s complete, unified revelation. This material, under the GCP adopted label Show Me Jesus, points children to know and trust Jesus, the Revealer of the Father and the Savior of his people.

During the 2005 year, GCP made a major change in the Show Me Jesus curriculum. The new elementary structure changed from three-year age groupings to two-year segments—Younger and Middle (Fall 2005) and Older (Fall 2006). GCP believes that the closer age grouping provides greater pedagogical integrity, age-appropriate learning, and organizational flexibility. Further information is available at GCP’s website (www.gcp.org).

5. Publications

In addition to the Show Me Jesus curriculum, GCP publishes and makes available numerous Christian education resources for use in the church.

- *Trinity Hymnal* (Original 1961 and Revised 1990 editions)
- Vacation Bible School material (2006 theme: The King is Coming)
- Catechetical materials featuring *Kids’ Quest! Catechism Club, First Catechism*, Settle’s *Memory Work Notebook* (newly done in NJKV and ESV)
- Westminster Standards (including Williamson’s Westminster Confession of Faith for Study Classes and Shorter Catechism for Study Classes)
- Resources for Teachers and Parents (including Tripp’s Shepherding a Child’s Heart; Hunt’s Heirs of the Covenant; Hunt’s My ABC Verses: Hiding God’s Word in Little Hearts; Marcellino’s Rediscovering the Lost Treasure of Family Worship; and Lindvall’s Read-Aloud Bible Stories: Volumes 1-4)
- Adult Discipleship Studies (including Cummings’s Confessing Christ; Engle’s Discovering the Fullness of Worship; Curry’s The God We Love and Serve; and Clowney’s The Unfolding Mystery)
- Church Resources (including Marston’s Biblical Baptism; OPC 9th General Assembly Report on Christ and the Lodge; Eyres’s Elders of the Church; Brown’s Order in the Offices; Cummings’s The Covenant of Grace; White’s From Slavery to Servanthood; Smith’s Testimony; Sartelle’s Infant Baptism; and Murray’s The Sovereignty of God)
- Baptism and Membership certificates
• Church bulletins (subscription service)
• Go.Teach! (Free articles and teaching helps).

6. Communication

As the Executive Director of GCP, Mr. Patete is accountable to the Board of Trustees. He and his staff are responsive to concerns expressed by the parent committees. Comments from within the OPC concerning content of GCP materials are properly and most helpfully addressed through sessions or presbyteries directly to the CCE.

F. Ministerial Training Institute of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (MTIOPC)

1. History

The 34th (1967) General Assembly established the Committee on Ministerial Training (CMT) as a standing committee of the General Assembly. The 47th (1980) General Assembly made the CMT a Subcommittee on Ministerial Training (SMT) of the CCE. The 65th (1998) General Assembly approved a plan for the SMT to establish a Ministerial Training Institute.

2. Purpose

The stated purpose of the MTIOPC is to assist in maintaining and enhancing the quality of ministerial service in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, especially pastoral and missionary, by helping men to prepare for informed and effective ministry that conforms to the standard of Holy Scripture. To this end, the Institute seeks to advance a constructive view of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and its doctrine, government, discipline, and worship.

3. Oversight

The six-member SMT serves as the board of directors for the Institute. These men are elected directly by the General Assembly. The MTIOPC offers instruction by a variety of means, primarily readings, correspondence, and training seminars under the SMT’s supervision.

4. Director and Administrator

Mr. Olinger serves as Director of MTIOPC and Dr. James H. Thomas, Jr., ruling elder at Immanuel OPC, West Allegheny, Pennsylvania, serves as Administrator.

5. Intensive Training

Intensive training seminars are held in different geographical regions in order to give greater opportunity for men and churches throughout the entire OPC to take advantage of MTIOPC. The May 2005 session was held at the OPC administration building in Willow Grove, Pennsylvania. The January 2006 session was held at Lake Sherwood OPC, Orlando, Florida. The SMT is exploring the possibility of additional sites to host the training sessions.

6. Program of Instruction

Now in its seventh year of offering instruction, the MTIOPC provides courses in:

a. The Westminster Standards (G. I. Williamson)
b. Ecclesiology (A. Craig Troxel)
c. Presbyterian Polity (Stuart R. Jones)
d. Homiletics (William Shishko and Peter J. Vosteen)
e. Pastoral Theology (William Shishko)  
f. Covenant Nurture (Thomas E. Tyson)  
g. Reformed Worship (Larry E. Wilson)  
h. Defending the Faith (William D. Dennison)  
i. The OPC: History, Character, Distinguishing Characteristics (John R. Muether)  

7. Participants in 2005 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Under</th>
<th>Licentiate</th>
<th>Pastors</th>
<th>Ruling</th>
<th>Elders</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homiletics (Shishko and Vosteen)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccesiology (Troxel)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC History (Muether)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring and Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Polity (Jones)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Standards (Williamson)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some of the participants have taken several of the courses.  
** Men from fifteen of the sixteen OPC presbyteries participated in 2005 MTIOPC courses.

8. Numerical History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New Students</th>
<th>Returning Students</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. 2006-2007 Course Schedule

The upcoming MTIOPC course schedule is:

Fall 2006—Intensive Training site to be determined

- Presbyterian Polity (Jones)  
- The Westminster Standards (Williamson)  
- Covenant Nurture (Tyson)  

Spring 2007—Intensive Training to be held in Willow Grove, PA

- Ecclesiology (Troxel)  
- Homiletics (Shishko and Vosteen)
G. Aids for Ministerial Training:

1. Glenn R. Coie Memorial Scholarship Fund

Glenn R. Coie was a minister and missionary in the OPC who served effectively and faithfully for many years. He was particularly interested in the training of young men for the pastoral ministry in the OPC. A fund in his honor exists to assist those who have the following basic qualifications:

1) He must be a candidate for the gospel ministry under care of a presbytery of the OPC.
2) He must be enrolled in a seminary.
3) If he is a senior, he must ordinarily be pursuing licensure in his presbytery.

Qualified applicants can receive a loan of up to $1500 and/or a limited grant. Application can be sent to the General Secretary of the CCE, 607 N. Easton Road, Bldg. E, Box P, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania 19090.

At the end of 2005, $17,555 was available in the fund.

2. Book Grants

An important component of ministerial training is the development of the pastor’s personal library, which tends to fall beyond a young minister’s budget. To address this problem, an anonymous donor made a generous gift of $10,000 to assist recently ordained ministers of the OPC to obtain books of their choice, especially solid biblical commentaries, for their libraries. At the end of 2005, $5,000 was available in the fund.

The CCE has established the following rules governing the disbursement of these funds:

1) Requirements:
   • have been ordained within three years of applying for the program
   • be engaged in pastoral or missionary ministry of the OPC
   • have completed at least two MTIOPC courses
2) To receive a grant, one must provide the following:
   • name of seminary, or seminaries, attended and date of graduation
   • dates of ordination and installation into current ministry
   • name and address of body with which currently he is serving as a minister
   • in the case of application for the three-year option, a letter from the proper person confirming that the body with which the applicant serves has committed to at least match the grant for each of the three years
3) Grants are credited in one of two ways:
   • a $200 one-time grant
   • up to $150 per year for up to three years if that amount is at least matched each year by the minister’s calling body
4) Applications are to be sent to the Administrator of the MTIOPC

H. The Ministerial Internship Program

1. Faithful Ministry
A ministerial internship program is at the heart of faithful ministry. The Apostle instructs “what you have heard from me in the presence of many witnesses entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also” (2 Tim. 2:2). The CCE assists the Church in this vital ministry by recruiting and providing guidance to prospective ministerial interns and mentoring churches.

2. Financial Assistance

The CCE provides matching funds up to $900 monthly for approved internships in 2006. In order to help churches with the financial burden that results from taking on an intern, the CCE is planning on raising the monthly support to $1,000 per month in 2007. This marks the third consecutive year that the CCE has raised the matching monthly support ($2005/$800, 2006/$900, 2007/$1,000). In 2005 the CCE provided $93,833 (a 25% increase over 2004 support) to assist 16 churches in funding summer and year-long internships.

3. Summer Internships 2005

The CCE assisted in funding 11 summer internships during 2005. The summer internships were:

- Grace OPC, Sheboygan, Wisconsin—John Shaw
- Faith OPC, Pole Tavern, New Jersey—Kevin Medcalf
- Calvary OPC, Glenside, Pennsylvania—James LaBelle
- Trinity OPC, Hatboro, Pennsylvania—Mark Sallade
- Pilgrim OPC, Metamora, Michigan—Timothy McClymonds
- Bethel Reformed Presbyterian OPC, Fredericksburg, Virginia—Ethan Allison
- Matthews OPC, Matthews, North Carolina—Scott Davenport
- Sovereign Grace OPC, Oak Harbor, Washington—Benji Swinburnson
- Harvest OPC, Vista, California—Rich Cunningham
- Mission OPC, St. Paul, Minnesota—Ryan Kron
- Christ Presbyterian OPC, Janesville, Wisconsin—Chuck Muether

4. Year-long Internships 2005-2006

The CCE also assisted in funding nine year-long internships which started in 2005. These longer internships are designed for men who believe that God is calling them to the pastoral ministry and who have made a commitment to pursue licensure in the OPC. The year-long internships, some of which are still continuing, are:

- Grace OPC, Sewickley, Pennsylvania—Brian Belh
- Calvary OPC, Glenside, Pennsylvania—Roth Reason
- Bethel Presbyterian OPC, Wheaton, Illinois—John Fikkert
- Covenant OPC, San Jose, California—Tim Black
- Lynnwood OPC, Lynnwood, Washington—Adam King
- Christ Covenant Presbyterian OPC, Amarillo, Texas—Andrew Moody
- Grace OPC, Mount Vernon, Washington—Jody Morris
- Providence Presbyterian OPC, Austin, Texas—Christopher Sandoval
- Franklin Square OPC, Franklin Square, New York—Benjamin Miller

5. Intern Statistics

The CCE has helped fund, coordinate, and supervise 286 ministerial internships in OPC congregations since 1990. The CCE approved intern applications from 17 congregations for 2006 summer interns and from six congregations for 2006-2007 year-long interns.
6. Guidelines for Seeking an Intern

For churches interested in participating in the ministerial internship program, the following policies guide ministerial internship approval:

a. The Committee will not fund second summer internships for men not committed to the OPC.
b. OPC and PCA men contemplating summer internships are required ordinarily to be under care of a presbytery.
c. Year-long interns must be members of the OPC.
d. A year-long intern must apply to a presbytery of the OPC for licensure no later than the commencement of the internship with a view to his being licensed at least by the mid-point of the internship.
e. Failure of a session to return intern evaluations will be considered a negative factor on a church’s next application for an internship.
f. Churches having a year-long intern are strongly encouraged to incorporate enrollment in an MTIOPC course in the plan for the internship and the mentoring pastor should consider the advisability of enrolling in an MTI course together with his intern.
g. Churches participating in the internship program, but which do not receive funding from the CCE, are asked to assist us by submitting evaluations of interns.
h. The Intern Evaluation form includes “preaching” as a separate category.
i. A separate document entitled “Committee Policy on Selecting Mentoring Churches” will be sent to all OPC churches by December of each year.

7. Readiness for Ministry Seminars

The General Secretary of the CCE also participates with the CHMCE in the Readiness for Ministry Seminars on different seminary campuses. During 2005, the General Secretary participated in seminars at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Westminster Seminary California, Escondido, California; and Mid-America Reformed Seminary, Dyer, Indiana. He also visited Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Greenville, South Carolina. While on seminary visits, the General Secretary meets with students to promote the OPC as a good option for Reformed ministry and to recruit for its ministerial internship program.

8. Mentoring Conference

The CCE held the 2005 Intern Mentoring Conference (IMC) in May 2005. The Rev. Ronald E. Pearce, pastor of Church of the Covenant in Hackettstown, New Jersey, and the Rev. William Shishko, pastor of Franklin Square OPC, Franklin Square, New York, were the main speakers. Mr. Pearce spoke on developing an intern mentoring plan. Mr. Shishko spoke on the call to the ministry. The Rev. Larry Wilson, instructor in the MTIOPC course on Reformed Worship, gave a presentation related to the course. The purposes of the training conferences are to:

a. Inform mentors of the purposes and goals of the OPC intern program and some of the best ways to realize these goals with OPC interns.
b. Provide insights and lessons from experienced OPC mentors, especially in the areas of these mentors’ demonstrated strengths.
c. Give workshops or equivalent forums for more informal interaction among seasoned mentors and less experienced ones.
d. Present material by various faculty members of the MTIOPC to help intern mentors develop various areas of their own understanding of the OPC, its faith and its practice.

Expenses for year-long intern mentors who attend the conference are borne by the CCE. Summer intern mentors and other OPC ministers who desire to attend the conference may have some or all of their expenses provided.

9. Future

The CCE believes that because of the importance of the intern program to the OPC it must budget and allocate more money to develop the Ministerial Intern Program. The CCE would like to increase the amount given to churches to $1,000 per month in 2007 in keeping with inflation so that churches can continue to participate in this program. In seeking to allow a greater number of churches to participate, the CCE is requesting $130,000 for the internship program in 2007. It should be noted that funds given to the church for the Ministerial Intern Program go back to local churches as they work in a joint relationship with the CCE to develop men for the gospel ministry.

10. Thanksgiving

We sincerely thank the dedicated congregations, pastors, and sessions who have committed themselves to the sacrificial service of providing this critical training and ministry. This is an exceedingly important ministry to these men and to the church.

I. Candidates and Credentials Conference

The 71st General Assembly (2004) encouraged the CCE and its SMT “to seek ways of working more closely with the candidates and credentials committees of presbyteries in order to bring ministerial candidates to a fuller understanding of the confessional standards, the Book of Church Order, the Minutes of the General Assembly and the history of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.” In response to this encouragement, the CCE hosted the inaugural Candidates and Credentials Conference on August 8-9 in Willow Grove, Pennsylvania. Invited to the conference were one representative of each presbytery’s Candidates and Credentials Committee. An emphasis was placed on the sharing of information by presbyteries, learning, and fellowship. Speakers included Dr. James S. Gidley, the Rev. Alan D. Strange, the Rev. G.I. Williamson and the Rev. Dr. A. Craig Troxel.

J. Seminary Visitation

1. Program

In 1998 the SMT revised its program of seminary visitation. The immediate purpose of visiting a seminary is to arrive at a more accurate picture of the seminary’s sympathy with the OPC and compatibility with our constitutional standards and of the seminary’s impact on the OPC through its graduates. We also have in view a cumulative effect of visiting seminaries: that we will arrive at a better understanding of what the OPC herself must do through the internship program, MTIOPC, or other means, to prepare her candidates for the ministry in the current situation. The seminary visitation program is not an accreditation program. The outcome of a visit is not intended to be either an endorsement or a disqualification of a seminary as a place suitable for training men for ministry in the OPC. The SMT arranges for men to visit seminaries and then to report their findings back to the SMT. The SMT reports on the visits to the General Assembly.
2. Seminary Visit Chronology

October 1998 Mid-America Reformed Seminary, Dyer, Indiana
**Visitation Members:** The Rev. G.I. Williamson, the Rev. Bruce Hollister, and the Rev. William Bomer

March 1999 Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
**Visitation Members:** Dr. James S. Gidley, the Rev. Lawrence Semel, and the Rev. Hailu Mekonnen

April 1999 Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Greenville, South Carolina

February 2001 Westminster Theological Seminary, Escondido, California
**Visitation Members:** Mr. David Winslow, Jr., the Rev. Thomas E. Tyson, and the Rev. Larry E. Wilson

March 2002 Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
**Visitation Members:** The Rev. Thomas E. Tyson, the Rev. Mark R. Brown, and the Rev. Danny E. Olinger

October 2003 Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Hamilton, Massachusetts
**Visitation Members:** Mr. David Winslow, Jr., the Rev. Gregory E. Reynolds, the Rev. John R. Hilbelink

3. Westminster Seminary California

a. Visitation Team

The Ministerial Training Subcommittee (SMT) of the Committee on Christian Education (CCE) conducted a comprehensive visit of Westminster Seminary California (WSC), Escondido, California on February 16-17, 2005. The visiting committee consisted of:

Danny E. Olinger, General Secretary of the CCE
Rollin P. Keller and Alan R. Pontier, members of the Credentials Committee, Presbytery of Southern California
David Winslow, Jr., member of the SMT.

Potential conflict of interest notice: Mr. Winslow serves on the Board of Northwest Theological Seminary.
While on campus the visitation committee met with members of the WSC administration, faculty and student body, and attended a number of classes and special assemblies.

b. Historical and Statistical Information

2005 marks the 25th anniversary of WSC’s existence in Southern California. Started in 1980 as an offshoot of Westminster in Philadelphia, WSC is now operated and governed as a separate institution. During that time the student body has grown to approximately 130-135 students of whom 80 are enrolled in the Master of Divinity (M. Div.) program. Since the SMT’s last visit, WSC has ceased the Doctor of Ministry program and has added a Master of Arts in Christian Studies (MACS). The emphasis remains on the preparation of men for gospel ministry through the M.Div. program. With approximately 65 graduates now serving in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC) (in 2001 the number was 35), the seminary is a leading institution in providing ministerial candidates to the OPC.

There are 11 full-time faculty members (4-United Reformed Church (URC), 3-Presbyterian Church in America (PCA), 3-OPC, 1-Presbyterian Church of Great Britain). Part-time professors and instructors include three OPC men as well. The student body reflects the faculty makeup with the PCA at about 25%, the OPC and URC at about 10% each and the balance comprised of other reformed, evangelical, baptist, or independent churches.

The Board of Trustees is composed of members of the Christian Reformed Church (CRC)-4, Korean American Presbyterian Church (KAPC)-1, OPC-4, PCA-3, and URC-7. All board members are carefully screened and the CRC men on the board come from conservative congregations. WSC is particularly focused on serving the KAPC, OPC, PCA, and URC. Financially, WSC is supported by 27 OPC, 23 URC, 13 CRC, 9 PCA, and 6 KAPC congregations. The URC and the OPC congregations provide the largest financial amounts.

c. Visit with President of WSC

The committee met with Dr. W. Robert Godfrey, president of WSC, and discussed a range of topics and issues which are herein reported.

Accreditation: WSC is an ATS and WASC accredited institution. One issue receiving increasing attention in higher education is the assessment of educational effectiveness. WSC has initiated faculty discussions of the key characteristics that it desires to see in every recipient of its M.Div. degree. Consensus on these key characteristics will then lead to further decisions regarding systematic means to discern whether the M.Div. program is enabling students’ growth toward these objectives.

Development: President Godfrey is pleased with the increased number of incoming students for the fall of 2005. Long-term plans call for building student housing on campus, which is seen as quite important given the high cost of housing in Southern California.

Faculty: OP faculty members are Steven Baugh (NT), Bryan Estelle (OT), and David VanDrunen (Systematics). Other OP instruction is provided by George Scipione (counseling), Zachary Keele (Greek) and D.G. Hart (Church History). With respect to the overall work of the faculty, it is President Godfrey’s assessment that the move toward a more Old School approach and confessional consciousness highlighted four years ago has continued.

A Confessional Institution: President Godfrey wants the faculty to keep asking what it means to be confessional so that “being confessional” is not taken for granted. It is the position of the administration that WSC must be an institution that “100%
endorses the Confessions.” Thus the administration believes that WSC cannot “stay below the radar screen” on a confessional matter like justification.

The relationship between Biblical Theology and Systematic Theology: President Godfrey sees a good level of faculty agreement that Biblical Theology contributes to a fully biblical and articulate Systematic Theology and that the value of a redemptive-historical reading of Scriptures does not mean that Biblical Theology should replace Systematic Theology.

The Westminster Standards: A course is taught every other year by Scott Clark (URC) with students pursuing ministry in a Presbyterian denomination strongly encouraged to take this class.

American Presbyterian History: This is covered in Modern Church History as well as in a one-week mini-course regularly taught by D.G. Hart.

Tongues and prophecy: The faculty is uniformly cessationist.

Days of Creation: President Godfrey is familiar with the action of the Seventy-First General Assembly (2004) regarding the days of creation issue and stated that the faculty would agree with the advice given to the presbyteries by that Assembly. Students noted that the report of the OPC’s General Assembly study committee on the issue is required reading. With regard to the positions of the various faculty members, one holds to day-age, three members to six ordinary days, and the rest to some form of the framework interpretation.

Women students: Women are not allowed in the M.Div. program or classes specific to that program. For example, women do not participate in the preaching classes.

Worship: There is support for “blended worship” from two faculty members in the Practical Theology department. The rest of the faculty is committed to worship more in keeping with historic reformed practice. Yet within this spectrum is a shared commitment to the regulative principle in worship. The faculty is far more unified on this issue than it was five years ago.

Preaching: The seminary’s approach to preaching is that it should be Christocentric and redemptive-historical; but the Practical Theology department emphasizes that redemptive-historical preaching does not mean the absence of application.

Counseling courses: Courses are taught according to the “nouthetic” approach to counseling theory and practice.

New Perspective, Federal Vision: No faculty members hold these positions, although the faculty attempts to give students some exposure to these views.

Polity: Students study the book of church order for their respective denomination during their Senior Seminar class.

Influencing students for the OPC, PCA and URC: There could be some mild tugging of students in one direction or another but the faculty is sensitive to the denomination from which students come and the sense of loyalty to that church which should rightly be present. How these churches handle “Christ and Culture,” worship and evangelism issues are seen as influencing some students toward one or another of these three churches.

White Horse Media (WHM): This is a new department at WSC which will not officially represent the seminary, though it is housed at the seminary. WHM is responsible for publishing Modern Reformation Magazine and the Whitehorse Inn radio program.

d. Conclusions
In the judgment of the visiting team, WSC offers a curriculum and community of learning that is effectual for preparing students for ministry in the OPC. The faculty’s accessibility to and mentoring of the student body is worthy of note. The focus and unity noted after the 2001 visit on being an institution committed to the Reformed confessions and a more Old School Presbyterian agenda have continued. This is not to say that there is not diversity on the faculty as, for example, the application of the regulative principle in worship or in views of the days of creation. Yet students are being educated for the most part in an environment friendly to the OPC’s character and distinctives. The OP students are enthusiastic about their preparation for the gospel ministry received at WSC and very appreciative of the OP congregations in the San Diego County area where they have worshipped, served, and been mentored during their seminary years.

The presence of an OP church in Escondido is a new development since the SMT’s last visit, one which has been welcomed by the administration, faculty, and students. The OP professors are active in the mission work and Pastor Keele is active on campus with students. He has hosted lunches for students on campus during which he and other OP ministers have presented topics on various aspects of pastoral ministry. These professors believe that relations with the local OP presbytery have improved during the past five years and they welcome continued interaction with members of the Presbytery of Southern California.

The tensions over the debate of the days of creation seem to have lessened. The seminary is on record as being committed to working within the advice given by the 2004 General Assembly to the presbyteries. Faculty members responsible for teaching on this subject are trying to be “rigorously fair” in teaching the various views, less dogmatic about their own view, and urging students to adopt their own view with humility, and this could help.

There remain areas of instruction that do not appear to be as fully addressed as would be desirable from the perspective of preparing men for ministry in the OPC. These include worship, the Westminster Standards, and OPC History. Notwithstanding this observation, WSC comes close to meeting the goals of the OPC’s Recommended Curriculum.

Finally, The Pattern of Sound Doctrine (P&R 2004, VanDrunen Editor) is a collection of 13 essays in honor of Robert B. Strimple contributed by OPC, ex-OPC and URC men who have served at one or both of the Westminster Seminaries. The visiting committee read it in preparation for the visit and would recommend it to other OP ministers and elders as representative of the teaching at WSC.

4. Reformed Theological Seminary, Orlando (RTS-Orlando)
   a. Visitation Team

   A visit by the SMT of the CCE to RTS-Orlando was conducted March 1-2, 2005. The visiting committee consisted of:
   The Rev. William M. Hobbs, Pastor, Calvary OPC, Tallahassee, FL
   The Rev. Danny E. Olinger, General Secretary of the CCE
   Mr. David Winslow, Jr., SMT member

   Potential Conflict of Interest notice: Mr. Winslow serves on the Board of Trustees of Northwest Theological Seminary.

   This was the first visitation of any campus of RTS by the SMT and was conducted in accordance with the SMT’s 1999 guidelines for seminary visits. The Orlando campus of RTS was chosen because it has provided a regular, though small,
stream of candidates for ministry in the OPC, has two OPC congregations nearby, and has several OP men involved in giving instruction.

During this visit the committee team attended most of the courses offered and the chapel service, met with several students, with faculty members, and with the President, Dr. Frank James, and the Acting Academic Dean, Dr. Mark Futato. The observations reported herein are based on these contacts, especially the visit with the administration. RTS-Orlando has a diverse faculty which is teaching a very diverse student body. RTS is a non-denominational seminary and for this reason the RTS-Orlando administration does not believe that it is necessary for the faculty to declare its position by way of public statement on various theological, ecclesiological, or societal issues of the day. These factors need to be borne in mind when reading the visiting committee’s observations.

b. Historical and Statistical Information

RTS-Orlando, the largest of the three RTS campuses (Charlotte, NC and Jackson, MS) opened its doors in 1989. In addition to the three main campuses, RTS operates three extension campuses (Washington D.C., Atlanta, GA; and Boca Raton, FL) and a Virtual Campus. This family of campuses traces it roots to the mid-1960s when men in the Presbyterian Church in the United States felt the need to fill a void in the southeast with a seminary “committed both to Reformed theology and to the Bible as God’s inerrant Word.” The growth in the Seminary since 1989 has been quite dramatic, with over 2500 people currently taking one or more RTS courses and approximately 800 taking Family Therapy Education. RTS is reaching beyond the southeast with its plans for growth as one of its advertising phrases states: “Flexible theological education: when, where –you decide.” The student body on campus at Orlando is 476 with over 60 denominations represented. It is significant to note that RTS-Orlando has a partnership arrangement with Campus Crusade for Christ which involves over 120 students from that organization taking from one class to a full degree program. The M.Div. program has 158 students, six of whom are identified with the OPC. There are at least six RTS-Orlando graduates currently serving as ministers in the OPC.

RTS is an administration-run, rather than faculty-run, seminary with an overarching board that administers all the campuses, yet each campus operates somewhat autonomously, with its own president, making its own decisions on faculty and course offerings. The composition of the RTS-Orlando faculty and instructors is primarily PCA, with several coming from non-denominational churches, Baptist churches and the OPC, and at least one from the PCUSA. The OP men currently providing instruction are ruling elder Mr. John Muether (Associate Professor of Church History), the Rev. Eric Watkins (part-time preaching instructor), and Dr. Mark Garcia (Systematics instructor).

The trustees, administration and faculty must annually sign a subscription statement in which they:

1) Declare belief in the authority and infallibility of the Word of God;
2) Declare belief in Reformed theology as set forth in the Westminster Standards (in the form adopted by the PCUSA in 1789) as containing the system of doctrine taught in Scripture;
3) Promise not to teach contrary, directly or implicitly, to any element of that system of doctrine;
4) Agree to notifying the trustees should a change of any kind take place in his belief not in accord with the subscription statement.
c. Visit with President of RTS-Orlando

The visiting team met with President James and Academic Dean Futato and discussed a range of topics and issues which are herein reported.

Female Students and Faculty: Women are admitted to all degree programs and participate fully in the preaching classes. There are no women on the faculty. However, at least one faculty member believes that women should be ordained.

Days of Creation: The length of the days of creation is not considered an issue of concern among the faculty who hold to a variety of views, including the “framework interpretation,” which is held by several men and taught in the OT exegetical classes.

OPC History: American Presbyterian history is not specifically offered at this time although it and OPC history does receive some coverage as part of a 20th Century Church History class taught by an OPC faculty member.

Church polity: For Presbyterian students, polity is currently taught by the Stated Clerk of the PCA in a one week class.

Ecclesiology: This is taught in a one-week course (currently by Dr. Sinclair Ferguson).

Westminster Standards: Since the time of the visit, the seminary has instituted a class on the Westminster Standards taught by Mr. Muether.

New Perspective/Federal Vision theology: These views are not held by any faculty member.

Open Theism: This view has no supporters and faculty members have spoken against it.

Cessation of Spiritual Gifts (tongues and prophecy in particular): Cessation is a position that all faculty members hold to although one faculty member has written critically of the OPC for its past discipline of ministers who did not hold a cessationist position.

Apologetics: This is taught from a presuppositional perspective.

Tri-perspectivalism: This approach to ethics and systematic theology, associated particularly with Dr. John Frame, is supported by many faculty members and considered to be an outworking of Cornelius Van Til’s thought.

Liturgics or worship: A spectrum of thought on worship from traditional to contemporary approaches is represented on the faculty and presented to the students, with the emphasis in practice quite strongly weighted toward a contemporary “blended” approach to worship.

Counseling: Courses follow integrationist principles, in contrast to the nouthetic, which are willing to accept the findings of modern psychology studies and integrate them with biblical revelation.

Biblical theology and Systematic Theology: These are seen by the administration as being firmly connected and working together in harmony.

Hebrew Instruction: Hebrew is offered on a two-track basis, with the advanced track being the one which Presbyterian students from the PCA and OPC are encouraged to take. The non-advanced track integrates basic language knowledge with computer software capabilities. The non-advanced, basic track enables the student to work with the Hebrew text though not read it. According to Academic Dean Futato, this basic track is considered cutting edge and one which other evangelical seminaries will be implementing in the future.

Preaching: The RTS-Orlando approach to preaching is considered to be “typical Presbyterian” in which there is an emphasis on topical preaching in contrast to preaching that is more exegetical.
The Sabbath: There are no particular policies with respect to Sabbath keeping at RTS-Orlando and there are on the faculty a variety of perspectives from the Puritan to the continental views.

d. Conclusions

RTS-Orlando provides an evangelical and reformed educational environment which to the visiting committee team seemed to come with a noticeable “post-denominational” ethos. OPC students will find a very diverse, primarily evangelical, student body and will probably also find that their views, as those coming from the OPC, challenged on a number of issues in the classroom. In the opinion of the visiting committee team, OP students who choose to attend RTS-Orlando would be best served by being fully involved in the life of one of the two local OP churches (Reformation OPC, Oviedo and Lake Sherwood OPC, Orlando). Students training for the gospel ministry in the OPC would also be strongly urged to augment their training at RTS-Orlando with courses from the MTOOPC. The committee team notes that there is a potential lack of campus community that may be due to the block scheduling of classes. Block scheduling allows students and professors to concentrate the educational experience in a day or two on campus per week. The administration is concerned to improve the community life, but believes that block scheduling is a positive for both students who need to work and faculty who have other ministry opportunities which they are enabled to pursue.

IV. PROPOSED BUDGET 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Outreach</td>
<td>262,529</td>
<td>274,611</td>
<td>280,608</td>
<td>299,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>New Horizons</em></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Reserves</td>
<td>30,528</td>
<td>30,921</td>
<td>66,418</td>
<td>70,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>493,057</td>
<td>525,532</td>
<td>582,026</td>
<td>620,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>New Horizons</em></td>
<td>200,227</td>
<td>221,947</td>
<td>233,971</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet ministries</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>22,824</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ordained Servant</em></td>
<td>32,003</td>
<td>14,754</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial Training Institute of the OPC</td>
<td>31,463</td>
<td>36,810</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial Internship Program</td>
<td>70,473</td>
<td>97,550</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT / SRC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>135,067</td>
<td>109,045</td>
<td>130,305</td>
<td>136,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>486,533</td>
<td>508,556</td>
<td>582,026</td>
<td>620,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess/(Deficiency)</td>
<td>6,524</td>
<td>16,976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. ELECTIONS

A. CCE

The CCE is composed of three classes, each composed of five members—three ministers and two ruling elders. Two of the members of each class are also members of the SMT. The Class of 2009 is to be elected by this Assembly. The present composition of the CCE is as follows:

Class of 2006
Ministers: Sidney D. Dyer, Thomas E. Tyson, G. I. Williamson
Ruling Elders: Darryl G. Hart, David Winslow, Jr.

Class of 2007
Ministers: Rodney T. King, Stephen A. Pribble, Alan D. Strange
Ruling Elders: James S. Gidley, John R. Muether

Class of 2008
Ministers: Gregory E. Reynolds, A. Craig Troxel, David VanDrunen
Ruling Elders: John S. Deliyannides, Paul S. MacDonald

Members whose terms expire at this Assembly are:

Ministers:
Sidney D. Dyer (SRC, Subcommittee on Serial Publications)
Thomas E. Tyson (SMT, Executive Committee, Subcommittee on Finance)
G.I. Williamson (SRC)

Ruling Elders:
Darryl G. Hart (SRC, Subcommittee on Serial Publications)
David Winslow, Jr. (SMT, GCP Trustee, Executive Committee, CCE treasurer, Subcommittee on Finance)

Mr. Williamson has respectfully requested not to be reelected to the Committee.

B. SMT

The members of the CCE’s Subcommittee on Ministerial Training (SMT) are elected directly by the Assembly. The six members must include at least two ministers and two ruling elders.

2006 2007 2008
Rev. Thomas E. Tyson Mr. John R. Muether Rev. A. Craig Troxel
Mr. David Winslow, Jr. Mr. James S. Gidley Rev. David VanDrunen

C. Procedure to Elect the Class of 2009

The Assembly must first elect the SMT class of 2009. These men elected to the SMT are automatically elected to the CCE. The Assembly must then elect the remaining three members of the CCE class of 2009.
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I INTRODUCTION

The sessions, congregations and presbyteries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church have developed a godly passion for the establishment of new churches. They have come to expect that their Church will plant a number of new mission works each year; that new men will be needed to fill the ranks of those who serve as pastors in her growing number of congregations; and that significant dollars will need to be expended in the divine direction of her expansion. These attitudes are now a part of what describes her denominational consciousness. The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension rejoices over these expectant attitudes in the OPC and is humbled to be a part of the process of the accomplishment of the church planting expansion that is occurring within her midst.

But during 2005, our great covenant God saw fit to lay before us issues and events even more challenging than continuing expansive growth. By mid-year the Committee had sponsored its first-ever OPC Hispanic Ministries Conference in response to a rising and recognizable interest in the Reformed Faith in general and the Orthodox Presbyterian
Church in particular among Spanish-speaking people throughout North America. And as the summer drew to a close, Hurricane Katrina, and her sisters Rita and Wilma, devastated the Gulf Coast of the United States and moved the Committee into unanticipated new ministry.

As the year 2006 unfolds, seventeen new mission works are busy finding their organizing pastors and doing the work of establishing a firm foundation on the Lord Jesus Christ who is their head and cornerstone. So the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension submits to the 73rd General Assembly the report that follows, in praise to God who has made our labors productive. We ask you to lift up your eyes as you read it, and understand it to be a recounting of His mighty acts among us and a statement of faith that He will continue to provide all that is needed to accomplish what He has laid out for us to do.

II FIELD SUPPORT IN 2005

A. Fields Supported

The following mission works were provided with financial assistance in 2005 (listed by presbytery):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pastor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dakotas</td>
<td>Provo, Utah</td>
<td>Scott L. Seder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>Charlottesville, Virginia</td>
<td>Anthony Monaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purcellville, Virginia</td>
<td>Charles R. Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan &amp; Ontario</td>
<td>Hudsonville, Michigan</td>
<td>Stephen W. Igo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shedden, Ontario</td>
<td>K. Dale Collison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>Jorge Barros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>Brainerd, Minnesota</td>
<td>Roger L. Gibbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houghton, Michigan</td>
<td>Todd Wagenmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Berlin, Wisconsin</td>
<td>James T. Hoekstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reedsburg, Wisconsin</td>
<td>Christian M. McShaffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Camden, New Jersey</td>
<td>Benjamin Alvira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medford, New Jersey</td>
<td>David Harr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vineland, New Jersey</td>
<td>Sixto Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York &amp; New England</td>
<td>Bucksport, Maine</td>
<td>Russell Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td>Michael L. Babcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reno, Nevada</td>
<td>Andrew J. Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>Idaho Falls, Washington</td>
<td>David A. Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monroe, Washington</td>
<td>David Inks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olympia, Washington</td>
<td>Brett A. McNeill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Angeles, Washington</td>
<td>William Renkema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Larry E. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Allegheny, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Robert L. Broline, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Yardley, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Harry R. McLeod, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Bradenton, Florida</td>
<td>David A. Smiley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key West, Florida</td>
<td>William V. Welzien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huntsville, Alabama</td>
<td>Mark A. Winder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td>Russell J. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oviedo, Florida</td>
<td>Eric B. Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Aiken, South Carolina</td>
<td>Mark J. Larson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charlotte, North Carolina (Clifford L. Blair)
Hickory, North Carolina (E. Cody Ray)
Neon, Kentucky (John W. Belden)

Southern California
Los Angeles, California (Gonzalo Salinas)
Escondido, California (Zachary Keele)
Mission Viejo, California (Douglas L. Watson)
Moreno Valley, California (Robert G. Herrmann)

Southwest
Dallas (NE), Texas (Chad E. Bond)
Houston, Texas (Adam A. York)

B. New Fields

Ten new mission works began receiving financial assistance in 2005: Aiken, South Carolina; Bradenton, Florida; Brainerd, Minnesota; Bucksport, Maine; Medford, New Jersey; Olympia, Washington; Reno, Nevada; Shedden, Ontario; Vineland, New Jersey; and Yardley, Pennsylvania.

C. Field Support Policy

The Committee reminds the church that the following financial support policies are being followed:

1. Aid for new mission works
   a. The Committee will provide financial assistance for a mission work up to 50% of its total budget and only if the presbytery and/or the mission work cannot fully support the labors of a full-time evangelist for that work. This support will be for no more than four years on a quarterly declining scale after the first year, contingent upon the renewed yearly recommendation of the presbytery and with the understanding that the Committee will be consulted in the selection of the church planter.
   b. Before receiving initial support, the presbytery will submit to the Committee an historical sketch of the mission work, including guidelines and provisions for oversight and evaluation, and a plan for developing it into a self-governing and self-supporting congregation, including adequate provision in its budget for the labors of the evangelist on a full-time basis.
   c. Before receiving continued support for the second, third, or fourth years, the presbytery will submit by November 15 a request for such renewal, together with a written annual evaluation of the mission work, including an indication that provision has been made in its budget for the continued labors of the evangelist on a full-time basis and for benevolent giving to presbytery and denominational causes.
   d. The Committee remains firm in its desire to work in partnership with the presbyteries in establishing churches that are Reformed in doctrine and Presbyterian in polity. Emphasis is also placed on the importance of every mission work identifying itself with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and including support of denominational budgets in the early ordering of its finances.
   e. Monthly reports are presented by church planters to the Committee as well as to the home missions committee of their presbytery. These include financial matters as well as attendance figures and a record of outreach calls being made. The Committee expects every church planter to make at least thirty outreach-type calls monthly. Items for praise and petition are also gleaned from these reports, with some being passed on through Home Missions Today and the Prayer Calendar in New Horizons.
2. Support for non-aid-receiving mission works

   Financial support is not the only kind of aid provided for the development of mission works. The coordination of prayer support makes the whole church aware of the needs of its mission works and encourages church planters and young congregations. Such prayer support will be coordinated by the Committee according to the following policy: The Committee will provide the same prayer support normally rendered to aid-receiving mission works to non-aid-receiving mission works upon request of the presbytery with the following stipulations:
   a. Non-aid-receiving mission works will make a commitment to report monthly on the challenges and blessings of the ministry for use in prayer support.
   b. Services and assistance provided by the Committee will include prayer listings in *New Horizons* and *Home Missions Today*, in addition to those services which the Committee makes available to all congregations of the OPC.
   c. Such requests from a presbytery will be on a yearly basis with renewal up to four years.

D. Support Concluded

   During 2005, nine churches concluded their support relationship with the Committee as follows:
   
   Aid totaling $50,550 was provided at the request of the Presbytery of the Southeast to Redeemer Presbyterian Church in Charlotte, North Carolina, for the support of Clifford L. Blair from July 2003 through December 2005, after which the session and presbytery indicated that further financial assistance to the work was not required.
   
   Aid was provided at the request of the Presbytery of the Southwest to Providence OPC in Houston, Texas, for the support of Adam A. York from August 2001 through July 2005, totaling $60,900.
   
   Aid was provided at the request of the Presbytery of Northern California to Providence OPC in Las Vegas, Nevada, for the support of Michael L. Babcock from March 2001 through February 2005, totaling $43,630.
   
   Aid was provided at the request of the Presbytery of the Northwest to Westminster OPC in Monroe, Washington, for the support of David Inks from January 2002 through December 2005, totaling $30,450.
   
   Aid was provided at the request of the Presbytery of Southern California to Sovereign Grace OPC in Moreno Valley, California, for the support of Robert G. Hermann from January 2002 through December 2005, totaling $42,630.
   
   Aid was provided at the request of the Presbytery of the Midwest to Covenant Presbyterian Church in New Berlin, Wisconsin, for the support of James T. Hoekstra from January 2002 through December 2005, totaling $42,630.
   
   Aid totaling $74,250 was provided at the request of the Presbytery of the South to Christ Presbyterian Church in New Orleans, Louisiana, for the support of Russell J. Hamilton from July 1999 through June 2005, after which the session and the presbytery determined to close the work.
   
   Aid totaling $40,000 was provided at the request of the Presbytery of the Dakotas to Christ OPC in Provo, Utah, for the support of Scott L. Seder from May 2004 through December 2005, after which the session and the presbytery determined to close the work.
   
   Aid totaling $24,725 was provided at the request of the Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic to Ketoctin Covenant Presbyterian Church in Purcellville, Virginia, for the support of Charles R. Biggs from August 2003 through December 2005, after which the session and presbytery indicated that further financial assistance to the work was not required.
III REGIONAL HOME MISSIONARIES

God has raised up a wonderfully gifted group of men to serve as regional home missionaries and has used their labors to establish many new Orthodox Presbyterian churches. These men serve as church planting representatives of their presbyteries and as liaisons with CHMCE. They perform a wide variety of church planting tasks for their presbyteries and for the denomination. They meet with groups interested in establishing new mission works. They provide wisdom and counsel to organizing pastors and supervising sessions. And they assist presbytery home missions committees with their expanding administrative responsibilities in an enlarged OPC in the process of finding, calling, and caring for the evangelists who become new church planters. During 2005, the regional churches of the OPC were served by eight full-time and two part-time regional home missionaries.

Rev. DeLacy A. Andrews, Jr., continued his ministry as a regional home missionary for the Presbytery of the Southeast by assisting in the development of mission works in Charlotte and Hickory, North Carolina; Neon, Kentucky; Aiken and Greenville, South Carolina; Cookeville, Tennessee; and Carrollton, Georgia. He has provided assistance to groups of people in Memphis and Nashville, Tennessee, and Williamsburg, Virginia.

Rev. James L. Bosgraf continued his ministry as a regional home missionary for both the Presbytery of the Midwest and the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario by assisting with the mission works in New Berlin and Reedsburg, Wisconsin; Houghton, Hudsonville, and Manistee, Michigan; Brainerd and St. Paul, Minnesota; and Jordan, Meaford, and Toronto, Ontario. He assisted congregations in Momence, Illinois and Roberts, Wisconsin as they joined the OPC. He provided help to groups of people in Illinois, Michigan, Ontario, and Indiana in exploring the possibility of becoming new OP mission works.

Rev. Gary W. Davenport continued his ministry as regional home missionary for the Presbytery of the Southwest by focusing much of his attention on the development of the mission work in the Mid-Cities area of Dallas, Texas. He continued to assist with recently planted churches in Dallas Northeast, Fort Worth, Houston, and Plainview, Texas. And he has been exploring potential new fields in Texas and New Mexico.

Rev. Richard N. Ellis continued his labors as a half-time regional home missionary for the Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic. He assisted with the development of the mission works in Charlottesville and Purcellville, Virginia; and Clarksville and St. Mary’s County, Maryland. He continues to lead the planting of a church in the Maryland House of Corrections at Jessup. He has been assisting with exploratory work in Washington, D.C. He assisted with the development of a potential new work in Jefferson County, West Virginia.

Ruling Elder Bruce Fenton assisted the Presbytery of New Jersey as their home missions administrator with the restart of the OPC congregation in Bridgeton and with the development of the inner city mission work in Camden. He has also been assisting an independent pastor in the Pennsville area who is working toward affiliation with the Presbytery. He assisted with the development of Immanuel OPC in Medford, Nueva Esperanza in Vineland, and an evening worship service ministry in the Chapel at Princeton University.

Ruling Elder James A. Heemstra continued his ministry as regional home missionary for the Presbytery of the South by assisting in the development of the mission work in Bradenton, Florida. He also assisted the works in Birmingham, Madison, and Mobile, Alabama; Natchitoches, Louisiana; and Pensacola, Florida. In addition, he has done exploratory work for mission efforts in South Florida and in Montgomery, Alabama.
Rev. Gerald P. Malkus continued his labors as a part-time home missions administrator for the New York region of the Presbytery of New York and New England. He has explored various communities as potential fields.

Rev. Lawrence B. Oldaker continued his labors as regional home missionary for the Presbytery of Ohio. He has assisted the mission works in Huntington, West Virginia; West Allegheny, Pennsylvania; and Indianapolis, Indiana. He is preaching and teaching weekly at the mission work in Kirkland, Ohio. He has also been exploring opportunities in northern Kentucky and in West Virginia.

Rev. Donald M. Poundstone continued his ministry as regional home missionary for the Presbytery of Southern California. He assisted in the development of mission works in Escondido, Paso Robles, Mission Viejo, Moreno Valley, and Temecula, California. He has also been exploring the possibility of a new work in the area of Big Bear Lake.

Rev. Thomas E. Tyson concluded his labors as regional home missionary for the Presbytery of Philadelphia at the end of June. He had primarily been assisting the mission works in Carlisle and Yardley, Pennsylvania. He assisted the mission work in Broomall, Pennsylvania. He also assisted New Life OPC in Williamsport with plans for planting a daughter congregation in Danville.

The Committee gives thanks to God for each of these dedicated and mature men and for their effective labors as church planters and church planting coordinators for their presbyteries.

IV WORKING WITH THE PRESBYTERIES

The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension sees its work as that of assisting the presbyteries in their establishment and care of new churches throughout the country. It is the presbyteries which authorize the beginning of new mission works and oversee their progress and development. It is the presbyteries which approve and call qualified men to work as church planters. The Committee stands in support of the work which the presbyteries do. Each year the general secretary and the associate general secretary visit at least half of the presbyteries at the time of their regular stated meetings and spend time with the home missions committees of those regional church bodies in an effort to assist, encourage, and coordinate.

In a continuing effort to foster a spirit of cooperation and partnership with the presbyteries, the Committee continues to distribute and use its Manual for Presbytery/CHMCE Partnership. This document, which is also published in electronic format on the OPC’s web site, is a description of the outworking of FG XXIX and also provides assistance to presbytery home missions committees in their work.

The Committee and its staff are constantly seeking new and better ways of being of service to the presbyteries of the OPC. The staff is regularly in contact with presbytery home missions committee chairmen and regional home missionaries. Information about potential church planters, procedural suggestions, and financial arrangements is constantly being shared via visits, phone calls, and e-mail. The concept of a true partnership between the presbyteries of the OPC and the denominational Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension has become a welcome and working reality.

From this partnership with the presbyteries has come the publication of Planting An Orthodox Presbyterian Church. This manual, which is also published in electronic format on the OPC’s web site, has proved useful for better equipping new OP church planters to their task. But it has also provided a helpful tool for working with emerging new groups and with the orientation of the overseeing sessions of new mission works. It is the
Committee’s hope that this document will continue to provide valuable assistance to our presbyteries in an Orthodox Presbyterian Church which God continues to expand.

Each fall, the Committee sponsors a Regional Church Extension Conference in order to enable presbytery regional home missionaries and home missions committee chairmen to confer together with the CHMCE staff in an effort to coordinate, as much as possible, their ministries and finances. These gatherings have proved increasingly beneficial to the whole church. They have enabled the Committee and its staff to understand more precisely the needs and challenges faced by the presbyteries and have enabled presbytery home missions committees to work together with each other as well as with the denominational Committee in their efforts to start new churches. The 2005 gathering was held November 3-5 in the facilities of Pilgrim OPC in Raleigh, North Carolina.

For more than a decade OP church planting practice has been largely a response to requests for us to help form a pre-existing core group into a new OP congregation. But in 2003 the first steps were taken for a more intentional strategy to be laid side-by-side with the current responsive strategy. Identifying five major metropolitan areas of North America where the OPC currently has no presence, and the urban cores of an additional five cities of influence in North America where our presence would make an important difference, the people of the OPC have been asked to pray and the presbyteries have been asked to discuss and strategize.

We are happy to report that discernable fruit has come from these efforts. Contacts began to surface in the Minneapolis/St. Paul area where the OPC had no previous presence. Now a mission work has been formed there, which is seeking an organizing pastor with the Committee’s help. Additionally, a group of ministers and elders in the Chicago area began to lay bold plans for a Hispanic work on the city’s west side. A Brazilian contact led to the establishment of a Portuguese language OPC in Toronto in 2004. And plans have begun to be laid by the churches surrounding Washington, D.C., for the start of an urban work there.

But this was not all that God had prepared for us to be involved in during 2005. For the past several years there has been a rising and recognizable interest in the Reformed Faith in general and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in particular among Spanish-speaking people throughout North America. As inquiries have come to the home missions offices, and as general secretary Ross Graham and associate general secretary Richard Gerber have seen it first-hand in their travels, it became clear that gathering and conferring with those who were expressing interest and providing Spanish language ministry in the OPC was the logical next step.

In late May of 2005, twenty-five Hispanic Orthodox Presbyterian church officers, some of their wives and children, and several potential candidates who wanted to explore the OPC, gathered at Immanuel OPC in Bellmawr, New Jersey, for a first-ever OPC Hispanic Ministries Conference sponsored by the Committee. They came from across the United States and the Caribbean. The event was conducted entirely in Spanish. Camden, New Jersey church planter Ben Alvira served as moderator and keynote speaker. Santa Ana, California OP pastor Steve Larson, who maintains a resource-rich website for Spanish language ministry, provided the group with a plethora of Spanish language materials. And pastor Charles Telfer of our Indian Head Park, Illinois OP congregation, who is fluent in Spanish, provided personal translation to keep the guests who spoke only English apprised of the discussion.

The group met with the general secretaries of each of the three program committees. They talked about the OPC’s relationship with people and churches in Puerto Rico and Mexico; about getting books published in Spanish; and about how best to prepare Spanish
language candidates for OP presbyteries. And when the question was finally asked on the last day of the conference, it was learned that on the Lord’s Day previous to the conference, the Reformed Faith was preached in Spanish in seven different places in the OPC. Where this new exploration will lead is uncertain. But already a Spanish language mission work in Phoenix, Arizona, has been received into the OPC, and our presbyteries are making contacts with Spanish language groups and pastors in various places around North America.

V TRAINING AND PROMOTION

The Committee seeks to provide encouragement and tangible assistance to those who do the work of church planting in the OPC. In January 2006, the Annual Church Planter Training Conference was held in the facilities of Pilgrim OPC in Raleigh, North Carolina, with twelve OP church planters attending. This conference is an enrichment opportunity for the church planters of new mission works. They are gathered together in the January following their arrival on the field for three days of intensive church planter training and discussion with CHMCE staff and selected regional home missionaries.

In its continuing effort to identify men who possess church planting skills, the Committee sponsored “Readiness for Ministry in the OPC” seminars in three locations during 2005 – Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Westminster Seminary California, and Mid-America Reformed Seminary in Dyer, Indiana. Men from other reformed seminaries are always invited and welcome. These seminars provide invaluable contacts for the Home Missions staff and for the intern program of the OPC.

In 1995, a fund was established for the receipt of special gifts to be used for the purchase of books published by the Committee for the Historian and for their distribution to OP mission works. This distribution continues. Mission works which began in 2005 received copies of all available titles.

In an attempt to provide the churches with timely prayer request information about OP mission works, a bi-weekly prayer bulletin of current items of praise and petition is made available. Items are gleaned from the reports of the mission works and received from organizing pastors by special request. Home Missions Today, as this bulletin is called, is available by e-mail transcript (to all OP congregations with e-mail and to individuals who have requested it), from the posting on the OPC website, by recorded telephone message, and by printed transcript (mailed to all OP congregations along with Foreign Mission’s Telenews).

Two pages of copy are regularly provided for each issue of New Horizons to keep the church informed of God’s working in our home mission fields. Occasional issues carry expanded coverage.

The Committee staff produced two editions of the full-color brochure called Home Missions Update, which provides a current listing of all home mission works along with stories and pictures chronicling some of what is happening across North America concerning home missions ministries.

By invitation, the general secretary and the associate general secretary gladly make presentations of the ministry of OPC home missions to congregations and presbyteries throughout the denomination.

Additional new avenues for promoting the ministry of home missions in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church continue to be explored. It was expected that some of these would come to fruition in 2005, but that goal was not realized.
VI FINANCES

In 2005, the Committee saw God graciously and abundantly provide the needed financial support for its work. We praise God for the abounding grace of faithful giving evident throughout the churches. The year-end figures showed that 101.8% of the Worldwide Outreach portion of the 2005 CHMCE budget had been provided.

The Committee’s reserves were also in a very healthy position at year’s end. From 2000 through 2005 the Committee used $383,538 of its reserves to be able to respond to the many requests for financial assistance to new mission works. This was done as part of a program of careful management of the Committee’s reserves. The year 2005 began with $582,006 in the Contingent Fund and the expectation that a draw of $81,126 would be needed to provide the necessary funds for 2005 ministries. Due to very generous Worldwide Outreach offerings, no draw was needed. Also, a number of bequests, which are placed in the Contingent Fund, were received throughout the year. The year-end balance was $958,796. The 2006 budget plans for a transfer of $84,500 from the Contingent to the General Fund to support new church plants.

During 2006, the OPC anticipates supporting 51 mission works along with eight regional home missionaries. In 2005, $517,510 went to assist new churches and regional home missionaries. In 2006, $647,250 is budgeted for those purposes, which includes anticipated support for the first two of our more costly urban mission works, which were mentioned earlier in this report. God has supplied abundantly for home missions in the OPC. He has given us every reason to anticipate his continued supply. So we look to our great Covenant God to provide all that is needed to sustain the ministry of home missions in the years to come.

VII BUDGET for 2005-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$896,846</td>
<td>$869,025</td>
<td>$903,786</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-OPC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(863)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (Reserves)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81,126</td>
<td>81,685</td>
<td>90,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$895,983</td>
<td>$953,151</td>
<td>$988,471</td>
<td>$1,043,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Planting</td>
<td>$573,949</td>
<td>$662,580</td>
<td>$699,660</td>
<td>$735,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>7,034</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>8,470</td>
<td>13,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>258,814</td>
<td>271,571</td>
<td>280,341</td>
<td>294,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$839,797</td>
<td>$953,151</td>
<td>988,471</td>
<td>$1,043,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$ 56,186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII CHURCH EXTENSION FUND

As reported to previous assemblies, the Committee has not received new investments into the Church Extension Fund since March 18, 1993. Investors in the Fund continue to
receive interest payments (or have them compounded) on their investments according to the original terms. As they have opportunity to do so, they may elect to withdraw their investment prematurely in order to purchase a Note(s) in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Loan Fund (OPCLF).

Due to the purchase by the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Loan Fund of the remaining Mortgage Notes Receivable from the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension (held in the Church Extension Fund) as of December 31, 2002, there were no outstanding loans in the Church Extension Fund in 2005.

As reported in 2003, during that year those investors holding Demand Notes (issued by the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, through its Church Extension Fund) had either received payment for their Notes, gifted their Note proceeds to the Committee (CHMCE), or used the proceeds to purchase new Notes in the OPC Loan Fund. During 2004 the remainder of the Demand Notes were closed with the exception of eight Notes, at 0% interest; during 2005 six of the eight Notes closed, leaving two Notes at 0% interest.

Notes outstanding on December 31, 2005, were as follows: demand, $10,100; five-year, $42,237; ten-year, $531,834; for a total of $584,171. Additional financial reports on the Church Extension Fund are available upon request.

IX ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH LOAN FUND

The Committee established a new corporation in 1993 called the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Loan Fund, Inc. (OPCLF), to replace the Church Extension Fund. Members of the Board of Directors of the OPCLF are elected by CHMCE. The Board is comprised of the following:

- Class of 2007: Messrs. George W. Knight III, Peyton H. Gardner
- Class of 2008: Messrs. Garret A. Hoogerhyde, Sidney O. Smith

The following men serve as officers of the Board: president, Garret A. Hoogerhyde; vice president, George W. Knight III; secretary, Richard A. Barker; treasurer, Sidney O. Smith; assistant secretary, Ross W. Graham; assistant treasurer, David E. Haney. Messrs. Graham and Haney are ex officio members of the Board. Mr. David E. Haney serves as loan fund manager. Mrs. Kathleen W. Bube serves part-time as loan fund administrator.

At the close of 2005, Notes in the OPCLF were offered in the following states: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin. During 2005 the states of Idaho, Ohio and Washington were added. Rigid regulations make it very difficult to offer Notes in some states. Notes are currently offered at the following fixed rates: 1-year, 3.0%; 3-year, 4.0%; 5-year, 5.0%; 10-year, 6.0%; these rates were effective September 14, 2005, and are subject to change by the Board. At the close of the year the total of the Notes outstanding was $6,348,931.

Notes outstanding, including accrued interest, on December 31, 2005, were as follows: one-year, $512,844; three-year, $971,645; five-year, $1,864,214; and ten-year, $3,000,228; for a total of $6,348,931. This is an increase of $138,331 from the prior year. Additional financial reports on the OPCLF are available upon request.
During the year the Board took the following actions: (1) granted a loan of $75,000 to Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Bellmawr, New Jersey, for the purpose of purchasing the residence adjoining the church property and located at 1008 Market Street, Bellmawr, New Jersey; (2) appointed Gary W. Davenport, Regional Home Missionary for the Presbytery of the Southwest, to act as agent for the OPC Loan Fund, Inc., with power to execute all necessary documents for the rental and/or sale of the church property (and adjacent residence) that had been deeded to the OPC Loan Fund, Inc., by Redeemer Presbyterian Church, Denton, Texas, in concurrence with its Presbytery, in lieu of future loan payments, the congregation having voted to dissolve at its meeting on December 12, 2004 (the sale was completed by the Loan Fund’s agent, with full payoff of the outstanding loan balance, and excess funds disbursed to the Presbytery); (3) agreed to modify the terms of the loan to Grace Reformed Presbyterian Church, Bend, Oregon, as memorialized in a new Loan Modification Agreement; (4) granted a second loan of up to $60,000 to New Life Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Canton, New York, for the purpose of completing the relocation, reconstruction and development of the existing church building, with attendant costs of relocation and development of the site, for their worship facility; (5) granted a supplemental request for an additional loan amount of up to $30,000 to Covenant Presbyterian Church, Fort Worth, Texas, for the increased expenses to complete the construction of new worship facilities; (6) granted a loan of $500,000 to Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church, Ft. Pierce, Florida, for the purpose of constructing new worship facilities on land it owns, and in addition, granted them an additional $50,000 loan from the SAFE funds designated for Board discretionary use; and (7) granted the request of Cornerstone Presbyterian Church in Chattanooga, Tennessee, for an additional loan of $10,000, bringing total disbursements to the previously approved amount, $320,000, for the expenses incurred to renovate their worship facility. The loans granted to Covenant Presbyterian Church, Fort Worth, Texas; Cornerstone Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Chattanooga, Tennessee; Covenant Reformed Presbyterian Church, Ft. Pierce, Florida; and Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Wasilla, Alaska, were not fully disbursed in 2005. A monthly commitment fee of 0.1% of 1% is ordinarily charged on loans granted by the Board but not disbursed within three months after the first scheduled draw date.

As reported last year, the Board, at its December 10, 2003 meeting, approved the purchase of the church property owned by Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Easton, Pennsylvania, for $250,000, with the Presbytery of Philadelphia expressing no objections. The “Covenant OPC (Easton, PA) Review Committee” provides ongoing annual review of the situation, and includes men from the Presbytery as well as the Loan Fund board; this review committee met April 28, 2005.

Gifts and bequests to the Loan Fund totaled $98,584 in 2005, including a gift from the heirs of the Rev. Dwight H. Poundstone, and a second substantial gift from the now-dissolved congregation, Beverly Orthodox Presbyterian Church, East Los Angeles, California, upon its dissolution and the sale of its real property. The Board directed these gifts into the separate fund titled “Supplemental Assistance Fund Endowment” (SAFE), in accord with a similar action for the 2004 gift from Beverly Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Provisional policies and procedures were approved as a working document for this separate fund.

The balances due on loans from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Loan Fund as of December 31, 2005, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Loan Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, WI - Apple Valley Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>$299,089.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX - Providence Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>523,217.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend, OR - Grace Community Orthodox Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>27,459.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bellmawr, NJ – Immanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church 73,673.63
Bowie, MD - Trinity Reformed Church 89,113.43
Canton, NY – New Life Presbyterian Church 173,211.87
Canton, NY – New Life Presbyterian Church (2nd loan) 59,649.64
Chattanooga, TN – Cornerstone Orthodox Presbyterian Church 305,633.17
Coopersville, MI - Little Farms Chapel 141,572.64
Dayton, OH - Redeemer Orthodox Presbyterian Church 7,584.20
Fort Worth, TX – Covenant Presbyterian Church 380,000.00
Glassboro, NJ - Providence Orthodox Presbyterian Church 47,337.58
Idaho Falls, ID - New Geneva Orthodox Presbyterian Church 47,715.51
Janesville, WI – Christ Presbyterian Church 26,318.89
Lake Worth, FL - Fellowship Orthodox Presbyterian Church 13,958.02
Lansing, MI – Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church 78,535.97
Manchester, NH - Amoskeag Presbyterian Church 85,155.11
Mansfield, PA - Grace Fellowship Orthodox Presbyterian Church 37,535.99
Matthews, NC - Matthews Orthodox Presbyterian Church 456,973.32
New Bern, NC – Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church 334,222.09
Norman, OK - Grace Presbyterian Church 28,387.05
Orland Park, IL - Covenant Church (OPC) 286,221.27
Philadelphia, PA - Emmanuel Chapel 15,640.79
Philadelphia, PA - Grace Fellowship Orthodox Presbyterian Church 160,678.86
Philadelphia, PA - Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church 28,247.68
Phillipsburg, NJ - River of Life Orthodox Presbyterian Church 317,980.90
Phoenix, AZ - Calvin Orthodox Presbyterian Church 201,849.04
Raleigh, NC - Pilgrim Orthodox Presbyterian Church 457,612.07
Reading, PA - Covenant Orthodox Presbyterian Church 19,921.33
Rockport, ME - Lakeview Orthodox Presbyterian Church 193,203.83
San Diego, CA - New Life Orthodox Presbyterian Church 341,084.62
Vienna, VA - Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church 305,275.75
Walkerton, IN – Grace Reformed Church 77,823.63
Wasilla, AK – Grace Orthodox Presbyterian Church 150,000.00
Wilmington, DE – Emmanuel Orthodox Presbyterian Church 536,133.94
TOTAL of all loans held by OPCLF as of December 31, 2005 $6,328,019.39

During the year the loans to New Life Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Williamsport, Pennsylvania; New Covenant Community Church, New Lenox, Illinois; Bonita Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Bonita, California; and Westminster Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Hamden, Connecticut, were paid off. As noted last year, on July 20, 2004, New Life Presbyterian Church, La Mesa, California, determined to leave the denomination and the Board determined to offer to extend the certain term in the loan documents, for the outstanding loan due by that congregation, for one year (from July 20, 2005, to July 20, 2006), thereby waiving for that period of time the required repayment of the remaining principal balance and accrued interest, with the possibility of further renewal, in view of New Life Presbyterian Church’s ongoing financial support of missionary families of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

The Orthodox Presbyterian Church’s response to the needs created by the Hurricane Katrina disaster was coordinated by the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, with the Loan Fund manager pressed into service by the general secretary to oversee the coordination of the volunteer teams. At their December 2005 meeting, the Board of Directors of the OPC Loan Fund expressed their “thankfulness to God for the
exemplary leadership of David E. Haney in coordinating the Hurricane Katrina disaster relief activities of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as perhaps the most visible expression of the love of the members of the OPC for neighbors and total strangers who suffered enormous loss. Mr. Haney’s labors in connection with the hurricane relief activities of the OPC were a reminder to all of us of the mercy of God to all men and especially to those of the household of faith.”

X CONTINGENT FUND

The Contingent Fund was created through special gifts to the Committee and includes receipts from bequests. During 2005, $163,752 was received in new gifts and bequests. These funds have been used to provide loans for the purchase of church properties, to assist in building needs, and to supplement program funds to finance capital purchases. The Contingent Fund is also used to provide a cash reserve for the General Fund to cover any deficit in that fund.

The balances due on all loans from this Fund as of December 31, 2005, are as follows:

Bethlehem, PA - Rev. Richard R. Gerber $ 31,854.85
Horsham, PA - Janet L. Giandomenico 47,948.03
Marlton, NJ - Rev. Ross W. Graham 54,236.45
Presbytery of MI and Ontario (formerly Presbytery of the Midwest) -
Living Hope OPC, Ionia, MI 33,824.62
Sonora, CA - Oak Hill Orthodox Presbyterian Church 63,437.56
Stratford, NJ - Stratford Orthodox Presbyterian Church 109,719.59

TOTAL of all loans held by Contingent Fund as of December 31, 2005 $ 341,021.10

During the year the loan to the Presbytery of the Midwest was paid off.

XI AUXILIARY MINISTRIES

A. OPC Ministerial Information Form for Ministers/Licentiates

The GA has assigned to the Committee the responsibility of administering a file of completed Ministerial Information Forms submitted by licentiates and ministers of the OPC who desire to have their availability known to the churches without pastors. Ordained ministers from other denominations may also submit completed forms for consideration by pulpit committees and home missions committees. Completed forms are kept on file and distributed for six months. At the end of the six-month period a man may complete and file a new form with the Committee. All churches requesting this information are sent copies. An updated list of vacant pulpits is also maintained in conjunction with the stated clerk and is sent to those requesting it. The list is also posted on the OPC website.

B. 2006 Salary Scale Guidelines

Salary scale guidelines for assisting churches and presbyteries in arriving at compensation packages for church planters in the initial phase of a mission work have been adopted annually for many years by the Committee on Home Missions and Church
Extension. The Salary Scale reflects an earlier day when the Committee called men to church planting efforts and guaranteed their salary according to the Scale for a certain number of years.

In more recent times the Committee has stressed the fact that these are guidelines to serve as a starting point in arriving at an adequate salary package for those called to a church planting situation. The Committee is pleased that the Salary Scale has also been consulted by established churches in calling a pastor and in some instances evaluating annually the compensation for their pastor as well.

While the approach to establishing the initial salary package for a church planter has changed, the Guidelines have continued to serve as an ongoing means to help determine beginning salary packages under our present policies for church planting. In compiling a salary package in any instance (mission work or organized congregation) the ideal compensation package reflects the following:

1. **Base Salary.** The calling body should make adequate provision for the pastor and his family (factors include the size of the family, personal preferences, style of living, amount of debt, if any - such as car loans, education loans, etc.). The Committee suggests a base salary of $27,787 for the first year of service following ordination. Yearly increments should be given on the basis of each additional year of service with an inflation factor included, based on the local and national cost of living index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$27,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$28,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>$29,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>$29,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>$30,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>$31,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>$32,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>$33,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>$33,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>$34,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>$35,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>$36,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>$37,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>$38,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>$39,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Housing considerations.** Consideration should be given to housing costs in the area, the ability of the pastor to rent or purchase adequate housing for his family, and personal preferences. When a realistic amount has been mutually arrived upon between the pastor and the congregation, the proper body should record that amount as “Housing Allowance” (in addition to salary) for tax purposes. This Housing Allowance shall include all utilities and other house related items recognized by the IRS as being covered under the Allowance stipulation.

3. **Car allowance.** A car is an important part of a man’s ministry. Providing for this cost depends upon several factors: condition of a car when a man is called to the field, type of car, and family circumstances that might substantiate having
more than one car. In carrying out his ministerial tasks the pastor should be reimbursed at the IRS allowable rate.

4. Hospitalization. The congregation should pay the cost for medical / hospitalization premiums for the pastor and his family. It is strongly suggested that this be done through participation in the OPC plan.

5. Pension. The church should pay the recommended 6% of the pastor’s salary (base salary and housing allowance) as a pension premium with the strong suggestion that he participate in the OPC Pension Plan.

6. Social Security. The church should pay one-half of the pastor’s Social Security premiums. For pastors not in the Social Security program, the church should pay one-half of the annual investment in an established investment or retirement income plan, this being on the same basis and in the same amount as though the pastor were in Social Security.

7. Other considerations. The calling body may also consider as part of the salary package items such as: arrangements to help in house purchase with a down payment if needed, disability insurance, and assistance in meeting Christian school tuition for children. The ability to implement any or all of the above suggestions is determined in part by the following:

   a. The congregation’s ability to meet the initial terms of the call with reasonable projections for annual evaluations, including increases as needed and prudent.

   b. In the case of mission works, financial aid from CHMCE, the presbytery and other possible outside sources as significant factors in determining the salary package. CHMCE support is premised on annual presbytery requests with a maximum commitment of four years.

XII DISASTER RELIEF WORK

On August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina came ashore at the mouth of the Mississippi River just to the east of New Orleans. The devastation in the Gulf Coast region caused by that storm and the two which followed it began a time of unprecedented response by Orthodox Presbyterian people. As the storm track of Katrina was plotted on national maps, many Orthodox Presbyterian Church members began to realize that its path would take it right over the home of our former mission work in New Orleans, as well as in very close proximity to our churches in Mobile, Alabama; Pineville, Louisiana; and Forest, Mississippi. They also realized that it was marching through the heartland of several PCA presbyteries in that same region. Concern escalated as the full extent of the damage became known.

As questions began to pour into the administrative offices, it fell to the Home Missions staff to try and make contact with pastors in the affected regions. General Secretary Ross Graham requested COC’s Director of Finance and Planned Giving David Haney (who also serves as CHMCE’s Loan Fund Manager) to coordinate initial fact-finding and response efforts from the administrative offices. Many asked how they could help those whose lives had been traumatically changed in such short order. It was soon learned that only a few OPC families had received damage, and attention immediately turned to our sister denomination, the Presbyterian Church in America, which had begun to place updates on their website and were soliciting volunteers. Those who expressed concern and a willingness to help were initially encouraged to volunteer through the PCA.

However, soon after this, a deacon from Grace OPC in Columbus, Ohio, was on his way into Slidell, Louisiana, and Picayune, Mississippi, to assist the PCA Nashville
Presbyter in their response efforts. He remained in regular contact with David Haney, and upon arriving on the scene, he urged David to join him so that he also could witness first-hand the need, and help to coordinate OP assistance efforts. Plans were quickly laid for the OPC to assist the PCA churches in Slidell and Picayune.

As the full extent of the disaster was being realized, the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension was providentially assembling for their annual fall meeting. When David Haney returned from the Gulf Coast, the CHMCE meeting was underway. He reported to them his findings and sought their advice. The Committee proceeded to commit $30,000 out of their reserves for emergency relief in order to immediately assemble needed equipment and supplies for use by our volunteers with the anticipation that these funds would be replenished by the contributions being received by our denominational Committee on Diaconal Ministries.

Volunteer teams began to be assembled with the help and leadership of deacon Jack Swann from Trinity OPC in Hatboro, Pennsylvania, and his wife, Vickie. This couple accompanied the first OPC team to Picayune and quickly became the eyes and ears of OPC disaster relief on the ground for more than two weeks. As they saw needs, they relayed them to David Haney who assembled the required supplies in different national locations to be sent down with the next team from that region. As the financial resources poured in to the administrative offices under CHMCE’s oversight, they were quickly converted to supplies and equipment to be used by our teams in assisting many families in the devastated areas.

Communication had already been established with Forest, Mississippi pastor Mark Smith where significant damage was reported but everyone was safe. Former New Orleans OP pastor Russell Hamilton (now of Penobscot Bay OPC in Bucksport, Maine) reported concerning contact with some of the families from the recently closed mission work there, that all but one of them had left the area, and while some had lost possessions, all were safe. Pineville, Louisiana pastor Jack Sawyer was already heavily involved in providing and coordinating assistance to storm refugees. And licentiate Phil Hodson of Christ the King OPC in Longview, Texas, was at work providing housing and transportation to those who had traveled as far away as east Texas to escape the ravages of the storm. As the information continued to unfold, weekly updates were sent out to the churches to inform them of the needs as well as opportunities for service. Over the next ten weeks, ten teams were sent into the south. Members of these teams included people from over 30 churches.

While assistance was continuing in the Picayune/Slidell region, Hurricane Wilma blew ashore in southern Florida. As damage to this region was assessed, it became clear that Fellowship OPC in Lake Worth, Florida, had sustained a significant hit. Not only had the church building received damage, but many members’ homes were also in disrepair due to the high winds. It was clear that it was time to shift operations from the Gulf Coast area to southern Florida. Team 7 helped complete this transition in short order and the remainder of the teams served through Thanksgiving in Lake Worth.

By late 2005, the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension had agreed in principle to serve the Committee on Diaconal Ministries by developing a plan to assist the CDM in implementing responses to future “Major Disasters in the United States” (as reported by the CDM to the 63rd General Assembly in 1996, pages 222-224). In early March 2006, the Committee on Diaconal Ministries formally requested the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension to serve as the responsible agent by which information concerning a truly major disaster may be conveyed to the CDM and through which gifts of money, material, or volunteer help may be coordinated, administered and disbursed.
Ongoing hurricane disaster relief response continues in 2006 with teams being sent to Key West, Florida, as well as back to the Gulf Coast states. Work progresses slowly but steadily as these areas begin the long process of rebuilding. The equipment procured for storm damage assistance has been repaired and is ready for deployment to the Gulf Coast states for rebuilding. It is also ready for redeployment to any other site where a natural disaster may occur. The Committee is exploring the temporary use of this equipment by our churches in between its use for natural disasters and is working with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Loan Fund to coordinate such a plan.

The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension is thankful to God for the generous response of Orthodox Presbyterian Church members during these unprecedented hurricane disasters. Through their generosity the OPC has been well equipped to help many families begin the rebuilding process and is in a position to be able to show mercy to many in tangible ways in subsequent years. The Committee wishes to thank the many members of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church who volunteered their time and energy to go to the hurricane-ravaged parts of the southern United States during the fall of 2005 to provide their help and to represent their Lord and their Church in offering “that cup of cold water” in Jesus’ name, and at the end of this report has recommended that the 73rd General Assembly formally take note of this matter.

Accounting of funds received for Disaster Relief Efforts are as follows:

Income:
- Contributions sent to P.O. Box P, Willow Grove, PA $44,429.51
- Contributions sent from Committee on Diaconal Ministries $203,876.21
- Other - Presbytery of the South Diaconal Committee $30,000.00
Total $278,305.72

Expenses:
- Direct Aid to Families/Individuals $10,040.00
- Equipment/Tools $133,560.10
- Supplies/Materials/Operations $21,830.93
- Storage Facility $50,000.00
- Reserve for Anticipated Needs/Teams 2006 $62,874.69
Total $278,305.72

Equipment/Tools breakdown:
- Tool Trailer/Mobile Workshop $6,192.35
- Trucks - 2 Heavy Duty Pick-ups $59,111.00
- Bobcat $33,650.00
- Chain Saws/Sharpener/Power Washers/Blowers/Etc. $34,606.75
Subtotal $133,560.10

Additional Donations of Equipment were received including:
- 5th Wheel Recreational Vehicle Estimated value = $20,000
- Dump Trailer
- Chain Saws
- Gloves/Masks/Respirators/Etc.

NOTE: Orthodox Presbyterian Church members contributed in excess of an additional $170,000 through the Pineville, Louisiana church, and the Longview, Texas church, bringing the total given by OPC sources to over $450,000.
XIII GENERAL ASSEMBLY MATTERS

The Committee appointed the Rev. Ross W. Graham, general secretary; the Rev. Richard R. Gerber, associate general secretary; Mr. David E. Haney, OPC Loan Fund manager, and the Rev. John R. Hilbelink, Committee president, as their representatives to the 73rd General Assembly.

The Committee has one recommendation to the 73rd General Assembly, which appears in section XVI below.

XIV ADMINISTRATION

A. Committee Members:

Class of 2008
Ministers: Ivan J. De Master, Jeffery A. Landis, Larry G. Mininger
Ruling Elders: Keith A. LeMahieu, James W. Van Dam

Class of 2007
Ministers: George W. Knight III, Donald M. Poundstone, Gerald S. Taylor
Ruling Elders: Robert L. Ayres, John M. Mauldin

Class of 2006
Ministers: Randall A. Bergquist, John R. Hilbelink, Lawrence Semel
Ruling Elders: Richard A. Barker, Garret A. Hoogerhyde

B. Committee Officers:

President, John R. Hilbelink
Vice President, Jeffery A. Landis
Secretary, Gerald S. Taylor
Treasurer, Garret A. Hoogerhyde

C. Executive Committee:

Messrs. Barker, Hilbelink (Chairman), Hoogerhyde, Knight, and Taylor

D. Committee Representative to COC:

Mr. Hoogerhyde

E. Subcommittees:

Finance: Messrs. Barker, Hoogerhyde, LeMahieu, Mauldin, and Semel
General Ministries: Messrs. Bergquist, De Master, Knight, Poundstone, and Van Dam
Special Ministries: Messrs. Ayres, Hilbelink, Landis, Mininger, and Taylor

F. Ministry Staff:
The current ministry staff consists of General Secretary Ross W. Graham, who began his service to the Committee in December 1990, and Associate General Secretary Richard R. Gerber, who began his service to the Committee in August 1999. The job descriptions for these two men call for a close working relationship between the general secretary and his associate and articulate a basic parity between them in their duties and responsibilities so as to allow for maximum care for the mission works and maximum presence in the presbyteries and the churches of the OPC.

G. Office Staff:
Beverly R. Mariani continues ably to serve the Committee as administrative assistant.

XV ELECTIONS
The terms of the above-named Class of 2006 expire at this assembly.

XVI RECOMMENDATION
The Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension respectfully requests that the 73rd General Assembly express its sincere appreciation to the many members of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church who volunteered their time and energy to go to the hurricane-ravaged parts of the southern United States during the fall of 2005 to provide their help and to represent their Lord and their Church in offering “that cup of cold water” in Jesus’ name.
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY
THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION

Prefatory Statement to the Report on Justification Adopted by the Committee on Christian Education on Behalf of the 73rd General Assembly

(Stated Clerk’s Note: The 73rd General Assembly requested the Committee on Christian Education write a prefatory statement to the report explaining: (a) the reasons and context surrounding the origin of the report, including the republishing of the statement on Justification adopted by the 71st General Assembly, and (b) an explanation of what it means for the General Assembly to commend a report for study. (See §150))

In response to an overture from the Presbytery of the Midwest, the Seventy-first General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church adopted the following Declaration on Justification:

The 71st (2004) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (i) declares its continued commitment to the teaching of the Word of God, the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms with regard to the doctrine of justification by faith alone; (ii) reaffirms that faith, which is a gift of God, is the sole instrument of justification; and (iii) reaffirms the following beliefs:

a. “Justification is an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone” (WSC 33).

b. “Those whom God effectually calls, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God” (WCF XI.1).

c. “Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification: yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love” (WCF XI.2)

d. “Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father’s justice in their behalf. Yet, inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them; and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead; and both, freely, not for any thing in them; their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice, and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners: (WCF XI.3).

e. “At the day of judgment, the righteous, being caught up to Christ in the clouds, shall be set on his right hand, and there openly acknowledged and acquitted, shall join with him in the judging of reprobate angels and men, and shall be
received into heaven, where they shall be fully and for ever freed from all sin and misery; filled with inconceivable joys, made perfectly holy and happy both in body and soul, in the company of innumerable saints and holy angels, but especially in the immediate vision and fruition of God the Father, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, to all eternity. And this is the perfect and full communion, which the members of the invisible church shall enjoy with Christ in glory, at the resurrection and the day of judgment” (WLC 990).

f. “Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruits of it, nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof, were imputed to him for his justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness” (WLC 73).

g. “Although sanctification be inseparably joined with justification, yet they differ, in that God in justification imputeth the righteousness of Christ; in sanctification his Spirit infuseth grace, and enableth to the exercise thereof; in the former, sin is pardoned; in the other, it is subdued: the one doeth equally free all believers from the revenging wrath of God, and that perfectly in this life, that they never fall into condemnation; the other is neither equal in all, nor in this life perfect in any, but growing up to perfection” (WLC 77).

By action of the Seventy-first General Assembly, this declaration was sent to all ministers and sessions of the church, to all churches with which the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is in ecclesiastical relationship, and to the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council and the International Conference of Reformed Churches. It was also posted on the OPC web site (www.opc.org) and published in New Horizons (Vol. 25, No. 8, Aug. – Sept. 2004).

In response to the same overture, the General Assembly also elected a Committee (of the seven members and two alternates elected, six men were able to serve: Messrs. David VanDrunen (Chairman), L. Anthony Curto, Sidney D. Dyer, John V. Fesko (Secretary), Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., and Alan D. Strange (Vice-Chairman)) and assigned it the following mandate:

To critique the teachings of the “New Perspective on Paul,””“Federal Vision” and other like teachings concerning the doctrine of justification and other related doctrines, as they are related to the Word of God and our subordinate standards, with a view of giving a clear statement to the presbyteries, sessions, and seminaries, and report back to the Seventy-second General Assembly.

According to its mandate, the Committee reported to the Seventy-second General Assembly concerning its progress. That Assembly, at the Committee’s request, extended its mandate for another year so that it could prepare a full report for the Seventy-third General Assembly.

Having received the report, the Seventy-third General Assembly instructed the Stated Clerk to send this report to the presbyteries, particularly to their candidates and credentials committees, and to all sessions and ministers of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, commending the report to them for study. The Assembly also requested the Stated Clerk to mail copies of this report to those churches with whom the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has Ecclesiastical Fellowship or a Corresponding Relationship. Further the
Assembly requested the Committee on Christian Education (1) to distribute this report to seminaries with which it has contact; (2) to post this report on our denominational web site for easy access by interested parties; and (3) to consider publishing it separately for distribution; thereby commending the report for study.

In commending the report for study, the Assembly approved the content and reasoning of the report. The Assembly did not take any action to endorse every word of the document or make the report itself a part of our constitution (which would have to be approved by the general assembly and presbyteries in the manner provided in the Form of Government for the amendment of the constitution); nor was the document written with that purpose in mind. It should be noted that the general assembly is not invested with power, by virtue of its own authority, to make pronouncements which bind the conscience of members of the church. Yet the deliverances of the general assembly, if declarative of the Word of God, are to be received with deference and submission not only because of their fidelity to the Word of God, but also because of the nature of the general assembly as the supreme judicatory of the church (Form of Government 15.8).

In the Preface to the report, the Committee defended its dependency upon the primary and secondary standards of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in writing the report. The Committee stated:

In presenting this report, the Committee does not condemn all of the views of those mentioned herein, but it does agree that aberrant views on justification have been promulgated from within these circles. Therefore the Committee has sought to reaffirm the church’s commitment to the teaching of Scripture and the Westminster Standards on justification and to identify and critique contemporary claims to the contrary from those holding these aberrant views.

In the interests of maintaining the truths of the gospel and the purity, the peace, and the unity of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, the report is commended to you for study. The report is reprinted here as it appeared in the Minutes of the 73rd (2006) General Assembly.
Appendix

sions and seminaries, and report back to the 72nd GA....” The seventy-first General Assembly elected seven men to serve on the committee and also elected two alternates. Before the committee’s first working meeting, two of the men elected were compelled to resign for personal reasons and one of the two alternates reluctantly was not able to join the committee. Hence, the committee has consisted of six men through the duration of its work: Messrs. Anthony Curto, Sidney Dyer, John Fesko (Secretary), Richard Gaffin Jr., Alan Strange (Vice-Chairman), and David VanDrunen (Chairman).

According to its mandate, the committee reported to the 72nd General Assembly concerning its progress. That Assembly, at the committee’s request, extended its mandate for another year so that it could prepare a full report for the 73rd General Assembly. Accordingly, the committee had two more working meetings in the past year, in August 2005 and January 2006, both in Woodstock, GA.

During the past two years, the members of the committee, by God’s grace, were able to establish a productive working relationship and have produced this consensus report. In accordance with its mandate, the committee has approached its task as one of critique. The 71st General Assembly indicated its view that the New Perspective on Paul (NPP) and Federal Vision (FV) movements, whatever helpful things they may teach on certain matters, have expressed views on justification that are in conflict with Scripture and the confessional standards of the OPC. In presenting this report the committee does not condemn all of the views of those mentioned herein, but it does agree that aberrant views on justification have been promulgated from within these circles. Therefore, the committee has sought to reaffirm the church’s commitment to the teaching of Scripture and the Westminster Standards on justification and to identify and critique contemporary claims to the contrary from those holding these aberrant views.

A noteworthy feature of current theological debates, including those on justification, is the dynamic of the internet. The internet has produced the opportunity both to disseminate rapidly one’s opinions and to obtain information quickly that was undreamed of until very recent years. While the internet presents exciting opportunities for communicating the gospel and Reformed theology more generally, it also presents dangers and temptations. One temptation is to post opinions without due reflection and without proper accountability to others. While the ordinary process of publication requires material to be read and critiqued by others before going into print, internet posting allows material to be circulated without going through these ordinary channels. This increases the danger that material is promulgated in an irresponsible manner, as authors promote their opinions promiscuously without being properly accountable to others and before receiving valuable feedback, as wisdom, humility, and love require. In this environment of internet posting, likewise, readers are less able to judge the competency and qualifications of those who circulate material. It is important to note this for our report, since many debates in Reformed circles about justification are taking place in cyberspace.

To accomplish its task, the committee presents this report in four main sections. First is a survey of the biblical and confessional teaching on justification and closely related matters. Second is an overview of discussions about the doctrine of justification as they are taking place in the contemporary ecumenical scene. Third is a survey and critique of the views on justification as expressed in the NPP. Finally, the fourth section surveys and critiques the views on justification advocated among proponents of the FV. In addition to this full report, the committee also presents to the General Assembly a concise summary of it. This summary is certainly not intended as a substitute for the full report, but the committee believes that this sort of brief account of its study and critique may be useful for many in the church. As a final matter, this report also presents a number of recommenda-
tions intended to aid the various assemblies of the OPC in dealing practically with the contemporary debates over justification.
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I GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This section of the report consists of a confessional and biblical exposition of the doctrine of justification. Though the committee’s task is specifically to critique certain
movements that have challenged this doctrine of late, we judge that a positive setting forth of the doctrine as taught in Scripture and summarized in the Westminster Standards is an appropriate prelude to the rest of this report. By means of this section, the committee hopes to remind the church what exactly the biblical and confessional doctrine of justification is, offer encouragement to the church that the doctrine of justification taught in the Westminster Standards is indeed the doctrine taught in Scripture, and provide a helpful background for the more specific critiques of the New Perspective on Paul and Federal Vision that follow in subsequent sections.

There is perhaps no better definition of the doctrine of justification, concise yet comprehensive, than that which the OPC confesses in the Westminster Larger Catechism (WLC) 70:

> Justification is an act of God’s free grace unto sinners, in which he pardoneth all their sins, accepteth and accounteth their persons righteous in his sight; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone.

In this definition, all the major elements of the biblical, Reformed doctrine are set forth. Justification is a forensic, judicial act of pardoning, accepting, and accounting, not a transformative work by which a sinner is made subjectively holy through an infusion of grace. According to this definition, justification is a blessing granted to sinners, those who have fallen short of God’s righteous requirements and stand condemned before him. In response to our sin, God, by his free grace, does two things for our justification: he pardons all our sins and accepts and accounts us righteous in his sight. God not only wipes away the guilt of sinners, but he also credits righteousness to them. In justification, God declares that we are innocent of ever sinning against him and credits us with keeping his law perfectly. The ground for this great work, WLC 70 goes on to explain, is nothing that is wrought within us or done by us. Instead, its ground is the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, imputed to us. In other words, Christ’s perfect obedience to God’s law is credited to us, so that we stand before God as if we ourselves had kept that law perfectly. And Christ’s perfect sacrifice of atonement is imputed to us, so that we stand before God as if we had atoned for our law-breaking. Finally, WLC 70 teaches that justification is received by faith alone. Not any work of obedience, but faith that receives and rests upon Christ, is the only instrument of justification.

In the subsections that follow, these and related issues are unpacked along confessional and biblical lines. Special attention is given to those areas in which significant controversies have arisen in recent years.

A. The Nature of Justification

1. The Forensic Character of Justification

Two primary characteristics of justification seem particularly pertinent to mention: its forensic nature and its definitive nature. The forensic character of justification was an important issue at the time of the Protestant Reformation. The medieval church in the West did not deny that there was a forensic aspect to justification. However, it placed the forensic declaration of righteousness at the end of a long process of moral renovation, upon which that declaration was based. Both the process of moral renovation and the subsequent forensic declaration were included in the concept of justification. The theologians of the Reformation, capitalizing on the Renaissance’s recovery of the study of Scrip-
ture in its original languages, recognized that the New Testament’s δικαιοσύνη meant “to declare righteous.” They affirmed that justification, according to biblical teaching, is not a process of moral transformation culminating in a forensic declaration, but is a forensic act, excluding any prior moral renovation as its basis.

The exposition of justification in the Westminster Standards reflects this view of justification’s forensic nature in a variety of ways. For example, the catechisms speak of justification as an “act of God’s free grace,” rather than as a “work of God’s grace,” which describes effectual calling and sanctification. By the terminology of “act,” in distinction from the terminology of “work,” the catechisms indicate a declarative, external divine blessing, not a renovative, internal divine blessing. In addition, the catechisms use forensic terms rather than transformative terms to describe justification (such as pardon, accept, account, and impute) and explicitly deny that justification involves moral transformation (“not for anything wrought in them, or done by them”). Furthermore, the Standards speak of Christ’s atoning work, the basis of justification, in forensic terms. Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF) 11.3 says that Christ “did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father’s justice in their behalf” in order that in justification “both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified.”

While perhaps not the focal point of recent criticisms of the doctrine of justification, some NPP and FV advocates have propounded weakened understandings of justification’s forensic nature. James Dunn claims that the crucial Pauline phrase, “the righteousness of God,” should not be understood in the Greek, judicial sense but rather in the Hebrew, relational sense; i.e., not as an ideal against which action is measured but as faithfulness in relationship. Furthermore, while not explicitly denying the forensic character of justification itself, he plays down the traditional Protestant/Roman Catholic debate and affirms that justification involves moral transformation by means of a living relationship with the covenant God. While N. T. Wright affirms the forensic character of the idea of “righteousness,” he also speaks of its significance in terms of “metaphor.” From the FV side, Peter Leithart also deals with the forensic aspect as a metaphor, in fact, as one metaphor among many that constitute the broader biblical doctrine of justification.

While the forensic nature of justification is indeed analogical (God’s archetypal judicial action is not identical to human, ectypal judicial action), it is not metaphorical.
cal. Justification is a forensic act, not merely similar to a forensic act. The context of Paul’s discussions of justification confirms the forensic meaning of justification, which the terminology of δικαιοῦν itself suggests. For example, the legal setting of the words of Rom 3:19-20 are unmistakable: “Now we know that whatever the law says it speaks to those who are under the law, so that every mouth may be stopped and the whole world may be held accountable [υποδικος] to God. For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight….” Paul also routinely makes direct contrast between justify/justification and the forensic terms “condemn/condemnation” [κατακριψειν / κατακριµα]. For example, Paul writes: “The judgment…brought condemnation, but the free gift…brought justification” (Rom 5:16); and, “Who shall bring any charge [εγκαλεω—itsel a forensic term] against God’s elect? It is God who justifies. Who is to condemn?” (Rom 8:33-34a).

A number of OT references, which are important background for these NT affirmations, speak of justification in the judicial context and/or contrast it directly with condemnation. Many such OT references are also significant in that God or human judges justify the righteous and not the guilty, which would not make sense if interpreted in transformative terms. Justifying the guilty is a noble act taken in a transformative sense; it is reprehensible when taken in a forensic sense. Among relevant examples are Exod 23:6-7 (“I will not acquit [justify] the wicked”); Deut 25:1 (judges should be “acquitting [justifying] the innocent and condemning the guilty”); and Prov 17:15 (“He who justifies the wicked and he who condemns the righteous are both alike an abomination to the LORD.”). All of these verses use the term בדש in the hiphil and are translated by δικαιοῦν in the Septuagint (LXX), the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible.6

Δικαιοῦν does carry something other than a strictly forensic meaning at times. Even when it does, however, its meaning is not one of moral transformation. For example, the demonstrative use of the term is the declaration of something to be what it really is (not the transforming of one thing into something else). This is evident in Christ’s words: “Wisdom is justified by her deeds/children” (Matt 11:19; Luke 7:35). As seen above, however, Paul uses δικαιοῦν in explicitly forensic contexts in his discussions of justification itself.

2. The Definitive Character of Justification

The other crucial characteristic of justification noted above is its definitive nature. In other words, justification is a once-for-all accomplished, completed, and perfect act. Though justification may be made manifest to the world on the last day in a way in which it is not manifest in this life, the justifying verdict rendered here and now to the one who believes is complete and definitive. Hence, WCF 11.4 explains that the time of justification is when “the Holy Spirit doth, in due time, actually apply Christ unto them.” This brings believers into “the state of justification,” as WCF 11.5 continues, from which state “they can never fail.” WLC 77 states decisively that justification “doth equally free all believers from the revenging wrath of God, and that perfectly in this life, that they never fall into condemnation…”

Some NPP advocates articulate a very different understanding. Dunn, for example, explicitly denies the “once-for-all” character of justification and states instead

---

6 In regard to the use of the hiphil, Brucke K. Waltke and Michael P. O’Connor explain that it “can denote the causing of an event in which a person or object is esteemed or declared through a judicial sentence or some kind of recognition to be in a state” (see An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax[Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990], 439).
that it is “the initial acceptance by God into restored relationship.” Wright compares and contrasts “present” with “future justification,” which in fact have different bases: “Present justification declares, on the basis of faith, what future justification will affirm publicly…on the basis of the entire life.” Scripture, however, affirms the definitive, once-for-all character of justification. This is evident, for example, in the first half of Romans 5, where Paul emphasizes the pastoral importance of this truth. He writes: “Therefore, since we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God” (5:1), and later, “Since, therefore, we have now [νῦν] been justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God” (5:9). In both instances, Paul’s use of the aorist suggests a once-for-all completed act, and the contexts confirm this interpretation. In 5:1, the accomplishment of justification means that the believer has peace with God—there is nothing uncertain or incomplete about the believer’s standing before him. In 5:9, the accomplishment of justification renders an absolute certainty that the believer will escape God’s wrath on the last day. The one who is justified need never fear condemnation again: “Who shall bring any charge against God’s elect? It is God who justifies. Who is to condemn?” (Rom 8:33-34a). Justification is neither the beginning of a process nor something awaiting a future fulfillment on a different basis, but is a present certainty that forms the bedrock of believers’ spiritual peace and assurance. Contra Wright, there is one justification, not two, and on the last day Christians will be welcomed into the eternal kingdom only on the ground of Christ’s righteousness, not their own works.

B. Perfect Obedience to the Law

1. Introduction

The question of what the law of God requires—particularly, whether or not the law demands perfect obedience—is of critical importance to the doctrine of justification. The biblical, Reformed doctrine of justification presumes as background that God does indeed require perfect obedience to his law from each human being. In the covenant of works, God held out the promise of life on the condition that Adam, acting on behalf of the human race, perfectly obey his demand for obedience. Adam failed in this task, though he had the ability to fulfill it, and consequently sin has rendered everyone descending from him by ordinary generation entirely unable to meet the law’s perfect standard. Neverthe-

---

7 Dunn, Theology, 386.


9 Those texts where the present tense of δικαίωμα appears cannot properly be used to deny that justification is a once-for-all act. For example, in Rom 3:24 it is used in a distributive sense and in Rom 3:28 it is used in a gnomic sense. As P. R. Williams explains, the gnomic present “does not say that something is happening but that something does happen.” See Grammar Notes on the Noun and the Verb and Certain Other Items, rev. ed. (Tacoma: Northwest Baptist Seminary, 1988), 27.

10 On this point, see Stephen Westerholm, Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The ‘Lutheran’ Paul and His Critics (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 283.
less, God’s demands have not slackened. He still requires perfect obedience from those who would enjoy eschatological life. Thus, as the doctrine of justification teaches, all people on their own stand condemned before God and need a Savior who will meet this requirement for them. Where the law’s requirement of perfect obedience is questioned, the traditional doctrine of justification is necessarily also thrown into dispute.

It is not surprising, therefore, that some contemporary critics of the Reformed doctrine of justification have rejected the idea that the law demands perfect obedience. A. Andrew Das notes: “So does Paul see doing the law as possible or impossible? This question has become the dividing line in Pauline scholarship on the law. The debate rages between those who think that Paul’s understanding of the law has absolutely nothing to do with the need to obey the law perfectly and those who still think that it does.”11 In his path-breaking work, which in some sense launched the NPP, E. P. Sanders specifically addressed the question of the law and perfect obedience. At one point in his discussion, Sanders claims: “The passages which assert that one who transgresses one commandment loses his place in the covenant or his share in the world to come do not mean that the Rabbis required legal perfection. There is no hint in Rabbinic literature of a view such as that of Paul in Gal. 3.10 or of IV Ezra, that one must achieve legal perfection.”12 Why was this the case? Sanders points his readers to several elements built into the Mosaic law itself that made provision for its transgression. For example, in noting that the “question of perfect obedience to the law hardly arises in the Tannaitic literature,” Sanders points to the law’s requirement of repentance. According to the Tannaitic authors, repentance wipes out sins and thus God does not deal with the repentant according to a strict reckoning of justice.13 Sanders also notes that the rabbis recognized the law’s provisions for atonement, which shows that they did not conceive of the law as requiring perfect obedience. Even a person who commits grievous sin can be called ‘righteous’ if he makes atonement. Sanders comments: “The righteous are those who obey the Torah and atone for transgression. Many have inferred from this a strict system of works-righteousness—those who obey the law are saved—but this would not be an accurate interpretation of the Rabbinic view.”14

Dunn has picked up on these claims of Sanders in his exposition of Paul’s epistles. Though Sanders himself contrasted Paul’s understanding of perfect obedience in Gal 3:10 with the view of contemporary Judaism,15 Dunn thinks Paul followed Judaism’s position. Dunn rejects the view that Gal 3:10 includes an implied premise and thus teaches that the law requires perfect obedience (an exegetical issue that is addressed below). He writes: “There is no evidence that the law was understood to require ‘perfection’ in that sense. The obedience it did call for was within the terms of the covenant, including the

11 A. Andrew Das, Paul, the Law, and the Covenant (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001), 6.


13 Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 175-76.

14 Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 204.

provision of atonement by covenant law. That obedience was considered practicable. And both Saul the Pharisee and Paul the apostle agreed.”

Despite such claims, Scripture does indeed teach that God requires perfect obedience to his law. The following subsections discuss various threads of biblical and confessional teaching on this point.

2. The Character of God’s Justice

The character of God’s justice is important background to any discussion of the demands of his law. While observing biblical statements about divine justice may not settle definitively every question about the law’s demand for perfect obedience, such statements at least set defined parameters for discussion of the issue. In back of this matter is the fact that justification must provide “a proper, real, and full satisfaction to God’s justice” (WLC 71).

Some of the earliest revelation in redemptive history wrestles with the question of divine justice. Abraham, conversing with God before the destruction of Sodom, appeals to God that he not put the righteous to death with the wicked so that the righteous fare as the wicked do. “Shall not the judge of all the earth do what is just?” God, remarkably, allows Abraham to engage in such dialogue with him, and his answer indicates that he accepts the premises upon which Abraham reasons (Gen 18:25-26). A fundamental principle is asserted: God does not confuse the wicked and the righteous in his judgment and always does what is just. In the Mosaic law, God declares his inability to render a verdict that is not based strictly on the works of the accused: “I will not acquit [justify] the wicked” (Exod 23:7). His impartiality in judgment is unimpeachable: “For the Lord your God is God of gods and Lord of lords, the great, the mighty, and the awesome God, who is not partial and takes no bribe” (Dt 10:17). This means that Israel’s judges, imaging the divine justice, are neither to take bribes (Exod 23:8) nor favor rich or poor in their judgments (Exod 23:3, 6). The OT renders a variety of additional testimony to the purity of God’s justice. Prov 17:15 affirms that “he who justifies the wicked and he who condemns the righteous are both alike an abomination to the Lord” and Nah 1:3 adds that “the Lord will by no means clear the guilty.”

Among the pertinent facets of this revelation is that passages such as Exod 23:7 and Prov 17:15 use the language of justification to describe God’s judicial action. Justification is a forensic act, something accomplished ἴδια — in a law-suit (Exod 23:6). The full NT revelation of God’s soteriological justification of believers in Christ is grounded in this OT revelation. The God who justifies is an uncompromisingly just judge, and the biblical doctrine of justification, though not limited to this truth, must assert nothing less than this lest God’s own character be maligned.

3. The Adamic Covenant of Works

The Reformed doctrine of justification rests upon a proper understanding of the covenant made at creation with Adam as a covenant of works. The doctrine of the covenant of works (or, covenant of life) is taught at various places in the Westminster Standards (WCF 7.2, 19.1; WLC 20; Westminster Shorter Catechism [WSC] 12). WCF 7.2 states concisely: “The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam; and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience” (emphasis). God held out the same hope of everlasting life to the first man in

---

16 Dunn, *Theology*, 361.
the covenant of works that he now holds out to believers in the covenant of grace. In the covenant of works, however, the promise of life was conditioned upon the “perfect and personal obedience” of Adam. From the beginning, therefore, God demanded perfect obedience to his law and made eternal life conditioned upon it. Despite this clear teaching in the Westminster Standards, some recent Reformed theologians have leveled critiques against the doctrine of the covenant of works, though still remaining orthodox on justification itself. A number of advocates of the FV have taken this critique in a more radical direction, however, and have in fact based their critiques of the Reformed doctrine of justification on their rejection of the covenant of works.

FV advocates are correct at least to this extent: the doctrines of the covenant of works and justification are intimately related, and theological coherence does suggest that rejection of one leads to rejection of the other. If one denies that God required perfect obedience from Adam as the basis for his attaining eternal life, then there is no reason why Christ must provide perfect obedience as the basis for our attainment of eternal life. If Adam, as a human being, was unable to earn or merit eschatological life by his perfect obedience, then Christ, as a human being, is unable to earn or merit eschatological life by his perfect obedience. “Since the works principle is thus foundational to the gospel, the repudiation of that principle…stands condemned as subversive of that gospel.”

Acquaintance with this covenant is of the greatest importance, for whoever errs here or denies the existence of the covenant of works, will not understand the covenant of grace, and will readily err concerning the mediatorship of the Lord

---

17 For example, John Murray (1898-1975) expressed his difficulties with the covenant of works in “The Adamic Administration,” in The Collected Writings of John Murray (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977), 47-59. Murray’s critique centered on his conviction that “covenant” is always redemptive, and hence inapplicable in the pre-lapsarian context, and that the presence of grace in God’s dealings with Adam makes the terminology of “works” misleading. Murray, however, did affirm the necessity of Adam’s perfect obedience and the promise of eschatological life if he did obey. Murray’s contemporary, Anthony Hoekema (1913-88), followed the general lines of Murray’s critique, though he was less sure than Murray whether Adam’s obedience would have led to eschatological life. Yet he also asserted that “we must indeed maintain the doctrinal truths that lie behind the concept of the covenant of works” (see Hoekema’s Created in God’s Image [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986], 118-21). A different sort of critique was offered by Herman Hoeksema (1886-1965) in Reformed Dogmatics (Grand Rapids: Reformed Free, 1966), 214-26.


Jesus. Such a person will very readily deny that Christ by His active obedience has merited a right to eternal life for the elect. This is to be observed with several parties who, because they err concerning the covenant of grace, also deny the covenant of works. Conversely, whoever denies the covenant of works, must rightly be suspected to be in error concerning the covenant of grace as well.20

The issue of merit is addressed below. Here, we may note that the history recounted in Genesis 1-3 itself, though narrated concisely, teaches that God placed Adam under law, with the requirement that it be obeyed perfectly, such that one violation would forfeit the hope of life. In the first description of man in Scripture, Gen 1:26-28, God gives commands to his image-bearers. The echo of law is already present here, and God’s further communication to Adam in Gen 2:16-17 more explicitly displays that God and Adam were in a legal relationship. In other words, God placed Adam under law such that if Adam perfectly obeyed, God would grant him the (implied) promise of eschatological life. The command of 2:17 is legal in nature. The very way in which God addresses Adam in 2:17—יוו התותאת אליך—“you shall not eat”—is a legal expression; God speaks in the same way when issuing the commands of the Decalogue in Exodus 20:1-17. To downplay or even eliminate the “forensic” element of the Adamic covenant because of perceived “filial” elements of Adam’s relationship to God, as some FV proponents do,22 is to create a dichotomy that does not exist in the biblical text. God is both Father and Judge (WCF 11.3 speaks of the “Father’s justice”), and neither one of these truths should be used to cancel out the other. Finally, a single violation of this command would and did bring the condemnation of death, demonstrating the truth stated in James 2:10: “For whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become accountable for all of it.” Necessarily, then, God’s original requirement was nothing less than perfect obedience.

4. The Post-Lapsarian Demand for Perfect Obedience

After the Fall into sin, God’s requirement for perfect obedience to his law did not waver. WLC 99 comments, in regard to the Decalogue, “That the law is perfect,
and bindeth everyone to full conformity in the whole man unto the righteousness thereof, and unto entire obedience forever; so as to require the utmost perfection of every duty, and to forbid the least degree of every sin.” As noted above, some contemporary critics of the doctrine of justification have claimed that 1st century Jewish theology did not view the Mosaic law as requiring perfect obedience. Whatever the weight such an assertion would have, if proven true, many competent scholars from a variety of theological perspectives have argued that though Sanders and others have corrected some misleading caricatures of 1st century Judaism, Sanders’s portrayal of it is not completely accurate. In particular, there were Jewish authors of that day who wrestled with the demands of perfect obedience. If Paul did in fact teach that the law requires perfect obedience, he was not the only Jew of his day to think so.23 But whatever the opinion of the rabbis, Scripture itself offers considerable testimony on the law’s continuing demand for perfection.

The focus in this section is upon the teaching of Paul. As noted above, Pauline scholars are waging many skirmishes over this question. The question, though sparked in recent decades by Sanders and NPP scholarship, is really not new. More than a century ago, Geerhardus Vos (1862-1949), interacting with the critical scholarship of his own day, defended the conception that Paul indeed taught, based upon the just nature of God himself, that the law must be perfectly obeyed and thus that the scheme of redemption must make provision for it.24 Several Pauline texts speak directly to this issue, in particular Gal 3:10 and Gal 5:1-4; and, in the view of many Reformed interpreters, Rom 2:6-8, 12-13.25


24 See Geerhardus Vos, “The Alleged Legalism in Paul’s Doctrine of Justification,” in Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos, ed. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. (Phillipsburg: P&R, 1980), 383-99. Among especially pertinent claims are the following: “In this whole chapter [Gal 3] the representation is, throughout, that the law method of justification is ineffective because it curses instead of blessing [sic]…. But it is plain that judgments of this class imply nothing derogatory to the law method of securing eternal life in the abstract. The disability under which the legal system labors is not inherent in the system itself, but arises wholly from the fact that men attempt to put it in operation in a state of sin” (388). “In the entire range of his polemic against the Jewish legalism, therefore, Paul has asserted nothing which can in the least prejudice his right to uphold the forensic principle of the divine righteousness in its twofold function of rewarding obedience and punishing disobedience, as a supreme and inalienable attribute of the divine nature, something which God cannot deny without denying Himself” (392).

25 One passage not dealt with here, but which has been proffered as a counter-example, is Phil 3:1-11. Some have argued, in a line of reasoning that seems to stretch back to Krister Stendahl, “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” Harvard Theological Review 56 (1963): 199-215, that Paul’s claim to have bee “blameless” as to the righteousness of the law indicates that he did not see the law as demanding perfect obedience. Helpful refutation of this claim is found in Das, Paul, 217-20; and Waters, Justification, 184-85.
Though there are many current exegetical debates concerning these passages that this report does not have the space to explore, a few words about Gal 3:10 and 5:1-6 may be helpful.

In Gal 3:10, Paul writes: “For all who rely on works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, ‘Cursed be everyone who does not abide by all things written in the Book of the Law, and do them.’” One initial question that this verse raises is the meaning of the phrase “the works of the law.” Though their views on this issue have changed somewhat over the years, NPP advocates typically understand the phrase to refer ultimately not to God’s legal requirements generally, but to the Mosaic law, especially to rules concerning the Sabbath, circumcision, or dietary restrictions that served as “boundary markers” to set apart Jew from Gentile. According to NPP analysis, Paul condemned those who relied upon the “works of the law” not because people were seeking to be saved by their good works, but because they were misusing these aspects of the law by making them tools to exclude Gentiles from the covenant community.

There are numerous difficulties with this NPP claim, and many scholars, from a variety of theological perspectives, have argued that “works of the law” in Paul cannot be taken as technical terminology for a misunderstanding of the law as Jewish boundary markers. Among the difficulties are that Paul regularly uses “works of the law” and “law” interchangeably, that Paul often contrasts faith and grace with “works of the law” just as he contrasts them with “works,” and that Paul uses “works of the law” in contexts that refer to Gentile as well as Jewish dis/obedience. The helpful and readily available critiques of the NPP’s position make a detailed defense of them here unnecessary. In what follows, therefore, “works of the law” is taken to refer more generally to what the law as a whole requires, not to an ethnocentric abuse of the law.

In the verses immediately preceding Gal 3:10, Paul has argued that all who have faith are children of Abraham and that the Scriptures had foretold that God would justify the nations by faith. After asserting the good news of blessing for all who share the faith of Abraham in verse 9, Paul turns to a darker side of the truth: the curse upon all who are of the works of the law. Here in verse 10 Paul clearly advances and even defends the broader argument that he is making—he begins with γαρ, “for.” In other words, the blessing of justification comes by faith because those who are of the works of the law are under a curse. He illustrates this by quoting Deut 27:26 to the effect that a curse comes upon all who do not do all the things written in the law. He then immediately goes on to add that no one is justified before God by the law (v.11). Therefore, the point of the broader section of the present report seems to be made quite clearly in 3:10: the law requires perfect obedience, such that anyone who fails on even one matter is cursed. Paul, in fact,
follows the LXX of Deut 27:26 in mentioning the need to keep “all the commands of the law, a word not found in the Hebrew text. Had Paul been unconcerned about holistic obedience to the law (as Sanders has claimed\(^\text{29}\)), he had every opportunity to eliminate reference to it. Instead, he emphasized the requirement for such obedience.

Several exegetical controversies cloud this apparently straightforward teaching, however, and a couple of them can be considered briefly. First, traditional readings of Gal 3:10 ordinarily understand that the verse contains an unstated but implied premise. In order for Paul’s logic to hold, he must be assuming that all who are of the works of the law do not and cannot keep the law perfectly. Hence Paul’s train of thought runs: everyone who does not do all that is written in the law is cursed (established from Deut 27:26); everyone fails to do all that is written in the law (the implied premise); therefore, everyone who is of the works of the law is in fact under a curse (affirmed in 3:10a). According to this interpretation, there is nothing inherently wrong with being of the works of the law nor is there any absolute impossibility of being justified by them. Instead, obeying the works of the law would be a valid way of being justified (see Gal 3:12) were it not for the crucial fact of human sin, which prevents justification by law.

A number of scholars writing recently, in order to debunk traditional readings, have searched for alternatives to finding an implied premise in 3:10. Other scholars have noted, however, that use of implied premises was a common rhetorical technique in Paul’s day and that Paul himself utilizes the technique elsewhere. Das has helpfully argued for the inadequacy of alternatives to the implied premise view and, along the same lines, Guy Waters’ conclusion is that omitting the implied premise from 3:10 makes “nonsense of the passage.”\(^\text{30}\) To put it in the language of the Westminster Standards, seeing an implied premise is a “good and necessary consequence” of the passage as it stands.

Another exegetical challenge to traditional readings of Gal 3:10 may be considered briefly. This objection, posed by Wright and others, states that Paul was not concerned with individual obedience to the law in his quotation of Deut 27:26, but with national Israel corporately. The larger context of the Deuteronomy passage does not confirm such a one-sided interpretation. Though concerns about corporate Israel are certainly present in this part of Deuteronomy, the sins of individuals are just as clearly evident. Deut 27:26, in fact, concludes a series of curse utterances that concern the sins of individuals, such as theft, sexual immorality, murder, and bribery.\(^\text{31}\) Also of relevance may be the way that Paul adjusts his quotation of Lev 18:5 two verses later, in Gal 3:12. Lev 18:5 in the LXX reads: α ποιησας ανθρωπος ζησεται εν αυτοις. Paul’s words in Gal 3:12 read slightly differently: ο ποιησας αυτα ζησεται εν αυτοις. Paul has added an article (in the singular) to the adverbial participle ποιησας and thereby changed it into a substantive. Clearly the individual must perform the law’s demands. Not (merely) the corporate but the individual is in Paul’s mind.

In short, the traditional view that Paul affirms the law’s requirement of perfect obedience in Gal 3:10 is based on firm exegesis. With good reason does Gal 3:10

\(^{29}\) Sanders, *Paul, the Law*, 20-22.

\(^{30}\) Waters, *Justification*, 168; see also Das, *Paul*, ch.6.

\(^{31}\) Also see discussion in Das, *Paul*, 153.
stand as a proof-text for the affirmation in WCF 7.2 that God required of Adam (and through him, all people), “perfect and personal obedience.”

Paul also teaches the requirement of perfect obedience in Gal 5:1-4, particularly verse 3: “I testify again to every man who accepts circumcision that he is obligated to keep the whole law.” In v. 1 Paul’s focus is upon returning (“again”) to life under the law. From the standpoint of new covenant freedom in Christ, however, returning to the old covenant law is of no basic difference from a return to paganism, both of which Paul characterizes as the “elements of the world” (4.3, 9).

What would be the consequences of making such a return? The following verses indicate that it would entail seeking justification by law rather than by grace (5:4). And this, in turn, means that one becomes obligated, a debtor (οφειλετης) to do (ποιησαι) the whole (ολον) law. A return to bondage, to the elements of the world, means that one must seek justification by law, which is a bondage to perform perfect obedience. As seen above, Paul has already established such a quest as impossible for sinful man, but this is the requirement of the law nonetheless. Paul presents this as being the only alternative to being justified by faith in Christ.

5. Merit and Perfect Obedience

Another aspect of the Reformed doctrine, and a subject of current controversy, is that this perfect obedience to the law, if and when rendered, is meritorious of the

---


33 In Gal 4, Paul emphasizes the freedom that believers enjoy in Christ. As he comes to chapter 5, Paul warns his readers of the danger of giving up this freedom and submitting again to a yoke of bondage (5:1). When Paul raises the issue of a yoke of slavery here, it is already a developed theme in Galatians. Both Jew and Gentile found themselves in the state of bondage before knowing Christ—the Jew in his existence under the Mosaic law and the Gentile in his pagan lifestyle. Though this association of life under the law and life under paganism insofar as they exhibit a similar bondage may be surprising, Paul nevertheless makes it. In both 4:3 and 4:9, Paul refers to bondage as being under the στοιχεια, the elements, and this applies to both Jews and Gentiles. The reference in 4:3, given the context of the end of chapter 3 and the beginning of chapter 4, seems to refer to those who used to be under the Mosaic law, yet now have attained the adoption through the coming of “the faith” and the Messiah. (The Apostle Peter had also referred to the Mosaic law as an unbearable yoke in Acts 15:10) Here, Paul says that such Jews under the law are held in bondage to the elements “of the world.” In 4:9, Paul’s focus seems to shift to Gentiles, for those formerly in slavery did not know God and were enslaved to what by nature are not gods (4:8), which surely does not describe Israel under the old covenant. Yet 4:10 speaks of the observing of days, months, times, and years, which could (but not necessarily) refer to Jewish practice. However these verses are interpreted precisely, they indicate that Paul saw a certain similarity between life in paganism and life under the Mosaic law (despite many obvious and important differences).

34 For helpful defense of the idea that Paul is referring here to obedience to all of the individual commands of the law, see Waters, Justification, 168.
reward promised by God. In other words, perfect obedience to the law is the true basis or
ground for receiving life; perfect obedience earns the reward as a matter of justice. It must
be granted that “merit” is a potentially slippery term. It may carry certain connotations that
tend, understandably, to be uncomfortable to Reformed ears. John Calvin (1509-64) rued
the fact that the term had entered theological vocabulary—yet he himself used the term in
his teaching on justification. Many Reformed orthodox theologians, however, spoke of
merit without any indication of discomfort. The Heidelberg Catechism affirms the meritori-
ous character of Christ’s work. The Westminster Standards also adopt this terminology.
WLC 55 begins: “Christ maketh intercession, by his appearing in our nature continually
before the Father in heaven, in the merit of his obedience and sacrifice on earth….” Merit,
therefore, is an orthodox and confessional idea.

A couple of qualifications and cautions seem appropriate when discussing
the importance of the concept of merit for the doctrine of justification. First, the Reformed
doctrine of justification does not in any sense affirm that a sinner’s (inevitably imperfect)
good works can merit eternal life. While Reformed doctrine teaches that Adam, in his
originally perfect state, and Jesus Christ as the Second Adam were able to merit life by
their perfect obedience, there is no possibility of a sanctified Christian’s good works mer-
iting salvation in any sense. The Reformation adamantly insisted on this point over against
the teaching of much of medieval theology.

Second, Reformed doctrine does not affirm the idea of merit in any abso-
lute or abstract sense. Perfect human obedience does not render God a debtor to man such
that the creator-creature distinction is destroyed. Some recent critics have spoken as if the
concept of merit necessarily carries along with it these connotations, but this is not the
case. Even medieval theologians such as Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) recognized that theo-
logians should not use “merit” in this absolute or abstract sense.

Objections to the idea of merit from some associated with and influencing the FV may be
found, for example, in Lusk, “A Response;” Jordan, “Merit Versus Maturity;” Sandlin,
“Covenant in Redemptive History;” Norman Shepherd, The Call of Grace: How the Cove-
nant Illuminates Salvation and Evangelism (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2000), 25-26; and idem,
“Justification by Works in Reformed Theology,” in Backbone, 111-18.

Calvin expresses his wariness about the term “merit” in Institutes of the Christian Reli-
gion, 3.15.2; see also 2.17.1. He uses the term positively in his exposition of Christ’s work
in, e.g., 2.17.3-5.

See Q&A 21: “…not only to others, but to me also, forgiveness of sins, everlasting righ-
teousness and salvation, are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of
Christ’s merits.”

For example, see Lusk, “A Response;” 121-22.

See Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae 1a2ae 114, where Aquinas explains that man
can do meritorious work, though only on the presupposition of a divine ordination. Lusk,
“A Response,” 121-22, claims that strict merit exists only between equals and appeals to
Aquinas in support of this point, though he does not indicate what text from Aquinas he has
in mind. Aquinas expresses important nuances on the subject that Lusk does not.
In the Westminster Standards, the context in which one could speak of merit without these connotations was that of the covenant. WCF 7.1 explains: “The distance between God and the creature is so great, that although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto him as their Creator, yet they could never have any fruition of him as their blessedness and reward, but by some voluntary condescension on God’s part, which he hath been pleased to express by way of covenant.” The relationship between God and Adam should be considered not ontologically or abstractly, but covenantally. Reformed theologians have been helpful in making these important distinctions. Francis Turretin (1623-87), for example, affirms that the perfect obedience of Adam would have been meritorious of the reward of life. But he explains that this merit “must not be understood properly and rigorously.” Adam would have received this reward “not by condignity of work and from its intrinsic value,” but instead “from the pact [i.e., covenant] and the liberal promise of God (according to which man had the right of demanding the reward to which God had of his own accord bound himself)…”40 In other words, Adam’s obedience would have truly earned the reward of life, according to the terms of the covenant, as a matter of justice. A robust affirmation of God’s justice in administering the covenant with Adam does not detract from the Creator-creature distinction.41

One question that sometimes emerges in connection with this topic is the relationship of merit and grace. Some recent critics have repudiated the idea of merit because they believe that even a perfectly obedient human being could receive eternal life from God only by grace and through faith.42 This is a subject that requires careful handling. Semantic disputes ought not cloud the underlying substantive issues, as they sometimes seem to do. Many Reformed theologians have affirmed that if Adam had been perfectly obedient in the covenant of works, he would have received his reward both by merit (because his works would be the basis) and by grace (because God was not absolutely obligated to enter into such a covenantal arrangement in the first place).43


41 Over against the claims of Lusk, for example, in “A Response,” 121-22.

42 For example, Lusk, “A Response,” 125, writing specifically in regard to the Adamic covenant, writes: “If Adam had obeyed, that obedience would have been rooted in faith, rather than antithetical to faith. Proponents of a covenant of works usually set the way of works in sharp antithesis to the way of faith. But for Adam, faith in the Creator God would have given rise to a life of sustained obedience.”

43 For an example of this approach, see Herman Bavinck, Reformed Dogmatics, vol. 2, God and Creation, ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 570. Bavinck is concerned here to repudiate suggestions that man can assert rights before God apart from the idea that God himself gives such rights. This concern, certainly legitimate and important, leads Bavinck to conclude that all relationships of man with God must be gracious and therefore covenantal. Other relevant comments appear in his consideration of God’s righteousness in his treatment of theology proper (Dogmatics, 2.226-28). In all of this, one may note (contrary to the impression given in Lusk, “A Response,” 125-26) that Bavinck defended the doctrine of the covenant of works and distinguished it clearly from the covenant of grace (Dogmatics, 2.563-90 generally). Bavinck states: “The doctrine of the covenant of works is based on Scripture and is eminently valuable” (Dogmatics, 2.568).
Certainly, “grace” could be defined in such a way as to indicate the goodness of God’s condescending to enter into covenant with man. Likewise, “faith” could be defined in terms of the trust that Adam and Eve had before the Fall in God and his word. If “grace” and “faith” are defined in such a way, then they are compatible with the Reformed idea of merit. God had to condescend by way of covenant if man’s obedience was to be reckoned meritorious (indeed, if Adam was to have any sort of relationship with God), and Adam’s obedience would hardly be genuine apart from trust in God. In this sense, Adam’s reward might be said to come both by law and works as well as by grace and faith.

Nevertheless, in the light of biblical and confessional language, of the nature of current controversies, and of the need for theological precision on important points of doctrine, if one uses “grace” and “faith” in this way it must be done with care and not confused with their clear Pauline usage. When Paul speaks in the context of justification, that is, the irrevocable declaration that one is righteous before God, he invariably establishes the starkest imaginable contrast between law and works, on the one hand, and grace and faith, on the other. (Though this is not true when he speaks about sanctification, in which law and works, and grace and faith, are perfectly complementary, since the good works of the law flow out of the faith that comes by grace). In other words, when Paul poses the question of justification there are two alternatives, and they are mutually exclusive. Either one is declared righteous before God by works of the law, or one is declared righteous before God by grace through faith. The relevance of this for the present question should be clear. In the Pauline sense, if Adam before the fall was to be declared irrevocably righteous before God on the basis of his obedience to the law, then he would not have been declared such by grace through faith.

A number of passages could illustrate Paul’s posing this stark contrast between law/works and grace/faith in the context of justification. In Rom 3:21-22, Paul reintroduces (from 1:17) the righteousness of God that is by faith, and this righteousness, he says, is apart from law. Paul repeats this contrast of faith and law in 3:28, where he speaks of being justified by faith, and this apart from works of the law. Romans 4 continues this antithesis in perhaps the most concentrated way anywhere in Scripture. In the context of justification established at the end of chapter 3 and 4:2, Paul starkly contrasts works as meritorious reward with faith as believing or trusting in 4:4-5. He writes that to the one who works, the reward is not reckoned according to grace (4:4). But, Paul continues, to the one who does not work, but believes, his faith is reckoned unto righteousness (4:5). That this faith is believing or trusting (and not some notion of faithfulness that becomes virtually indistinguishable from “working”) is evident from the description of Abraham’s faith in 4:20-21: it did not doubt the promise of God but was fully convinced. Furthermore, 4:13 states that the promise did not come to Abraham through law but through the righteousness of faith. Paul explains that this is so because faith would be voided and the promise destroyed if the inheritance was from law (4:14). These affirmations lead Paul to make the remarkable claim that the inheritance is by faith in order that it might be according to grace (4:16). In other words, justification comes to Christians by faith and not by the law in order

---

44 One may note that Dunn, though obviously not sympathetic to the overall analysis offered here, accepts that this is the understanding of faith used by Paul in these verses (see James D. G. Dunn, Romans 1-8, vol. 38a, WBC [Dallas: Word, 1988], 204). Of course, the idea of “faithfulness” is within the semantic range of πιστίς, and this seems to be the use in a passage such as Rom 3:3. The point here is that “faithfulness” is not in view when Paul is drawing the antitheses under discussion in the present context.
to protect justification’s gracious character. Law and grace are incompatible in the context of justification.45

Paul continues to make such bold contrasts later in Romans. For example, 6:14-15 asserts that Christians are not under law but under grace. These are the great alternatives, not a matter of both-and. Later, in the important verses 9:30-32 and 10:5-6, Paul returns to his antitheses: between the righteousness of faith and the law of righteousness unto law (9:30-31); between from faith and from works (9:32); and between the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of faith (10:5-6).46

Such contrasts are hardly unique to Romans. Several places in Galatians set up virtually identical antitheses. In Gal 2:16, for example, Paul states that a person is justified from/ by faith and not from works of the law not once but three times—the “triple antithesis,” in Dunn’s words.47 Similar are several statements in Gal 3. By the law no one is justified because the righteous will live by faith (3:11), and the law is not of faith (3:12).48

In Gal 5:4, Paul explains that those who seek to be justified by law have fallen away from grace. The implication of this verse is striking for the present topic: if seeking justification by law nullifies grace, then there is no such thing as gracious fulfillment of the demand for perfect obedience enunciated in the previous verse, 5:3.

45 A representative NPP understanding of Rom 4 is offered by Dunn, who denies that the language of work/ing/reckoning/reward is a description of the Judaism of Paul’s day and argues that Paul ties faith and grace together as he does because of Jewish perversion of the law in a nationalistic direction (see Romans, 204, 216). Critics of the NPP have presented a number of points in response to such claims. For example, Paul overturns the Jewish view of Abraham as a model of faithful obedience (see, e.g., Das, Paul, 205-06; and Leon Morris, The Epistle to the Romans [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988], 195), jarringly reckoning Abraham among the ungodly (4:5). He also overturns the common Jewish synergistic linking of faith and works (see Douglas J. Moo, The Epistle to the Romans, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996], 264); Westerholm, Perspectives, 306-07, 310). Against Dunn’s insistence that ethnocentrism is the focus (see Romans, 200), Thomas R. Schreiner offers several helpful observations in Romans, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 217-19; on this point, see also Waters, Justification, 161-62; and Das, Paul, 206.

46 Moo, Romans, 644, comments: “Central to the Reformers’ teaching about salvation was their distinction between ‘law’ and ‘gospel’…. This theological ‘law’/ ‘gospel’ antithesis is at the heart of this paragraph [10:5-13]…. ” Das, Paul, 238-40 also has helpful comments on this antithesis. Waters, Justification, 165; Moo, Romans, 646-47; and Schreiner, Romans, 552-54 answer Wright’s claim that there is no contrast between 10:5 and 10:6. On the forensic context of his passage (see Moo, Romans, 618-19, 621).

47 Dunn, Theology, 381.

48 On these verses, Westerholm, 304-05, comments: “But whereas in other passages it was regarded as self-evident that the law was to be done or kept, that it was not to be transgressed, here the axiom is made the basis for a fundamental claim about the nature of the law: since the basic principle of the law is that it requires deeds, it ‘does not rest on faith.’ Faith and deeds (or faith and the law) are seen—in this context at least—as exclusive alternatives.”
Though Romans and Galatians have particular relevance for this report, other Pauline statements to similar effect need not be overlooked. Phil 3:9, for example, contrasts having one’s own righteousness which is from the law with that which is through faith in Christ. In Eph 2:8-9, Paul states that we have been saved by grace, through faith, not of works. Paul also explains in Titus 3:5-7 that God has saved us, not from works that we have done in righteousness but according to his mercy, and thus we might be justified by that grace. Finally, 2 Tim 1:9 teaches that God has saved us not according to works but according to his own purpose and grace.49

There is overwhelming evidence, therefore, that Paul, when addressing the question of justification, the irrevocable declaration of righteousness before God, understood law and works to stand in a relationship of stark contrast and antithesis with faith and grace. Paul speaks in such a way not on occasion or in passing, but repeatedly and consistently.50 For him, the choice was faith or works, grace or law—to be justified by faith—and works, grace and law, was inconceivable. Which was the case for Adam before the Fall? Adam was never instructed to look in faith by grace to a mediator. This is the great and essential contrast between the irrevocable declaration of righteousness held out for Adam in the covenant of works and our justification—the irrevocable declaration of righteousness—granted to us in the covenant of grace. Gen 2 points to no other basis for the promised life than Adam’s own conduct. His obedience, in this very important sense, would have been meritorious, according to the standards of God’s justice. As noted above, one could define ‘grace’ and “faith” in such a way that is consonant with this. But in doing so, in order to avoid confusion and error, one would have to make clear that such language is being used in a way different from Paul.

C. The Inability of Sinners to be Justified by Works

The sinfulness of the human race is not a topic that has received particular attention in the current justification controversies. Nevertheless, the importance of this subject should not be neglected. An under-appreciation for the dire character of human sin seems to lie behind many recent attempts to make believers’ good works, in some sense, the basis of justification. Recognizing the utter helplessness of the human race in its sin highlights the need for a Savior who accomplishes the work of salvation in its entirety, to which nothing of our own can be added.

49 Waters notes that Dunn has conceded that these last three references in fact express the traditional Protestant view of works. For those of us who accept Pauline authorship of these epistles, these references surely ought to strengthen the interpretation of the other verses discussed here. But even on Dunn’s position that Paul was not the author, the NPP view on works is surely not bolstered by the idea that the first generation of Paulinists—those who knew his thought best—adopted a view similar to that of the Reformation (see Waters, Justification, 167; and also Das, Paul, 271-72), in regard to Eph 2.

50 Rom 3:27, which refers to the νομος of faith, is a possible exception to the Pauline antithesis between law and faith. Translating νομος as “principle” is a legitimate possibility and seems an attractive option, given the context; see Westerholm, Perspectives, 322-25, for a defense of this view. Das, Paul, 192-200, argues for taking νομος as “law,” though does so as a critic of the NPP.
Perfect obedience to the law and meriting life thereby, though possible for Adam before the Fall, is impossible for sinners after it. The WCF teaches clearly that our first parents fell into sin (6.1) and that consequently they “became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the parts and faculties of soul and body.” (6.2) Due to Adam’s federal headship over his posterity, not only is the guilt of his sin imputed to all people, but our first parents’ corrupted nature is also “conveyed to all their posterity,” Christ excepted. (6.3) WCF 6.4 goes on to explain that “From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.” And despite the blessed reality of sanctification in the believer, “This corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated…” (6.5) In a later section, the WCF explains the consequences of these truths for those who seek to be right with God: “They who, in their obedience, attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate, and to do more than God requires, as that they fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.” (16.4) Hence, “We cannot by our best works merit pardon of sin, or eternal life at the hand of God.” (16.5) Rather, sin has left us condemned. Every sin brings “guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God, and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries spiritual, temporal, and eternal.” (6.6)

Scripture teaches these truths in many places. In the days before the Flood, “The LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen 6:5). Paul affirms that all people by nature are “dead in the trespasses and sins” and hence “children of wrath” (Eph 2:1-3). Though Christ has delivered believers even in this life from their death in sin, Scripture teaches that no one can say honestly that he is without sin (1 John 1:8) and instructs Christians to ask for forgiveness as part of the ongoing pattern of prayer (Matt 6:12). Perhaps nowhere does Scripture describe the depth of human sin more vividly than in Rom 3:10-18, where Paul strings together a series of OT verses that demonstrate his conclusion that “None is righteous, no, not one.” Significantly, Paul’s concern in this passage is justification. He proceeds immediately to explain that human sin eliminates any possibility that a person might be justified in the way that Adam could have been justified before the Fall, by perfect obedience to the law: “Now we know that whatever the law says it speaks to those who are under the law, so that every mouth may be stopped, and the whole world may be held accountable to God. For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight, since through the law comes knowledge of sin” (Rom 3:19-20).

D. The Perfect Obedience of Christ

1. Introduction

The previous sections have discussed matters that, were they to stand alone, would be entirely bad news. God demands perfect obedience to his law, yet no person is able to render such obedience due to innate moral corruption. The good news of the gospel, however, announces that God, in Christ, has done for us what we could never do for ourselves. The Lord Jesus Christ, as the incarnate God-Man, has both borne the curse of our sin and has perfectly obeyed the requirements of the law. These two truths correspond to the traditional theological language of Christ’s “passive” and “active” obedience.

In Gal 4:4 Paul writes that Christ was “born under the law.” This statement indicates, with marvelous brevity, what Christ’s redemptive work entailed. To say that Christ became “under the law” is striking, for being “under the law” is precisely the state from which we have been redeemed and to which Paul warns that we must never return.
In what condition does that put Christ? First, it puts Christ under the curse of the law, culminating in his crucifixion. Being under the law entails a curse for Christ because he stood in the place of sinful people, whose failure to obey all the law brought that curse (Gal 3:10, 13). In addition, however, being “under the law” means that in order to live one must do the law (Gal 3:12); it means that one is justified according to the obligation to perform the entire law (Gal 5:3-4). To be justified and live, then, Christ had to render positive obedience to the law’s demands. The fact that he was justified and lives in everlasting glory indicates that Christ in fact did obey the law perfectly. And this he did for our redemption (Gal 4:5).

The relationship between Christ’s active and passive obedience should not be misunderstood. Christ’s life was not divided into a period of active obedience followed by a period of passive obedience. Rather, Christ positively obeyed the precepts of the law from the beginning of his life to its very end, and he endured the curse of the law from beginning to end. Furthermore, the terms “active” and “passive” should not be taken as antonyms, as if Christ was “passive” in being inactive, in simply letting events happen to him. On the contrary, Christ was “active” even in his going down to death (John 10:18). “Passive” is to be taken in the sense of the Latin passus, from which our English word is derived: Christ’s passive obedience is his suffering obedience.

Many recent attempts to revise the doctrine of justification have challenged these truths. FV proponents have typically reaffirmed the doctrine of Christ’s passive obe-

---

51 J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937) provides extremely helpful discussion of this point in God Transcendent and Other Sermons (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 174-75. At one point he writes: “Do you not see, then, what the true state of the case is? Christ’s active obedience and His passive obedience are not two divisions of His work, some of the events of His earthly life being His active obedience and other events of His life being His passive obedience; but every event of His life was both active obedience and passive obedience. Every event of His life was a part of His payment of the penalty of sin, and every event of His life was a part of that glorious keeping of the law of God by which He earned for His people the reward of eternal life. The two aspects of His work, in other words, are inextricably intertwined. Neither was performed apart from the other. Together they constitute the wonderful, full salvation which was wrought for us by Christ our Redeemer.”

52 On this point, note the comments of John Murray in Redemption Accomplished and Applied (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955), 26-27: “The term ‘passive obedience’ does not mean that in anything Christ did he was passive, the involuntary victim of obedience imposed upon him. It is obvious that any such conception would contradict the very notion of obedience. And it must be jealously maintained that even in his sufferings and death our Lord was not the passive recipient of that to which he was subjected. In his sufferings he was supremely active, and death itself did not befall him as it befalls other men…. The word ‘passive,’ then, should not be interpreted to mean pure passivity in anything that came within the scope of his obedience. The sufferings he endured, sufferings which reached their climax in his death upon the accursed tree, were an integral part of his obedience and were endured in pursuance of the task given him to accomplish.” Louis Berkhof (1873-1957), Systematic Theology, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1938), 381, adds: “Christ as Mediator also entered the penal relation to the law, in order to pay the penalty in our stead. His passive obedience consisted in His paying the penalty of sin by His sufferings and death, and thus discharging the debt of all His people.
dience, his bearing the punishment for human sin. Some advocates of the NPP, however, have been less than clear in their affirmation even of this point. What is certain is that most people associated with the FV and NPP seem to share a common antipathy toward the doctrine of the active obedience of Christ. Among NPP writers, for example, N. T. Wright has made his objections clear. And some within FV and other Reformed circles, such as Rich Lusk, James Jordan, Norman Shepherd, and Andrew Sandlin, have critiqued this doctrine. These writers affirm active obedience only in the sense that Christ’s sinless adherence to the law qualifies him to be the spotless sacrifice for sin.

In the light of such contemporary challenges, the church must reaffirm its commitment to both the passive and active obedience of Christ, who was made under the law for our salvation. His bearing the curse of the law truly satisfied divine justice as a punishment for our sin and his obeying the requirements of the law truly merited our acceptance before God. “This office [of mediator and surety] the Lord Jesus did most willingly undertake; which that he might discharge, he was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfil it…. The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience, and sacrifice of himself, which he, through the eternal Spirit, once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father; and purchased, not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven…. ” (WCF 8.4-5) Reformed theologians and confessional standards from Calvin to the present day have professed this doctrine as central to the gospel. The following sections summarize the biblical teaching on this crucial issue.

53 For example, see Norman Shepherd, “Justification by Faith in Pauline Theology, in Backbone, 87-89.

54 For discussion of this point in regard to Wright, see Waters, Justification, 141-42.

55 See for example Wright, What Saint Paul, ch.6.

56 See Lusk, “A Response,” in Knox Colloquium, 139-43; Jordan, “Merit Versus Maturity,” in Federal Vision, 194-95; Shepherd, “Justification by Faith in Pauline Theology,” in Backbone, 85-89; Sandlin, “Covenant in Redemptive History,” in Backbone, 69-70. Shepherd also makes the untenable claim that Calvin, Casper Olevianus (1536-87), and the Heidelberg Catechism did not teach the active obedience of Christ (see “Justification by Works in Reformed Theology,” in Backbone, 103-20). As for Calvin, see the references in the next footnote. As for Olevianus and the Heidelberg Catechism, Q&A 60 speaks of believers being righteous in Christ as God “grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ, as if I had never committed nor had any sin, and had myself accomplished all the obedience which Christ has fulfilled for me, if only I accept such benefit with a believing heart.”

2. The Passive Obedience of Christ

Scripture teaches as a general matter that Christ came to render obedience to the will of his Father, for which task he was sent. The Gospel of John perhaps emphasizes this more than anywhere else. Christ speaks of being given a commandment(s) by his Father (10:18; 12:49; 14:31; 15:10). He finished the work that the Father entrusted to him (17:4). Central to this task entrusted to Christ was his suffering the curse of sin and going down to death for the forgiveness of his people. Reformed theology has rightly spoken of this aspect of Christ’s work as his passive obedience. Scripture speaks in many places of Christ’s suffering as the fulfillment of his Father’s will (e.g., Isa 53:10; Heb 10:5-10).

Scripture offers abundant testimony of this aspect of Christ’s work. The OT sacrificial system typologically pointed to the one final offering that Christ would make. For example, the law prescribes for the Israelite: “He shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.” (Lev 1:4) Leviticus repeatedly declares forgiven the one on whose behalf the sacrifices are made (4:20, 26, 31, 35; 6:7 [MT 5:26]). Since the blood of goats and bulls could never truly take away sin (Heb 10:4), however, God provided one final and perfect sacrifice, which the OT sacrifices anticipated. Christ was “offered once to bear the sins of many” (Heb 9:28) and “offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins.” (Heb 10:12) Thus the Apostle Peter can proclaim: “He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness. By his wounds you have been healed.” (1 Pet 2:24) Paul adds: “God shows his love for us in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us.” (Rom 5:8) All of this announces the fulfillment of the beautiful and haunting words of the prophecy of Christ’s work in Isa 53:4-6: “Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions; he was crushed for our iniquities; upon him was the chastisement that brought us peace, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD has laid on him the iniquity of us all.”

While the treatment of Christ’s active obedience in the next section is more comprehensive than that of his passive obedience as discussed in this section, this in no way implies that his active obedience is more important than his passive obedience. Rather, in the current controversies, fewer parties dispute the significance of his passive obedience, while his active obedience is under greater attack. Thus, the doctrine of active obedience warrants closer scrutiny.

3. The Active Obedience of Christ

Before looking directly at biblical teaching on the active obedience of Christ, it may be helpful to note that it does not appear in a vacuum. From the beginning, as discussed in section B.4, God has required of all human beings perfect obedience to his law. Adam did not fulfill this demand on behalf of his posterity, and of course no one since is able to fulfill it on his own. Yet God has continued to remind his people of this demand and thereby to indicate that he will not simply overlook it. Conscientious readers of Scripture would naturally expect their Messiah to satisfy this requirement on their behalf. Thus, when Jesus says that he must fulfill all righteousness (Matt 3:15) and when Paul announces that Christ was born “under the law” to redeem us (Gal 4:4-5), it is very difficult to imagine that only passive obedience is in mind or active obedience simply in the sense of qualifying Christ to be an acceptable sacrifice. This theological background, which shows the necessity of Christ’s active obedience if we are to be saved, should be kept in mind.

In addition to such general theological concerns, more specific exegetical considerations also demonstrate the truth and importance of Christ’s active obedience. One important example is Paul’s teaching on the “righteousness of God.” One of the elements of the NPP’s critique of traditional interpretations of Paul is that the important Pauline
phrase “the righteousness of God” refers to God’s covenant faithfulness. NPP proponents have also argued that “righteousness,” when applied to human beings, indicates their covenant status. The idea of “righteousness” is inevitably crucial for an understanding of justification. Not only does justification itself refer to a declaration of righteousness, but Paul also identifies the righteousness of God as the answer to the human plight caused by inability to be justified by works of the law. Much traditional Reformed exposition of Paul and the doctrine of justification has seen a vital connection between the righteousness of God that justifies and the righteousness that is imputed to believers for their justification. More specifically, Reformed theologians have associated the “righteousness of God” with the obedience of Christ that is imputed to Christians and upon which the justifying verdict is rendered. The typical NPP understanding breaks this connection. For Wright, for example, the righteousness of God is not the sort of thing that can be imputed to another, because the righteousness of the judge is a very different thing from the righteousness of a plaintiff or defendant.

Paul’s use of “righteousness” language is a large question and the subject of much recent scholarly debate. Though this report cannot provide a comprehensive treatment of this topic, it does seek to remind the church of the solid exegetical ground upon which traditional Reformed understanding of the “righteousness of God” rests.

Noteworthy, in the first place, is that a number of competent scholars have provided rigorous critiques of the NPP view of the “righteousness of God.” No full-blown critique here is therefore necessary, but a few points can be mentioned. Stephen Westerholm critiques the NPP view in the midst of his own constructive description of Paul’s use of “righteousness” language. Mark Seifrid offers his critique through a study of the use of “righteousness” terminology in the OT and early Judaism. One of the important conclusions emerging from Seifrid’s study is that the NPP’s understanding of the righteousness of God is greatly oversimplified. Among his findings are the following points: First, “righteousness” in the OT is both retributive/punitive and saving; though the latter is four times more common, Paul’s use of “righteousness” in justification must have a retributive aspect. Second, the concept of a standard or norm is generally associated with the word group. Third, “righteousness” language in the OT is seldom used in covenantal contexts;

---

58 See citations and discussion above.

59 Wright, What Saint Paul, 97-98.

60 Westerholm, Perspectives, ch. 15.

instead it has to do first of all with God’s ordering of creation.\textsuperscript{62} Fourth and finally, following upon the previous point, when Paul evokes associations from the Psalms and Isaiah in Rom 1:17, the context is creational: God’s acts of justification are not merely “salvation” (and not merely for Israel), but the establishment of justice in the world he made and governs.

What does it mean to be declared “righteous,” that is, justified? Is the Christian’s righteousness simply a matter of his covenant status, as suggested by NPP proponents? Paul’s use of “righteousness” language is not consistent with this claim, as is evident straightaway upon Paul’s introduction of the righteousness theme in Romans. Immediately after announcing that the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel (1:16-17), Paul writes that “the wrath of God is being revealed from heaven upon all the ungodliness and \textit{unrighteousness} [\textit{αδικιαν}] of men who suppress the truth in \textit{unrighteousness} [\textit{αδικια}].” Paul, therefore, speaks of unrighteousness in moral terms, indicating that righteousness has to do with moral activity and not just covenant status.\textsuperscript{63} Furthermore, when Paul speaks about the righteousness that does \textit{not} justify, he speaks in moral terms and not in terms of being in or out of the covenant. For example, in Titus Paul says that we are justified by grace (3:7), “not from works in \textit{righteousness} [\textit{δικαιοσυνη}] that we have done” (3:5). Likewise, what does not justify is “their own righteousness” [\textit{την ιδιαν δικαιοσυνην}] (Rom 10:3) or “my own righteousness” [\textit{εµην δικαιοσυνην}] (Phil 3:9). In context, this personal kind of righteousness is one that is pursued zealously, by doing (Rom 9:31; 10:2, 5), by zealous efforts according to the law (Phil 3:5-6). Again, the verdict that “there is no one \textit{righteous} [\textit{δικαιος}], not even one” (Rom 3:10), is demonstrated by people’s immoral behavior (3:11-18) and ends with the verdict that no flesh shall be justified [\textit{δικαιωθησεται}] by works of the law (3:20).

The Pauline answer to the plight that no one is righteous and therefore that one’s own righteousness cannot justify is the \textit{rightness of God} [\textit{δικαιοσυνη θεου}]. This is evident in most of the passages referenced in the preceding paragraph. The great contrast with the unrighteousness of men (Rom 1:18) is the gospel’s revelation of the \textit{rightness of God}, such that the righteous will live by faith (1:16-17). The radical transition from Rom 3:20 to 3:21 is similar: no one is righteous and hence no flesh shall be justified by works of the law (3:10, 20), “But now apart from law the \textit{rightness of God} [\textit{δικαιοσυνη θεου}] has been manifested, testified to by the law and the prophets, the \textit{rightness of God} [\textit{δικαιοσυνη θεου}] through faith in Jesus Christ” (Rom 3:21-22). Likewise in Rom 10:3: those seeking to establish their own righteousness were those who did not submit to the \textit{rightness of God}, of which they were ignorant. Phil 3:9 also makes such a contrast. Paul no longer wishes to have his own righteousness, but the \textit{rightness from God} [\textit{την εκ θεου δικαιοσυνην}]. Finally, a passage not mentioned in the

\textsuperscript{62} Westerholm, \textit{Perspectives}, 286-96, makes a similar point. While this dissociation of covenant and righteousness rests upon interesting observations and is effective for critiquing the NPP, one should be wary about too strict a dissociation between these two concepts—at the very least since the creation order itself is covenantal in nature.

\textsuperscript{63} See pertinent comments by Waters, \textit{Justification}, 137, which touch upon inconsistencies in Wright’s presentation at this point.
previous paragraph but also speaking of the righteousness of God in the context of justification is 2 Cor 5:21 (see 5:19 for the clear reference to God’s justifying act).

Paul is clear, then, that the righteousness of God is the answer to our inability to be justified by our own righteousness. Nearly all of the passages cited above explicitly associate this righteousness of God with justification by grace through faith. Thus, if our problem is lack of righteousness, understood in moral terms, then the righteousness of God must provide the solution. More specifically, however, what is this righteousness of God and how does it provide for our lack of righteousness in justification? Two passages just mentioned, Phil 3:9 and 2 Cor 5:21, speak very significantly of the righteousness of God for our justification coming to us “in Christ.” The righteousness of God provides for our lack of righteousness only through Christ and his work. Christ mediates and communicates the righteousness of God.

Paul fills in the picture in Rom 5:16-19. Here he speaks specifically of our righteousness as the obedience of Christ, the Second Adam. That Paul’s concern in this passage is with justification and the covenant of works is clear. In 5:16 he states that the gift brought δικαιοσύνη, justification, in contrast to κατακρίμα, condemnation. The references to Adam, transgression, the disobedience of the one, and death draw readers’ minds to the creation covenant. 5:17 begins with γαρ, “for.” Thus, v. 17 explains what the justification mentioned in 5:16 entails. Paul says that those who reign in life through Christ are those who receive the gift of δικαιοσύνη, righteousness,—hence, justification consists in receiving righteousness, as a gift. A number of commentators understand this righteousness as a reference to the Christian’s status as righteous.64 As considered above, however, our predicament in regard to righteousness concerns our moral uprightness, not our status per se. Paul speaks not of a gift of justification, which might indeed refer to a gift of the status of being righteous. He speaks instead of a gift of righteousness, a provision of the moral rectitude that we lack in ourselves. Given all that Paul says elsewhere, this gift of righteousness must be the righteousness of God in Christ, somehow bestowed upon us.65

Rom 5:18-19 confirms this interpretation. In 5:18, Paul says that justification of life comes through “one act of righteousness” ενος δικαιωματος.66 This “one act

64 E.g., see Moo, Romans, 339; Schreiner, Romans, 286; and Morris, Romans, 237.

65 This is the view defended by Murray, Romans, 1.198.

66 This phrase presents two difficult issues of translation. First, on the definition of δικαιωματος as “act of righteousness” rather than “justification,” as in 5:16 (see Murray,” Romans, 200-01). Morris, Romans, 239, takes the opposite view. Second, assuming the definition of “act of righteousness,” whether the translation should read “one act of righteousness” or “the act of righteousness of the one” is grammatically ambiguous. The latter translation would seem to be supported by the widely accepted idea that 5:18 finishes the comparison begun in 5:12 but suspended through verses 13-17; the emphasis in 5:12 is on the one man who sinned rather than on the oneness of the sin. If this translation is adopted, the objection to taking this verse in support of the doctrine of active obedience considered in the next section is certainly weakened. Even following the former translation (as is done here, for the sake of argument), however, active obedience is taught in this text.
of righteousness,” then, apparently defines what the “gift of righteousness” in 5:17 is—and this makes perfect sense in light of the idea of righteousness as moral rectitude. Paul then becomes most specific in 5:19: the righteous act that we receive as a gift of righteousness is none other than “the obedience of the one.” The many are constituted righteous through the obedience of Christ. Hence, in summary, Paul asserts that a gift brings justification (5:16), this gift is a gift of righteousness (5:17), this gift of righteousness focuses upon one righteous act (5:18), and this righteous act is the obedience of the one man, Jesus Christ (5:19).

The more likely reading of 5:18 contrasts the “one sin” that brings condemnation with the “one righteous act” that brings justification. Objectors claim that reference to “one” act seems odd if Paul was intending to point to Christ’s active obedience, and therefore they believe that the scope is limited to the crucifixion, that is, his passive obedience. The objectors’ own interpretation of Rom 5:18 has very serious weaknesses, however. First, the crucifixion itself was not really one act of Christ. Insofar as Christ submitted himself to this fate and interacted with his Father and those around him, the crucifixion was a series of actions rather than a single act. Second, even on the assumption that the crucifixion was a single act, Christ’s passive obedience cannot be equated with the crucifixion. His passive obedience was no more a single act than his active obedience was, since he suffered throughout his life and thereby learned obedience in order to become a perfect high priest (e.g., Heb 2:10, 17-18; 5:7-10). Therefore, even if Rom 5:18 refers only to passive obedience (as the objectors wish to understand it), it must refer to much more than the crucifixion. Third, it is unwarranted to understand the crucifixion only in terms of passive obedience. Christ’s going to the cross was a supreme act of love toward God and neighbor, and therefore was an aspect of his active obedience as well, the positive fulfilling of the law of God.

In light of these considerations, there must have been some reason for Paul’s emphasis on the oneness of Christ’s righteous action other than the isolation of a single discrete event. Much more plausible is that Rom 5:18 refers to the whole course of Christ’s obedience. As Murray suggests, Paul speaks of the one act as a reference to the whole of
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67 This claim is in contrast to a number of commentators who do not associate the gift of righteousness with the one righteous act (e.g., see Dunn, Romans, 283), though he does not explain his reasons for this conclusion.

68 On the forensic meaning of this term (see, e.g., Moo, Romans, 345). Murray, Collected Writings, 2.214-15, speaks of this in terms of union with Christ and therefore as richer than imputation, but also demands that the term be taken as strictly forensic. Schreiner (Romans, 288), does not so limit it.

69 Dunn (Romans, 283-84), is clear on this point; Moo (Romans, 344) and Schreiner (Romans, 287-88) agree tentatively. Wright, though rejecting the idea of active obedience, takes a somewhat broader view of Paul’s reference than simply the crucifixion (see Romans, 529). Both Wright and Dunn say that Paul “almost certainly” does not speak of active obedience in this passage. Norman Shepherd, without any qualifications, restricts the reference in 5:18-19 to Christ’s “sacrifice of atonement” (see “Justification by Faith in Pauline Theology,” 88-89).
Christ’s obedience in its “compact unity.” An initial consideration in support of this interpretation is the analogy between Adam and Christ. In 5:18, this analogy is obvious and cannot be denied, as is the case in 5:15-19 more generally. What significance does this have for understanding the reference to Christ’s obedience? Dunn argues that interpreting Christ’s one act as comprehensive breaks the comparison to Adam, but the opposite in fact seems the case. Paul, of course, establishes both similarity and dissimilarity between Adam and Christ in these verses. While the similarity lies in the mode of representation by which Adam and Christ, by disobedience and obedience, have brought condemnation/death and justification/life to the many, dissimilarity lies in the fact that Christ gained for us “much more” (5:17) than Adam lost. God required of Adam a perfect obedience, tested over time, not only the original righteousness and moral guiltlessness in which he was created. Adam was born righteous and continued in that state for a time, but God required a course of obedience to his law, the passing of a probationary test, for Adam to attain to a state of irreversible judicial approbation and eschatological life. If Christ indeed came as the Second Adam, to succeed where Adam failed, and brought in much more than Adam lost, then simply seeing passive obedience in 5:18 and surrounding verses seems radically insufficient. Christ’s passive obedience brings forgiveness, resulting in a condition of moral guiltlessness. But that was not enough for justification resulting in eschatological life. In context, the “righteous act” of Christ surely cannot be dissociated from the tested righteous obedience that God required of Adam in the garden.

Other considerations also support Murray’s suggestion that Paul refers to Christ’s entire obedience in its “compact unity” in Rom 5:18. For example, if Paul did have Christ’s death particularly in mind in 5:18, this hardly constitutes reason to eliminate his prior course of obedience. Christ’s death may well have been at the forefront of Paul’s thoughts. Paul and many other biblical writers speak of the cross as the great act of Christ’s earthly ministry on our behalf, and the immediately preceding context provides an example of this (Rom 5:8, 10). However, the importance of the crucifixion can only be understood in the light of a number of other passages—Pauline and otherwise—that describe the cross as the climax of a course of obedience extending throughout his entire earthly life.

The Gospels present such a picture of the relation of Christ’s death with his previous ministry. Luke 9:51, for example, speaks of Christ fixing his face to go to Jerusalem (surely an allusion to Isa 50:7). Little more than one-third of the way through this Gospel, Luke begins to portray specifically the death of Christ as the goal toward which his long course of obedience was pointing, in the face of great temptation to divert from it. Christ’s crucifixion was not an isolated act, but the climax of the whole.

Paul’s own testimony on this point is perhaps best seen in Phil 2:8. Here Paul writes that Christ became obedient μεχρὶ θανάτου—unto death. As argued immedi-

70 Murray, Romans, 1.200-02.

71 Dunn, Romans, 283-84.

72 This point needs to be affirmed against Robert Gundry’s claim, in regard to Rom 5:12-19, of “the absence of any contextual indication that Christ’s obedience included a previous life of obedience to the law” (see Robert H. Gundry, “The Nonimputation of Christ’s Righteousness,” in Justification: What’s at Stake in the Current Debates, ed. Mark Husbands and Daniel J. Treier [Downers Grove: IVP, 2004], 32).
ately below, 2:8-9 teaches that Christ’s exaltation was the reward of his obedience, and here we may simply note that the text does not allow this obedience to be identified with or isolated in the crucifixion. Instead, as an obedience unto death, the crucifixion must be seen as the end or climax of a longer course of obedience. Where did this obedience begin? Whether the first action of Christ referred to in 2:7 (“he emptied himself”) refers to his incarnation or death, the other two actions described here surely refer to the incarnation. Christ’s obedience, then, began at the very inception of his human existence and his death brought it to its dramatic completion.

More generally, Phil 2:5-11 offers helpful confirmation of the idea at work throughout this section, namely, that Christ offered a true human obedience that was accepted by the Father and deserved an eschatological reward. Verses 7-8 meditate upon Christ’s obedience in his emptying himself, taking the form of a servant, being found in appearance as a man, and humbling himself. These verses climax with the affirmation that Christ became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” Verses 9-11 proceed to reflect upon the Son’s exaltation following his obedience. God exalted him and gave him the name above every name in order that every knee might bow before him and every tongue confess Christ as Lord. Crucial for the present discussion is that Paul describes Christ’s exaltation as the consequence of his obedience and his obedience as the cause of his exaltation. Paul does this by connecting the conclusion of his description of Christ’s obedience in 2:8 and the beginning of his description of Christ’s exaltation with the strong causal conjunction διο: Christ “was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God exalted him.” The exaltation is the consequence of the obedience; the obedience earns the reward. Hence the initial act of Christ’s exaltation, his resurrection, is described as his justification (1 Tim 3:16; compare Rom 1:4); it was a justification not by grace through faith, but of works.

At least two FV proponents have argued that this passage actually rules out the notion of merit in regard to Christ’s obedience, because in 2:9 Paul uses the word εχαρισατο, which etymologically derives from the word for “grace,” χαρις, to describe God’s giving the name above every name to Christ. This indicates, they claim, that the Father exalted the Son not meritoriously but graciously. This argument as it stands fails, however. One reason it fails is its fallacious reasoning that etymological derivation determines the meaning of a word apart from context. The context of Phil 2:5-11 shows that


75 For further discussion of this passage in the context of similar issues, see David Van Drunen and R. Scott Clark, “The Covenant Before the Covenants,” in The Foolishness of the Gospel.


77 This is what D. A. Carson terms the “root fallacy.” “One of the most enduring of errors, the root fallacy pre supposes that every word actually has a meaning bound up with its shape or its components. In this view, meaning is determined by etymology; that is, by the root or roots of a word” (see Exegetical Fallacies [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984], 26-32).
merit cannot be eliminated from Paul’s teaching here. The context, as Vos puts it, is one of “work rendered and value received.”\(^7^8\) The Father exalted the Son because the Son perfectly fulfilled his course of obedience. The Son obeyed, *therefore* the Father exalted him. Vos, who sees a reference to “grace” here, cuts through possible confusion: “Εχαρισατο means that God bestowed it as a gracious gift, not, of course, in the specific sense of the word ‘grace,’ implying that there was any unworthiness in Christ which God had to overlook, but in the more general sense implying that this was an act in which the graciousness, the kindness of God manifested itself.”\(^7^9\) Vos writes this only after having established the “objective causal connection expressed in…Philippians 2:9” which illustrates the fact that “Christ by His perfect obedience was just before God, and on the ground of His being just received eternal life.”\(^8^0\)

To conclude this section on active obedience, it is worth recalling that God repeatedly affirms that he desires obedience, not sacrifice—understood comparatively, in relation to each other. Sacrifice is necessary, but God desires much more, he desires obedience. Robert L. Dabney (1820-98) comments: “Pardon would release from the punishment of its breach, but would not entitle to the reward of its performance.” He analogizes to a servant who fails to perform a duty for which a reward is promised and then, being punished, demands the reward because he was punished. “Common sense would pronounce it absurd,” Dabney concludes.\(^8^1\) Reformed theology has rightly believed that Scripture too pronounces it absurd. Christ, as the Second Adam, and therefore as a true human being, fulfills for his people the general human requirement for this perfect obedience. He has left us not in a state of moral guiltlessness and untested and unconfirmed righteousness like Adam before the Fall, nor does he give us simply that with which God is unsatisfied (sacrifice), but provides that true obedience to God’s will, that love of God and neighbor in summary of the law, which found its greatest evidence and climax in his going down to death.

Thus, various streams of biblical teaching come together in the doctrine of active obedience. Paul associates the obedience of Christ with the righteousness of God that justifies. A true human obedience is rendered by the one called the Second Adam, satisfying the requirement of obedience discussed at length above. Yet this obedience is also the righteousness of God, being offered by the God-Man. God’s righteousness in general undoubtedly conveys more than simply Christ’s obedience during his earthly min-

---

78 Geerhardus Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (1930; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 275. The full sentence reads: “Hence in Phil. ii.9 the gracious bestowal of the name above every name upon the Saviour is placed by Paul without the slightest hesitation on the footing of work rendered and value received: ‘*Wherefore also* God highly exalted Him and gave unto Him the name which is above every name.’” Vos further elaborates his point in footnote 13, page 275.


istry. In the context of justification, however, that divine righteousness is expressed in the obedience of Christ, and this is the righteousness granted us as a gift that constitutes us righteous. The reductionism of the NPP is to be avoided. The righteousness of God and the righteousness of man come together at last in the work of Christ, and thus in him we find our righteousness (see also Jer 23:6).

E. The Imputation of Christ’s Obedience to Believers

If Christ endured the curse of the law so that our sins might be forgiven (passive obedience) and performed the requirements of the law so that God’s demand for perfect obedience might be satisfied (active obedience), then the benefits of this objective work must also be applied to us in the act of justification itself. According to the Reformed tradition, our sins become Christ’s and the righteousness of Christ becomes ours by means of imputation. That is, our sins are judicially reckoned or credited to Christ (whereby he does not become inherently sinful) and his righteousness is judicially reckoned or credited to us (whereby we do not become inherently righteous). In back of this lies the doctrine of the imputation of Adam’s first sin to his posterity.

The doctrine of imputation is expressed a number of times in the Westminster Standards. For example, WCF 11.1 explains that God freely justifies believers “not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them….” The WLC uses similar language in speaking of believers being justified “only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to them” (70) and of God “imputing his righteousness to them.” (71) WSC 33 likewise affirms that justification is “only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us.” This judicial imputation accomplished in justification answers the judicial imputation of Adam’s first sin: “They [our first parents] being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed…. (WCF 6.3)

The idea of imputation comes directly from Scripture. The imputation of Adam’s first sin is foundational background to the doctrine of justification. A number of Reformed theologians, drawing from Rom 5:12-19 especially, have competently defended the doctrine that Adam’s sin is imputed directly or immediately (that is, without the mediation of inherited depravity) to his descendants.82 Thus, no detailed argument for the doctrine is offered here. Given that human condemnation rests upon the imputation of Adam’s first sin and one’s own individual sins, Scripture describes the two aspects of justification (the forgiveness of sins and the accounting of believers as righteous) in terms of imputation. First, Paul speaks of forgiveness as the non-imputation of sins. In Rom 4:8, quoting Psa 32:2, Paul calls blessed the man to whom the Lord does not impute [λογισθηται] sin. The entire quotation from Psa 32 in Rom 4:7-8 displays that non-imputation and forgiveness are identical: “Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven, and whose sins are

82 Among the more noteworthy defenses of the doctrine, particularly in light of the contexts in which they wrote, are Turretin, Institutes, 1.613-29 and Hodge, Systematic Theology, 2.192-205. More recently, Murray offers an extended defense of the position in Imputation.
covered; blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not count [impute] his sin.” 2 Cor 5:19 is similar. Paul describes God’s reconciling the world to himself in Christ as his “not imputing [λογιζοµενος] to them their transgressions.”

Scripture also treats the second aspect of justification, God’s accepting believers as righteous, in terms of imputation. This is implied, though not said explicitly, in 2 Cor 5:21: “For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.” Paul mentions imputation specifically two verses earlier, in 5:19, as considered in the preceding paragraph (“not imputing to them their transgressions”). Thus the concept of imputation is present in the immediate context. In addition, 5:21 speaks of God making Christ, who knew no sin, to be sin for us. Christ must have been “made sin” by imputation, given a broader biblical and theological understanding of the nature of Christ’s expiatory sacrifice and the fact that Christ, the lamb of God without blemish (1 Pet 1:19), never became inherently sinful. Since the second half of 5:21 overtly parallels the first half, if Christ’s being made sin is by imputation then our “becoming the righteousness of God” must also be by imputation.

Paul also speaks of the imputation of righteousness in explicit terms. Rom 4:6 teaches that God imputes righteousness apart from works. Paul repeats this language in 4:11: “in order that righteousness may be imputed to them.” Given the structure of 4:5-6, the statement that God “imputes righteousness apart from works” seems equivalent to the statement in 4:5 that God “justifies the ungodly.” In other words, to impute righteousness apart from works is precisely what justification of the ungodly is. What is this righteousness that is imputed to believers for their justification? Reading Rom 4 and 5 together answers this question. Rom 4 explains that righteousness is imputed in justification, but does not specifically tell us whose. Rom 5 tells us that Christ’s righteous obedience becomes ours in justification, but does not specifically tell us how. Read together, the ground and the means are linked: in justification, righteousness is imputed (Rom 4), specifically, the righteousness of Christ (Rom 5).

These truths are not metaphorical or peripheral, as some NPP proponents claim. Such claims fail to appreciate just how important a role imputation plays in Rom 4. It is more than a metaphor, it is God’s way of justifying the ungodly (4:5), precisely the thing he said he would not do (Exod 23:7)! God will not declare righteous one who is not truly righteous in some genuine sense. Hence if an imputation of righteousness does not underlie the justification of those who are ungodly in themselves, God is unjust (compare

---

83 On the interesting and significant parallel statements in the text, see D. A. Carson, “The Vindication of Imputation,” in Justification: What’s at Stake, 63.

84 Wright refers to imputation in Rom 4 as a “bookkeeping metaphor” that is a sidelight in Paul’s discussion and should not be made the dominant theme, as has been common in Reformation-inspired interpretation (Wright, Romans, 491). Dunn expresses perhaps analogous sentiments in regard to the “gift of righteousness” in 5:17. He says that this idea is significant and “not merely a rhetorically stretched usage,” but also argues that it should not be made determinative: the gift is the status of one acceptable to God, not an object received as if it becomes one’s own property (Dunn, Romans, 281-82).
Rom 3:25-26). Furthermore, Paul’s reference to the imputation of righteousness in Rom 4:6, 11 cannot be taken as mere statement of the fact that justification occurs rather than as a statement about how justification occurs. The theological shock that 4:5 provides to careful readers (i.e., that God will justify the ungodly, what Exod 23:7 says he will not do) makes the “how” question inevitable. And 4:6 answers that question exactly: by the imputation of righteousness God may justify the ungodly.

Other objections to the interpretation of Rom 4 offered here revolve around certain contextual difficulties concerning the imputation of righteousness. The chief difficulty is that righteousness is not the only thing that Paul says is imputed; he also says that God imputes faith (4:5, 9). Defenders of the imputation of active obedience cannot deny that there are difficult exegetical issues here. Nevertheless, defenders of the doctrine have countered the objectors’ contentions on a number of points. Murray dealt with the issue in an appendix to his Romans commentary, and though not offering a definitive explanation to all of Paul’s language, effectively argued that taking faith itself as that which is imputed violates the context. In a recent essay, D. A. Carson provides a very thorough and helpful treatment of Rom 4 on the question of imputation of active obedience.

---

85 This is the claim of Michael F. Bird, “Incorporated Righteousness: A Response to Recent Evangelical Discussion concerning the Imputation of Christ’s Righteousness in Justification,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 47 (2004): 266. Bird argues for the idea of “incorporated” righteousness over imputed righteousness, though he does not deny the idea of imputation of Christ’s righteousness altogether. He makes the undeveloped claim that talk of imputed righteousness is acceptable within the discourse of systematic theology, but “in more finely nuanced discussions of the topic” he believes that we should use language that “more readily comports with Paul’s concept of justification” (275). He states earlier that Paul addresses the topic of how we are justified, and answers that it is by union with Christ. He also states here, however, that Paul does not address the question of how union with Christ justifies, but that systematic theology may then legitimately answer that it is by imputation (see 261, n.44). In this latter claim, it seems that systematic theology is engaging in the more “finely nuanced” discussion. Though Bird claims Carson as inspiration for his thoughts on these matters (see ibid), the treatment of issues of biblical vs. theological language in the context of justification seems much more carefully handled by Carson in “The Vindication,” 47-50.

86 For example, the variation of Paul’s language is part of what drives Bird to conclude that Paul is not interested in the mechanism of justification in this chapter (“Incorporated,” 264-66). Robert Gundry (“The Nonimputation,” 19-25) also emphasizes this difficulty in his polemic against the imputation of “active” obedience (he affirms the imputation of passive obedience). Gundry concludes that faith cannot be understood as instrumental (as is common among those seeing imputed active obedience here), but that the imputing of faith and the imputing of righteousness are the same thing: “The conclusion to draw is that God counts both faith and righteousness because he counts them as identical to each other” (25).


88 Carson, “The Vindication,” 46-78.
A few points of response may be summarized, all of which Carson deals with in much greater detail. First, Paul clearly establishes the stark difference between merited and unmerited imputation in 4:4-5. Indisputably, Paul speaks of the Christian’s justification by faith as an unmerited imputation, such that justification is of the ungodly. To interpret Paul as turning around and in the very same verses affirming that a person’s own faith is the righteousness by which he is justified is strikingly untenable. Second, to see faith as playing an instrumental role in these verses is precisely where the context points us. Both the end of Rom 3 and the end of Rom 4 speak of faith as the instrument of justification, even using expressions such as “from” [ἐκ] and “through” [διὰ] faith. Third, λογίζοµαι carries a wide range of meanings, and the variations of expression at the beginning of Rom 4 hardly need to be taken as identical.

F. By Faith Alone

Another key aspect of the biblical Reformed doctrine of justification is that it is by faith alone. That is, faith, in distinction from “works,” is the only instrument of justification, the only means by which sinners obtain this blessing. This truth is well grounded in Scripture and expressed in the Westminster Standards and in Reformed theology more generally. Nevertheless, proponents of both the NPP and FV have challenged various aspects of this doctrine too. Therefore, the biblical and confessional character of both the role of faith as the alone instrument of justification and the specific nature of saving faith must be reaffirmed.

1. The Alone Instrument of Justification

First to consider is faith’s role as the only instrument of justification. The Westminster Standards teach this idea in several places. WCF 11.2 states: “Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification….” The WLC explains that justification is “received by faith alone” (70; see also WSC 33) and that God requires “nothing of them for their justification but faith…” (71). Furthermore, WLC 73 says: “Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruits of it, nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof, were imputed to him for his justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness.”

As is evident in WLC 73, the affirmation that faith is instrumental is the denial that faith is the basis or ground of justification. Our faith is not the basis upon which we are justified, but the means by which we are justified. Scripture uses a variety of expressions to teach this instrumental character of faith. For example, Paul speaks of the righteousness (of God) that is through faith (διὰ πίστεως) in Rom 3:22 and Phil 3:9. In Phil 3:9 he also uses the apparently equivalent statement that the righteousness of God is by faith (επι τῆ πίστει). A third expression that Paul uses, in Rom 5:1, is that justification comes from faith (εκ πίστεως). The Epistle to the Hebrews 11:7 communicates faith’s instrumental character with yet another expression: Noah was an heir of the righteousness according to faith (κατὰ πίστιν).

In nearly all of the biblical passages cited in the previous paragraph, faith is distinguished from works. This is one of the important ways in which Scripture teaches that faith alone is the instrument of justification. Justification comes by faith, not by works; hence, justification is by faith alone. Section I.B.5 above of this report documented the copious examples in the Pauline literature in which faith, as the instrument of justification,

2. The Nature of Saving Faith

In order for this sharp contrast between faith and works to make sense, however, the precise nature of this saving, justifying faith must be understood. The confession that justification is by faith alone, apart from works of the law, demands conceptual clarity on what it is that makes faith unique, in distinction from everything that might be classified as works or obedience to the law. Faith as the alone instrument of justification is rightly understood only when this clarity is attained.

To begin, Reformed theology has often identified three aspects of true saving faith: notitia, assensus, and fiducia, perhaps best translated by the words knowledge, assent, and trust. Though knowledge of the object of faith and assent to the truth of this knowledge is necessary, they are by no means sufficient. The intellectual element of faith must be accompanied by trust. Furthermore, the particular object of saving faith is Christ, the redeemer and mediator of the covenant of grace. Though trust in God and his word was required before the Fall, saving, justifying faith is soteriological (that is, pertaining to salvation) and hence possible only after the Fall. As trust in Christ the mediator, saving faith is “extraspective” in nature; in other words, it looks outside of itself and rests upon the work of another. This is the unique office of faith and explains why it must not be confused with “works” more generally. Though faith is an act of obedience in the sense that God does command us to believe in his Son, faith is different from every other act of obedience, from “works,” in that faith is the only virtue that grasps and receives the merits of another, namely, Christ. Faith is different from faithfulness (though the same Greek word, πιστις, can indicate either one). For this reason, we understand that God did not arbitrarily select faith as the established instrument of justification, but that faith is the entirely appropriate, and only, instrument of justification. Good works flow from faith as its fruits, as is considered in more detail below; however, faith and good works must be distinguished and never confused.

Again, the Westminster Standards articulate these ideas quite clearly. WLC 72, for example, speaks of the necessity of both intellectual assent and trust for true faith: the sinner “not only assenteth to the truth of the promise of the gospel, but receiveth and resteth upon Christ and his righteousness....” The WCF likewise speaks of the believer’s faith as a “receiving and resting on him [Christ] and his righteousness” (11.1; 11.2), and WLC 73 and WSC 33 and 86 use similar language. In addition, WCF 14.2 describes the “principal acts of saving faith” to be the “accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace.” Finally, WLC 73 carefully distinguishes justifying faith from good works by calling good works the “fruits” of faith rather than an aspect of faith itself: “Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruits of it, nor as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof, were imputed to him for his justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness.”

Some writers associated with the FV have expressed views of faith different from this historic Reformed teaching, as expressed in the Westminster Standards. Though not ordinarily challenging the terminology of “justification by faith alone,” they have changed the definition of faith and have therefore changed the meaning of “faith alone.” Specifically, these writers make faith into a broad category that includes good works or acts of obedience more generally, rather than upholding the confessional distinction between faith, on
the one hand, and works as the fruits of faith, on the other hand. Their concern to avoid antinomianism and the separation of faith from works is valid, but their failure to make a clear distinction between faith and works is a serious error. Furthermore, it seems doubtful that any significant Reformed theologian has ever actually denied that works must invariably flow forth as the fruit of faith.

In light of recent developments, the biblical support for the Reformed view of the nature of saving faith may be recounted briefly. First, that saving faith requires more than simply a general trust in God and his word (often called *fides generalis*), but also a particular trust in Christ and his redeeming work (often called *fides specialis*), is evident in Scripture. The various authors of the NT consistently point us to Christ as the object of faith. John tells us that “whoever believes in him” (God’s only Son) will not perish or be condemned, but receive eternal life (John 3:16, 18). Luke records the words of Peter that “everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins” (Acts 10:43), and Peter com-

---

89 The relationship between faith and works is a recurring ambiguity throughout Shepherd’s writings. At times he appears to uphold a distinction between them yet at other times to make other acts of obedience simply a part of what faith itself is, encompassed under the broader category of faithfulness. He is ambiguous in his repeated use of the phrase “a living, active, obedient faith” and variations of this phrase. For example, he writes: “faith looks away from personal merit to the promises of God. Repentance and obedience flow from faith as the *fullness* of faith. This is faithfulness, and faithfulness is perseverance in faith. A living, active, and abiding faith is the way in which the believer enters into eternal life” (*The Call of Grace*, 50, emphasis added). The use of “fullness” here is unclear at best. It easily suggests, which the context does not exclude, that, just as it “looks away” to God’s promises, faith lacks integrity or wholeness, or is incomplete, unless it includes, in addition, repentance and obedience. Our concern here is not to isolate faith from repentance and good works. Rather, we are concerned not to obscure the extraspective, fiducial nature of the faith, never alone, that alone justifies. Similarly ambiguous is the statement: “Gospel proclamation calls us to a living faith, that is, to a penitent and obedient faith” (*BOTB*, 101). This leaves the impression, in its context, that repentance and obedience are what make faith living. Undeniably, “faith without works is dead” (Jam 2:26), but from that (and other like biblical passages) it does not follow that works give life to faith or constitute the vitality of faith. When our *Confession* (14.2) details what saving faith does, in distinction from its “principal acts” of “accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life,” it hardly means to say that the vitality of these principal acts resides in the manifold obedience done “by this faith.” Rather, such good works flow from faith as “the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith” (16.2). Elsewhere, Shepherd expresses his concern that this metaphor is subject to being misunderstood and rejects the analogy that faith is to good works as an appletree to the apples it bears. “An apple tree without apples is still an apple tree, but faith without its fruits and evidences is neither true nor lively” (“Justification By Faith Alone,” *Reformation & Revival Journal*, vol. 11, no. 2 [Spring 2002], 82). True, “faith without its fruits and evidences is neither true nor lively.” But the analogy is quite apt. The tree has its vitality *distinct* from the apples that grow on it and without that vitality there would be no apples; the apples do not constitute the vitality of the tree. Good works are certainly integral to the life lived by faith, but they are not integral to faith itself.
ments in his own epistle that though we do not see him now, we “believe in him” (1 Pet 1:8). Paul, of course, concurs as he announces the righteousness of God that comes “through faith in Jesus Christ” (Rom 3:22).

Scripture also testifies to the truth of the Reformed teaching that this saving faith in Christ is characterized not merely by intellectual assent, but especially by trust. One of Paul’s favorite OT verses for explaining the doctrine of justification, Hab 2:4, carries strong connotations of trust in its context. When the Lord proclaims that “the righteous shall live by his faith,” he contrasts the believer’s posture with that of the Chaldeans, who are puffed up (2:4), proud (1:8), and full of scoffing (1:10), whose own might is their god (1:11). While the Chaldeans are self-sufficient, the true Israelites must trust in God—even when every earthly indication suggests that all is lost (see 3:17-18). Hence, Hab 2:4 becomes the perfect verse for Paul to quote in contrast to Lev 18:5 (“if a person does them [God’s statutes and rules], he shall live by them”) in a passage such as Gal 3:11-12. Not by one’s own works, but by trust in another, can the sinner attain life. This element of trust is evident in many other places in which Paul speaks of faith. One clear example is Rom 4:20-21, where he speaks about Abraham: “No distrust made him waver concerning the promise of God, but he grew strong in his faith as he gave glory to God, fully convinced that God was able to do what he had promised.” Once again we can see the uniqueness of faith over against “works” and perceive why Paul can draw such a strong contrast between them.

Since faith is this extraspective trust in Christ, in distinction from “works,” it is also the entirely appropriate instrument of justification. By looking away from itself and resting upon another, faith is the suitable correlate of a justification that comes by divine grace rather than human effort. Paul stresses this point on a number of occasions. Rom 4:16 provides a helpful example. After making one of his frequent contrasts between inheriting the promise of God by faith and inheriting it by law in 4:13-15, Paul writes: “That is why it depends on faith, in order that the promise may rest on grace and be guaranteed to all his offspring….” If the promise comes by obedience to the law, it is not gracious; as Paul had explained several verses earlier: “Now to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due” (4:4). Likewise, he says later in Romans: “So too at the present time there is a remnant, chosen by grace. But if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works; otherwise grace would no longer be grace” (11:5-6). God makes justification rest upon faith in order that the promise may be according to grace (4:16). Faith, not works, is receptive of the gift that grace is. Paul drives home the same point in Gal 5:4-5. After warning his readers that putting oneself under the law means an obligation to perform the entire law (5:3), he writes: “You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace. For through the Spirit, by faith, we ourselves eagerly wait for the hope of righteousness.” Justification by

---


91 As noted above, even Dunn admits that this is the way in which Paul understands πίστις here; see *Romans 1-8*, 204.
works, then, is not gracious. If God is to give justification to his people as a free gift, faith alone is the proper instrument for receiving it.

G. Justification and Sanctification

A final matter to address in this section of the report is the relationship of justification and sanctification. In contrast to Roman Catholic theology, which makes sanctification an aspect of justification, Reformed theology has taught that justification and sanctification must be clearly distinguished. While justification is the judicial act of pardoning sin and reckoning believers as righteous, sanctification refers to the work of God by which he inwardly renews believers and makes them subjectively holy. But while Reformed theology has adamantly protected this distinction between these two blessings, it has also insisted that justification and sanctification are inseparable. A person cannot have one blessing without the other. In response to perennial suspicion that the Reformed doctrine of justification makes Christians antinomian or indifferent to holy living, Scripture and the Westminster Standards make clear that justification and sanctification are distinct yet inseparable. Justification is not sanctification, yet sanctification always follows justification; faith always has its fruits.

1. The Distinction between Justification and Sanctification

The various definitions of justification and sanctification offered in the Westminster Standards make the distinction between them evident. WLC 77, however, specifically describes how they differ: “Although sanctification be inseparably joined with justification, yet they differ, in that God in justification imputeth the righteousness of Christ; in sanctification his Spirit infuseth grace, and enableth to the exercise thereof; in the former, sin is pardoned; in the other, it is subdued: the one doth equally free all believers from the revenging wrath of God, and that perfectly in this life, that they never fall into condemna-

92 It is important to note here, and to keep in mind throughout the discussion that follows, that the term “sanctification” here is being used in its traditional Reformed sense of a progressive, inward work of God’s Spirit making believers holy. This is the meaning used in the Westminster Standards: “Sanctification is the work of God’s free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness” (WSC 35). Some recent Reformed theologians have also spoken of a “definitive sanctification,” indicating, with an appeal, e.g., to Rom 6:1-7:6, the believer’s once-for-all deliverance from being under the enslaving dominion of sin to being under the lordship of Christ and enslaved to righteousness; see John Murray, “Definitive Sanctification,” in Collected Writings, 2.277-93; and idem, Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics (1957; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 202-28. This idea is not directly under discussion here.

93 To illustrate this, A. A. Hodge (1823-86) states: “you can no more separate justification and sanctification than you can separate the circulation of the blood from the inhalation of the air. Breathing and circulation are two different things, but you can not have one without the other; they go together, and they constitute one life. So you have justification and sanctification; they go together, and they constitute one life” (see Evangelical Theology [London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1890], 310-11).
tion; the other is neither equal in all, nor in this life perfect in any, but growing up to perfection.”

2. The Inseparability of Justification and Sanctification

This quotation of WLC 77, though focusing upon the differences between justification and sanctification, also states that these blessings are “inseparably joined.” Gainsayers have constantly attempted to show the incompatibility of the biblical doctrine of justification with a genuine interest in the moral life. The Apostle Paul already confronted and answered such objections. Immediately after laying out the doctrine of justification in Romans 3-5, Paul faces his detractors: “What shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound?” (6:1) Shortly thereafter, Paul asks a similar question: “What then? Are we to sin because we are not under law but under grace?” (6:15) In Galatians, one can again hear the challenge of the gainsayer in the background: “For you were called to freedom, brothers. Only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh....” (5:13) Does justification, with the grace and freedom that it bestows, make one indifferent to or even encourage one to despise the concern for holiness? Paul’s answer is “by no means!”94 (Rom 6:2, 15)

Part of the reason why this is true is rooted in the doctrine of union with Christ. Before the WLC and WSC address the saving blessings of effectual calling, justification, adoption, and sanctification, it affirms the union with Christ true of all believers (WLC 66; WSC 30). WLC 66 states: “The union which the elect have with Christ is the work of God’s grace, whereby they are spiritually and mystically, yet really and inseparably, joined to Christ as their head and husband; which is done in their effectual calling.” Union with Christ underlies justification and sanctification and the other saving blessings, as WLC 69 goes on to explain: “The communion in grace which the members of the invisible church have with Christ, is their partaking of the virtue of his mediation, in their justification, adoption, sanctification, and whatever else, in this life, manifests their union with him.”

Scripture teaches this doctrine that we are justified and sanctified in union with Christ and that, correspondingly, justification and sanctification manifest that union. We are “justified in Christ” (Gal 2:17). In regard to sanctification, “We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, in order that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life” (Rom 6:4). Significantly, both of these passages just quoted fall in contexts in which Paul answers objections that his doctrines of justification and sanctification are incompatible. Justification and sanctification flow out of the same union with Christ. The one who is united with Christ must enjoy both justification and sanctification.

In addition to the doctrine of union with Christ, the idea of the ordo salutis makes clear that justification is prior to sanctification. This is not priority in the sense that

94 Paul’s phrase, µη γενοιτο, “strongly deprecates something suggested by a previous question or assertion” and “expresses the apostle’s abhorrence of an inference which he fears may be (falsely) drawn from his argument” (see Ernest De Witt Burton,”Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, 3rd ed. [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900; reprint Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1976], 79).
one is somehow more important than the other. Neither is it a temporal priority, strictly speaking, for there is no such thing as a justified person who is not also being sanctified. But while justification is the necessary prerequisite of the process of sanctification, that process is not the necessary prerequisite of justification. It is true to say that one must be justified in order to be sanctified; but it is untrue to say that one must be sanctified in order to be justified. Justification and sanctification bear a relationship to each other that cannot be reversed.

Minimally, Scripture teaches that sanctification is not incompatible with a justification that comes by grace alone through faith alone. Paul, for example, after acknowledging the objection to his doctrine of justification in Rom 6:1, goes on to explain (6:2-7:6) that in fact those who by faith in Christ are united to him in his death and resurrection and so are no longer slaves to sin now live in newness of life, offering up their bodies as instruments of righteousness. Paul is clear that the grace of God in Christ that justifies also sanctifies and does not nullify sanctification, as the Reformed tradition has consistently affirmed.

Beyond this minimal perspective, however, Scripture and the Reformed tradition have made a stronger affirmation. It is not simply that justification is compatible with sanctification, but also that justification is necessary for sanctification. Reformed theologians have expressed this conviction in various ways. Calvin, for instance, when explaining why justification, “the principal ground on which religion must be supported,” must be given such great care and attention, writes: “Unless you understand first of all what your position is before God, and what the judgment which he passes upon you, you have no foundation on which your salvation can be laid, or on which piety towards God can be reared.”

These claims rest upon solid biblical and theological considerations. Christ’s words in Luke 7:47, in regard to the sinful woman who anointed him at a Pharisee’s home, are on point: “Therefore I tell you, her sins, which are many, are forgiven—for she loved much. But he who is forgiven little, loves little.” The fact that this woman loved much was the proof that her many sins had been forgiven. If her love was possible apart from the forgiveness that comes in justification, then Christ’s appeal to this evidence loses its force. Without the experience of forgiveness there is no love; where there is love one can be sure that there has been forgiveness. Perhaps Paul’s most powerful statement of this necessity of justification for sanctification is Gal 5:13: “For you were called to freedom, brothers. Only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love serve one another.” Both Martin Luther (1483-1546) and John Calvin perceived the profundity of what Paul writes here, connecting Christian liberty, and thus justification, with sanctification.

---

95 Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.11.1.

96 Turretin, *Institutes*, 2.693.

liberty “a proper appendix to Justification.”

Following Paul’s lead, Calvin reflects upon why the Christian’s freedom, far from discouraging good works, in fact enables them. He writes: “Being constantly in terror so long as they are under the dominion of the law, they are never disposed promptly to obey God, unless they have previously obtained this liberty”; and later: “how can unhappy souls set themselves with alacrity to a work from which they cannot hope to gain anything in return but cursing? On the other hand, if freed from this severe exaction, or rather from the whole rigour of the law, they hear themselves invited by God with paternal lenity, they will cheerfully and alertly obey the call, and follow his guidance.”

For Calvin, no one can hope to begin pursuit of the good works that God requires, nor in the way he requires, apart from the peace of conscience gained only in justification.

Also relevant to note is the relationship between faith and works. As discussed above, faith is unique and thus distinct from works. But the Westminster Standards also teach that good works are never absent where faith is present. Though WLC 73 wishes to emphasize that faith justifies as an instrument and not in any other way, it does speak of “those other graces which do always accompany it” and “of good works that are the fruits of it.” Likewise, WCF 16.2 states: “good works, done in obedience to God’s commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith.” According to the Standards, therefore, good works must always accompany faith. Good works are the fruit and evidence of faith (though faith is not the fruit and evidence of good works).

Paul affirms these truths in passages such as Gal 5:6, where he speaks of “faith working through love” (Gal 5:6). Likewise, James emphasizes that any genuine faith will be accompanied by works: “So also faith by itself, if it does not have works, is dead” (2:17). James also connects faith and works a few verses later, while giving faith the causal priority: “You see that faith was active along with his works, and faith was completed by his works” (2:22). In this context, James shows that Abraham’s justification by faith (2:23; Gen 15:6) issued forth in good works, illustrated by his obedience in offering up Isaac many years later (2:21-22; Gen 22). In this connection we may note that there is no dispute in doctrine between Paul and James on justification. Though there have been differences among Reformed theologians on the particular exegetical details of James 2, many of them have effectively demonstrated the doctrinal concurrence of these two apostles. Any apparent disagreements between them (arising particularly from James’ statement that justification is “not by faith alone” in 2:24) are the result not of contradictory theologies, but of their intent to address different issues within the church and their different uses of the term “faith.” As J. Gresham Machen succinctly commented, “the faith that James is condemning is not the faith that Paul is commending.”

Even mainstream biblical schol-

98 Calvin, Institutes, 3.19.1.

99 Calvin, Institutes, 3.19.4-5.

ars, with no particular interest in defending the overarching doctrinal unity of Scripture, have recognized this point.\footnote{For example, Luke Timothy Johnson writes of Paul and James: “Despite the remarkable points of resemblance, they appear not to be talking to each other by way of instruction or correction. Rather, they seem to be addressing concerns specific to each author.” See \textit{The Letter of James}, vol. 37a, \textit{The Anchor Bible} (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 64.}

II JUSTIFICATION IN THE ECUMENICAL CONTEXT

As the OPC and other Reformed churches confess this biblical doctrine of justification and address the challenges to it presented by the NPP and FV, they would do well to remember the broader context in which the doctrine of justification is discussed in the present day. Perhaps most noteworthy on this score are recent Roman Catholic efforts to enter into discussion with Protestants on this issue and the resulting statements that these discussions have produced. Such statements have been general and ambiguous enough to permit both Roman Catholic and Protestant representatives to endorse them, yet have not clearly embraced Reformational teaching nor forsaken traditional Roman Catholic teaching. Such statements, along with other events, have left many in the present day with the impression that a great degree of unity exists among Roman Catholics and Protestants on the doctrine of justification. Yet the Roman church has never revoked the teaching of the Council of Trent, which anathematized the Reformation’s justification doctrines. Such a misleading situation may tempt Reformed people into complacency about the need to defend the doctrine of justification today or to be unduly attracted to attempts to transcend or go beyond historic Rome-Reformation debates, as the NPP, for example, purports to do. In light of this, the present section offers a brief survey of probably the two most important ecumenical statements on justification in recent years, the “Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification” and “The Gift of Salvation.”

A. The Joint Declaration

The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification (JDDJ) was signed on Reformation Day 1999 in Augsburg, Germany by representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and the Lutheran World Federation (an organization consisting of many, though not all, Lutheran denominations worldwide). The JDDJ presents itself as the culmination of many past discussions and statements produced by Lutherans and Roman Catholics (§§ 3, 6) and thus, with its strong claims about unity among the parties on the doctrine of justification, it represents a remarkable ecumenical event. This declaration purports to summarize the results of these Lutheran-Roman Catholic discussions and also to show that Lutheran and Roman Catholic churches are able to articulate a common understanding of justification, such that whatever differences remain are no longer to provoke doctrinal condemnation (§§ 3-4, 13, 41). There is “a consensus in the basic truths; the differing explanations in particular statements are compatible with it” (§14; see also § 40). The JDDJ acknowledges that Roman Catholics and Lutherans have condemned each other in the past, and at one point even comments on the “seriousness” of these condemnations (§ 42). But the declaration emphasizes developments and new insights that call for divisive questions to be reexamined in the present day (§ 7).
As the JDDJ describes the doctrine of justification, it often affirms positions that are consistent per se with the doctrines of the Reformation. For example, members of the OPC would warmly embrace the following affirmations: “Christ himself is our righteousness” and we are saved by grace alone, “in faith in Christ’s saving work and not because of any merit on our part” (§ 15); “whatever in the justified precedes or follows the free gift of faith is neither the basis of justification nor merits it” (§ 25); “We confess together that good works…follow justification and are its fruits” (§ 37). Elsewhere, however, it commends views that either conflict with Reformation teaching or at least omit key aspects of it. For example, in what is apparently a general definition of justification, the JDDJ omits any reference to the imputed righteousness of Christ and includes reference to sanctification (liberation from the power of sin): “Justification is the forgiveness of sins…. liberation from the dominating power of sin and death…and from the curse of the law…. It is acceptance into communion with God” (§ 11). This apparent confusion and mixing of the doctrines of justification and sanctification continues to be problematic in subsequent sections (for example, see §§ 22, 26, and 27). These are a few examples of why the Lutheran signers of the JDDJ must be suspected of compromising their fidelity to the teaching of the Reformation.

B. The Gift of Salvation

The second important ecumenical statement of recent years to mention here is the Gift of Salvation (GS). GS may be even more pertinent to the OPC than the JDDJ, given its North American context and the fact that some of its “evangelical” signatories have been well-respected names in many Reformed circles. GS appeared in late 1997, signed by a group of Roman Catholics and evangelicals, many of whom had previously adopted Evangelicals and Catholics Together: The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium in 1994. This 1994 document joined Roman Catholics and evangelicals as allies in the contemporary culture wars, called one another brothers and sisters in Christ, and embraced cooperation in evangelism—all of this despite important remaining differences between them. GS addressed one of these areas of historic difference: salvation in general and justification in particular. The signers of this document say they are able “to express a common faith in Christ and so to acknowledge one another as brothers and sisters in Christ” and “together bear witness to the gift of salvation” despite “some persistent and serious differences.”

Like the JDDJ, GS often sounds orthodox from a Reformation perspective. At the same time, many of these statements are general or ambiguous enough that a Roman Catholic can affirm them as well without sacrificing his allegiance to Trent and traditional Roman doctrine. For example, when GS says that “justification is not earned by any good works or merits of our own; it is entirely God’s gift,” it is not clear whether this eliminates merit that, according to Roman doctrine, one attains after initial justification and before

---


final justification.\textsuperscript{104} Also, when GS asserts that “In justification, God, on the basis of Christ’s righteousness alone, declares us to be no longer his rebellious enemies but his forgiven friends, and by virtue of his declaration it is so,” it is unclear whether the righteousness of Christ referred to here means the imputed obedience of Christ as the sole ground of justification. Traditional Roman doctrine can use similar language while meaning something very different by it; for example, it affirms “Christ’s righteousness,” but as an infused rather than imputed righteousness.\textsuperscript{105}

Later in the document, GS describes faith and claims that “what we here affirm is in agreement with what the Reformation traditions have meant by justification by faith alone (\textit{sola fide}).” Despite this assertion, GS fails to speak of the extraspective character of faith, probably the aspect of faith that most distinguishes traditional Reformation and Roman understandings of it. A final example is the affirmation of GS that sanctification “is not fully accomplished at the beginning of our life in Christ, but is progressively furthered as we struggle, with God’s grace and help, against adversity and temptation,” which is certainly consistent with Reformed doctrine \textit{per se}, but is no less consistent with historic Roman doctrine. The key element distinguishing Reformation and Roman teaching on this point—whether this progressive sanctification is part of justification itself or a distinct yet inseparable blessing—is never addressed.

Perhaps most revealing of the hollowness of GS’s claims to express a united doctrine of salvation is its conclusion. It acknowledges remaining differences among the participants and includes among these differences the matter of “imputed and transformative righteousness” and “the assertion that while justification is by faith alone, the faith that receives salvation is never alone.” Such issues are not peripheral but stand at the very center of the Reformed doctrine of justification. If these issues remain unsettled then there is no sense in which adherents to traditional Protestant doctrine can claim agreement with Rome on justification and related matters.

A number of other people and movements could be identified as important for the contemporary ecumenical context of justification debates.\textsuperscript{106} Among these are George Lindbeck’s influential ideas on the cultural and linguistic contexts of the development of doctrine,\textsuperscript{107} the proposal of Thomas Oden that finds a consensus teaching on the doctrine of

\textsuperscript{104} For Roman Catholic teaching on this point, see, for example, \textit{Catechism of the Catholic Church, Second Edition} (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997), § 2010.


\textsuperscript{106} The other people and movements mentioned here are addressed in David VanDrunen, “Justification Under Fire; A Survey of the Contemporary Scene,” in \textit{Covenant and Justification}. A fuller exposition of JDDJ and GS than that found in the present section also appears in this essay.

justification across various eras and confessions in church history, and the “Finnish” interpretation of Martin Luther developed by Tuomo Mannermaa and his associates. Your study committee draws attention to such people and movements so that we, as confessionally Reformed Christians, do not conduct our discussions on justification in an isolated way, ignorant of the wider theological context or of the assaults on the historic Reformation doctrine in the broader world.

III THE NEW PERSPECTIVE ON PAUL

A. Introduction

One of the tasks assigned to our committee is critiquing the new perspective on Paul (NPP). To accomplish this assignment we must first briefly survey the history that leads up to the development of the NPP. Throughout the history of the study of the NT, theologians have faced challenging questions especially concerning the interpretation of the Pauline corpus. The difficulty in interpreting the apostle Paul’s writings at points is certainly not new; the apostle Peter himself comments about Paul’s letters: “There are some things in them that are hard to understand” (2 Pet 3:16b). Our own confessional standards likewise admit that “all things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all” (WCF 1.7). In the history of the interpretation of Paul we certainly see the ebb and flow of the tide of various quests to uncover aspects of Paul’s thought: the question of the place of divine grace in the application of redemption, as in the patristic period (100-600 AD), in the debates between Augustine (354-430) and Pelagius (d. ca. 410) and the debates over justification by faith during the Reformation (1517-65); the disputes surrounding the proper method for the interpretation of Scripture in the middle ages (600-1300 AD) resulting in the solidification of the quadriga (literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical senses) evident in the commentaries of Thomas Aquinas (1225-74); or the question of the center of Paul’s theology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the writ-


ings of F. C. Baur (1792-1860) and Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965). It is especially the milieu of the nineteenth and twentieth century that provides the backdrop for the development of the NPP.

B. The Development of the NPP

1. Krister Stendahl: the Introspective Conscience of the West

Krister Stendahl delivered a lecture to the American Psychological Association in 1961, where he apparently first complained that the interpretation of Paul in the twentieth century had been unduly influenced by the interpretive legacy of Martin Luther (1483-1546): “The Reformers’ interpretation of Paul rest on an analogism when Pauline statements about Faith and Works, Law and Gospel, Jews and Gentiles are read in the framework of late medieval piety. The law, the Torah, with its specific requirements of circumcision and food restrictions becomes a general principle of ‘legalism’ in religious matters.” Stendahl’s overall criticism was that NT scholars had read Paul in terms of the individual’s struggle with sin as Luther had supposedly read him in the sixteenth century. According to Stendahl, Luther read the anachronistic medieval question of merit back into Paul’s epistles to Rome and Galatia rather than read him in his first century context. Stendahl’s criticism did not go unheard.

2. E. P. Sanders: Covenantal Nomism
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E. P. Sanders, in his watershed work, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, set out to destroy the general Christian view of Judaism as a religion of legalism, or works-righteousness. Sanders wrote to refute the common opinion that Jews were interested in earning their salvation through their obedience to the law. Sanders researched the literature of Second Temple Judaism and concluded that it was a religion of grace. Sanders coined the term *covenantal nomism* to describe first century Judaism: “The view that one’s place in God’s plan is established on the basis of the covenant and that the covenant requires as the proper response of man his obedience to its commandments, while providing means of atonement for transgression.”

Regarding the specific nature of the law and its function within Judaism Sanders identifies eight characteristics:

1. God has chosen Israel
2. He has given Israel the law, which implies
3. God’s promise to maintain the election and
4. The requirements to obey
5. God rewards obedience and punishes transgression
6. The law provides for means of atonement, which results in
7. Maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship
8. All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement, and God’s mercy belong to the group that will be saved.

We may summarize Sanders’s understanding of first century Judaism as entry into the covenant by God’s grace, or election, and maintaining one’s place in the covenant by obedience and making use of the means of atonement. Sanders’s thesis is that Judaism is based upon election and covenant, in other words, the grace of God. In the minds of many NT scholars, Sanders’s reevaluation of Judaism was the needed illumination upon Paul’s context to evaluate better the historical-contextual setting of his epistles. Sanders’s work sets the stage for the work of N. T. Wright.

3. N. T. Wright: the Apostle of History

Shortly after the work of Stendahl and Sanders, N. T. Wright joined the chorus of those objecting to a Lutheranized Paul. Wright argued that Lutheran interpreters such as Gerhard Ebeling had to divorce the doctrine of justification from history in order to preserve the Lutheran distinctives of a theology of the Word and the *theologia crucis*, the theology of the cross. Additionally, Wright also argued that “the tradition of Pauline interpretation has manufactured a false Paul by manufacturing a false Judaism for him to oppose.” Again, like Stendahl, Wright argues that the portrait of the Jews as legalistic was first manufactured in the sixteenth century by Luther in his battle against Rome. Wright therefore concludes that, “We have, in short, as a result of a projection of reformation and
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modern ideas into the world of Paul, an apostle of faith, or at least of imagination, who reveals more about his inventors than about the Paul of history.” Wright goes on to argue that “the categories with which we are to understand Paul, and for that matter the whole New Testament, are not the thin, tired and anachronistic ones of Lutheran polemic. They are the ones given to us by the Paul of history himself.” Wright was not alone in his observations, as another key player would soon join the chorus of dissent.


James Dunn, drawing upon Stendahl’s groundbreaking essay, believes, like Wright before him, that Paul had been read in terms of Luther’s battle with Roman Catholicism. In the light of Sanders’s work, particularly his research in the Second Temple literature, interpreters finally could “see Paul properly within his own context, to hear Paul in terms of his own time, to let Paul be himself.” Dunn in fact coins the term, “the new perspective on Paul.”

5. Summary

Thus far we may summarize the NPP as a rejection of the traditional orthodox Protestant interpretation of Paul because that interpretation is supposedly based upon Luther’s. Rather than read Paul through the lens of Luther, we must instead re-read Paul in the light of his historical context, namely the literature of second-temple Judaism. In reading Paul in this new light, or from this new perspective, we are supposed to obtain a better understanding of Paul’s epistles and, of course, a better understanding of the doctrines contained therein, especially the doctrine of justification. At this point we may move forward and set the course for our critique of the NPP, specifically as it relates to the doctrine of justification.

C. Major elements of consideration

Before we proceed with our critique, it is of cardinal importance that we recognize the variegated character of the NPP. The NPP is an academic movement that contains, like any movement in biblical studies, a spectrum of viewpoints. Therefore, one must be cautious in critiquing the NPP as it relates to justification. The NPP is not a unified, homogenous group. Nevertheless, one may proceed by identifying the key issues that have been raised in an influential way by specific authors who have been associated with the NPP and seeing how those issues bear upon the doctrine of justification. The key issues we will investigate are first, prolegomena, in particular how those associated with the NPP view the doctrine of Scripture and principles of hermeneutics. Second, we will treat mat-

118 Wright, “Paul of History,” 81.

119 Wright, “Paul of History,” 87.

ters of definition, namely, the terms *righteousness*, *works of the law*, and *justification*. Third, we will examine what effects these definitions have upon the doctrine of justification. Fourth, we will then critique the NPP understanding of justification as it has been specifically defined. One last matter should also be noted, namely, at certain points our critique will largely, though not exclusively, focus upon the writings of N. T. Wright, since his views in particular have had an impact in the Reformed and broader evangelical communities and on the interpretation of the doctrine of justification by some within these communities.122

1. Prolegomena

The first element of our critique involves an exploration of the prolegomena, or presuppositions, that those associated with the NPP bring to the table. This is an important aspect of any theological discussion, including one concerning the doctrine of justification. While we cannot explore every aspect of the prolegomena of those associated with the NPP, it is important that we take special note of their doctrine of Scripture. It is particularly two elements of the doctrine of Scripture of which we wish to explore: the inspiration and authority of Scripture.

a. The Inspiration of Scripture

One of the key emphases of those associated with the NPP is the desire to explore the NT within its first century historical context, especially against the backdrop of the literature of Second Temple Judaism, rabbinic sources, the writings of the Apocrypha, Josephus, and Qumran. N. T. Wright, for example, states, “We are therefore studying human history, in the recognition that the actors in the drama, and hence in a sense the drama itself, can only fully be understood when we learn to see the world through their eyes.”123 Wright argues that if we are dealing with the Scriptures as history, then one can begin to understand the NT by entering the world of the first century by exploring the various competing worldviews of the time: those of the Essenes, who believed they were participating in a secret new covenant; of Josephus, who believed that Israel’s God was going over to the Romans; of Jesus, who told a story about a vineyard; and of the early Christians, who told the story of the kingdom of God and its inauguration through Jesus.124 Wright’s investigative method, then, is to explore and seek to understand the NT Scriptures.

---


123 Wright, People of God, 118.

124 Wright, People of God, 41.
as a historical phenomenon. Wright contends that one can then verify the veracity and validity of the NT through a hypothesis-verification method:

History, then, is real knowledge, of a particular sort. It is arrived at, like all knowledge, by the spiral of epistemology, in which the story-telling human community launches enquiries, forms provisional judgments about which stories are likely to be successful in answering those enquiries, and then tests these judgments by further interaction with data.125

We must ask, however, can the NT be explored merely as a historical phenomenon? Is it merely one document among the many writings of the first century?

We should first recognize that Wright’s view of the NT is a definite improvement over the views of Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976), who tried to de-historicize the NT, or the history of religions school, represented by F. C. Baur and D. F. Strauss (1808-74), who denied the miraculous because of a bias against the supernatural.126 It is essential that any investigator take seriously the historicity and historical context of the NT. At the same time, an absolutely fundamental presupposition is accounting for the inspiration of the NT Scriptures by the Holy Spirit.127 It seems that Wright’s view of Scripture in this regard is no more of an improvement than the quest for the historical Jesus. In fact, in Wright’s New Testament and the People of God, where he sets forth his prolegomena, there is not a word about the work of the Holy Spirit, either in the inspiration of the NT or in the Spirit’s work in removing the noetic affects of sin to enable the interpreter to comprehend the Scriptures (e.g., 1 Cor 2:14-16; 2 Cor 2:12-17).128

125 Wright, People of God, 109.


128 There is only one place in his writings that we have found where Wright acknowledges the need for the work of the Holy Spirit in one’s theological epistemology: “The Spirit broods over us as we read this book, to straighten out our bent thinking; the world-views that have got twisted so that they are like the world’s world-views” (N. T. Wright, “How Can the Bible Be Authoritative?” The Laing Lecture 1989 and the Griffith Thomas Lecture 1989, 18; cf. idem, “How can the Bible be Authoritative?” Vox Evangelica 21 [1991], 7-32). There are two points to make regarding this quote: (1) Wright makes no mention of this important theological point in his prolegomena in New Testament and the People of God, so whether it is an oversight or a change in his view is not known; and (2) if Wright still holds this view it does not materially manifest itself in his prolegomena.
Some might counter that Wright does affirm the inspiration of Scripture, as he has devoted one of his most recent books to the subject of the authority of Scripture. Wright, however, dodges the issue of inspiration:

‘Inspiration’ is a shorthand way of talking about the belief that by his Spirit God guided the very different writers and editors, so that the books they produced were the books God intended his people to have. This is not the subject of the present book, but we should note that some kind of divine inspiration of scripture was taken for granted in most of the ancient Israelite scriptures themselves, as well as in the beliefs of the early Christians.

It is odd that in a book devoted to the authority of Scripture there is no treatment of its inspiration. Note, for example, that in Wright’s book on the authority of the Bible there is not one reference to 2 Tim 3:16-17.

By contrast, B. B. Warfield (1851-1921) saw the inspiration of Scripture inextricably intertwined with its authority and therefore devoted nearly fifty pages to defending the foundational importance of 2 Tim 3:16-17. We see this same point of emphasis in our own doctrinal standards: “The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed, and obeyed, depends not upon the testimony of any man, or church; but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God” (WCF 1.4; 2 Pet 1:19-20; 2 Tim 3:16; 1 John 5:9; 1 Thess 2:13; Rev 1:1-2). Furthermore, Wright repeats his commitment to his Spirit-less historical investigation of the Scriptures, emphasizing his commitment to critical-realism. Wright’s failure to account for the inspired nature of the Scriptures leads him into two errors that color his explanation of Paul’s doctrine of justification.

b. The Authority of Scripture

The first error is in giving too much interpretive weight to the writings of first century Judaism. This interpretive method surfaces in discussions determining what Paul means by the terms righteousness and the works of the law. At key points Wright appeals, not to the self-interpreting Scriptures but the literature of Second Temple Judaism.
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132 It should be noted that the proof-texts are the same for both the original and OPC versions; see *The Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church with Prooftexts* (Willow Grove: The Committee on Christian Education of the OPC, 2005); *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1646; Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1995).
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to interpret the NT (cf. WCF 1.3-7). The apostle Paul, by way of contrast, arguably never appeals to the literature of Second Temple Judaism but the OT exclusively. The second error is that he appeals to a truncated Pauline corpus in explaining Paul’s doctrine of justification. In Wright’s *What St. Paul Really Said*, for example, he restricts his treatment of Paul to the so-called undisputed Pauline epistles: Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians.

Moreover, when Wright treats important subjects such as the interpretation of the phrase, the “works of the law,” he relies upon and agrees with the conclusions of James Dunn. Yet, Dunn bases his interpretation of the contested phrase upon the letters of Paul other than Ephesians and the Pastoral epistles, whose authorship he believes to be post-Pauline. However, there are a number of passages in Ephesians and the Pastoral epistles that are important to Paul’s understanding of the works of the law and justification (e.g., Eph 2:8-9; 2 Tim 1:9; Tit 3:5). Even if Wright affirms the Pauline authorship of all of the epistles that bear the apostle’s name, to restrict investigation to the so-called undisputed epistles allows the unchecked presuppositions of the historical-critical school into the equation and fails to account for the testimony and authority of the Holy Spirit in these matters.

c. Summary

One must keep these presuppositional issues in mind as we investigate and critique the NPP and its understanding of Paul’s doctrine of justification. When one associated with the NPP states, “Paul writes,” it does not necessarily mean the same thing as when the historic Reformed tradition makes the same statement. Often one associated with the NPP appeals only to some of Paul’s writings, which affects the resulting portrait of Paul’s doctrine of justification. Keeping prolegomena, particularly the doctrine of Scripture, in mind, then, we may proceed to our examination of matters of definition.

2. Key Definitions

There are certainly many terms that should be investigated in any examination of the doctrine of justification but there are three specific terms that are key in the current debates: righteousness, works of the law, and justification. These three terms are important, especially given the paradigm-shifting nature of the NPP. One must recognize that definitions of the most basic concepts of the traditional Protestant understanding of justification are not the same as those offered by the NPP.

a. Righteousness

---


As one can imagine, the term “righteousness” and its definition must feature in any discussion of justification (see above I.D.3). The issue of the definition of this key term surfaces prominently in the question of the proper interpretation of Rom 1:17a: “For in it the righteousness of God is revealed.” Historically, interpreters such as Luther and John Calvin have understood Paul’s reference to God’s righteousness to be one involving imputed righteousness. In recent years, however, this understanding has been challenged. For example, Ernst Käsemann (1906-98) argued that the righteousness of God denoted not imputed righteousness but God’s saving power and active faithfulness to his creation. One may describe this explanation, in distinction from the traditional Reformed understanding, as a reference to an activity of God, not something that he gives to the believer. It is in the vein of this shift that proponents of the NPP argue that the righteousness of God denotes his active faithfulness to his covenant promises. Righteousness, then, is God’s covenant faithfulness.

Wright, for example, explains Rom 1:17 in this regard when he writes, “The gospel, [Paul] says, reveals or unveils God’s own righteousness, his covenant faithfulness, which operates through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for the benefit of all those who in turn are faithful.” If righteousness, then, denotes God’s covenant faithfulness, what about the term when it is connected to the believer? When we consider the term righteousness and what it denotes in relation to the believer, along with some shades of difference we see some essential unity of opinion on the subject. To be righteous is not so much a moral or judicial quality as a relational one; it means that one is in covenant with God. While there may be slight differences among those associated with the NPP, gener-
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142 Sanders argues that the term in its first century Jewish context did not denote moral perfection. Rather, it was simply a designation for those who were part of the covenant, and did not denote that a person was totally innocent of wrong-doing (Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 204-05). Similarly, Dunn states that “to be ‘righteous’ is to be not so much acceptable to God as accepted by God—righteousness as the status which God accorded to his covenant people and in which he sustained them” (Romans, 203). Wright likewise states that when Paul writes, “Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness” (Rom 4.3) that, “Its overall meaning must then be something like: ‘God counted Abraham’s faith as constituting covenant membership’” (Wright, Romans, 491; idem, The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 148).
ally speaking righteousness denotes either God’s covenant faithfulness (Rom 1:17) or one’s covenant membership demonstrated by reciprocating faithfulness (Rom 4:3).

b. Works of the Law

What about the second key term, namely, “works of the law”? In recent years much debate has swirled about the meaning of this term. What does Paul mean when he writes that, “For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight” (Rom 3:20a)? Historically, Reformed interpreters have understood the phrase “works of the law” to refer to the Jewish attempt to merit one’s justification. In other words, its referent is legalistic, in the sense of using the law to obtain salvation. This traditional interpretation, however, runs counter to the recent claims of Sanders, who argues that Judaism was not a religion of works-righteousness. Sanders argues, for example,

The frequent Christian charge against Judaism, it must be recalled, is not that some individual Jews misunderstood, misapplied and abused their religion, but that Judaism necessarily tends towards petty legalism, self-serving and self-deceiving casuistry, and a mixture of arrogance and a lack of confidence in God. But the surviving Jewish literature is as free of these characteristics as any I have ever read. By consistently maintaining the basic framework of covenantal nomism, the gift and demand of God were kept in a healthy relationship with each other, the minutiae of the law were observed on the basis of the large principles of religion and because of commitment to God, and humility before God who chose and would ultimately redeem Israel was encouraged.

Given Sanders’s research, most advocates of the NPP rule out the possibility that the works of the law refer to legalism. They rule out this possibility on the grounds that: (1) the common Israelite was already a member of the covenant and had no need to establish his salvation; and (2) membership in the covenant presupposes God’s gracious election. To what, then, do works of the law refer?

According to Dunn and Wright, “works of the law” is a phrase that refers to the Jewish national boundary markers, those things that distinguish Jew from Gentile: circumcision, dietary food laws, and Sabbath observance. Dunn, for example, relying upon Sanders’s covenantal nomism argues that, in Rom 3:20,

‘works of the law’ are nowhere understood here, either by his Jewish interlocutors or by Paul himself, as works which earn God’s favor, as merit-amassing observances. They are rather seen as badges: they are simply what membership of the covenant people involves, what mark out the Jews as God’s people; given by God for precisely that reason, they serve to demonstrate covenant status.

143 Calvin, Romans, 69-70; also Charles Hodge, Romans (1835; Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1989), 81.
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Dunn bases these conclusions on a host of scriptural and second-temple citations (Lev 11:1-23; Deut 14:3-21; 1 Maccabees 1:62-63; Dan 1:8-16; Tobit 1:10-13; Judith 10:5; 12:1-20; Gen 2:3; Deut 5:12-15; Exo 20:8-11; Isa 56:6-8). Dunn is insistent that the traditional reformational exegesis, begun by Luther and repeated, at least as he sees it, by heirs of the Reformation down to Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976), that equates works of the law with good works in general is incorrect. Dunn is insistent that the traditional reformational exegesis, begun by Luther and repeated, at least as he sees it, by heirs of the Reformation down to Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976), that equates works of the law with good works in general is incorrect. One should note, though, that Dunn has recently modified his position on this point. More will be said about this modification below. Though there are undoubtedly some differences between Dunn and Wright, the latter is in essential agreement with the conclusions of the former concerning the interpretation of the “works of the law.”

c. Justification

Needless to say, those associated with the NPP do not define the term “justification” as it has been traditionally understood. The Westminster divines, for example, define justification as “an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone” (WSC 33). By contrast, Wright would argue that this definition has more in common with sixteenth and seventeenth century dogmatics than it does with Paul’s teaching seen within the historical setting in first century Palestine. Wright, for example, states that justification

in the first century was not about how someone might establish a relationship with God. It was about God’s eschatological definition, both future and present, of who was, in fact, a member of his people. In Sanders’s terms, it was not so much about ‘getting in,’ or indeed about ‘staying in,’ as about ‘how you could tell who was in.’ In standard Christian theological language, it wasn’t so much about soteriology as about ecclesiology; not so much about salvation as about the church.

Additionally, Wright contends that justification in the first century was primarily about Israel’s vindication before the Gentile nations. God had called Israel to be his special covenant people, yet in the first century the Jews were under the thumb of Rome. Israel was, according to Wright, in exile even though they were dwelling in the land of promise. When and how, then, would God vindicate, or justify, his covenant people? When would he justify them before the nations indicating that Israel was “in the right”? When defin-
ing justification then, one must keep this first century context in the forefront, according to those associated with the NPP.

d. Summary

We have briefly surveyed the three key Pauline terms from the point of view of the NPP: righteousness, works of the law, and justification. Given these NPP-influenced definitions, it is already evident that Paul’s doctrine of justification takes on an entirely different shape from the classical Protestant view set forth in its confessions. Let us proceed to examine how these NPP-influenced definitions shape the understanding of the doctrine of justification for those associated with the NPP.

3. Paul’s Doctrine of Justification and the NPP

At this point in our survey, we will focus largely, though not exclusively, upon the formulations of N. T. Wright. While others associated with the NPP draw similar conclusions on justification, at the same time no NPP author has been as widely influential as Wright within the Reformed community. When Wright expounds Paul’s doctrine of justification, he identifies three categories that one must consider: covenant, law-court, and eschatology. First, Wright argues that one must not read Paul’s teaching on justification in terms of sixteenth and seventeenth century covenant theology but in terms of first century Judaism and the covenant promises God made to Abraham. Second, one must understand that justification is law-court language. When God made his covenant promise to Abraham, it was God’s way of correcting the sin of Adam and putting the world to rights. In God’s law-court his people will be vindicated before the world and shown to be “in the right.” Third, Paul speaks of justification in terms of eschatology. Justification is not part of some abstract system of doctrine by which people are saved but is rooted in the decisive action of God in Jesus Christ whereby he rescues the cosmos from sin through the Holy Spirit, bringing all things under the authority of Jesus.¹⁵⁰ From these broad contours, one can see Wright’s understanding of Paul’s doctrine of justification emerge.

Justification is not about the imputation of God’s righteousness to the believer. Rather, justification is the vindication of the covenant people of God before the world. Justification is about demonstrating that the people of God are “in the right” before the unbelieving world, those who refused to place their faith in Jesus Christ and oppressed the people of God. Wright substantiates his understanding of justification by summarizing the overall first century context in which one finds the NT’s message of justification:

a. The creator god [sic] calls Israel to be his people;
b. Israel, currently in ‘exile,’ is to be redeemed, precisely because she is the covenant people of this god [sic];
c. Present loyalty to the covenant is the sign of future redemption;
d. Loyalty to this covenant is being tested at this moment of crisis;
e. At this moment, what counts as loyalty, and hence what marks out those who will be saved / vindicated / raised to life is [faith in Jesus Christ].¹⁵¹

¹⁵⁰ Wright, St. Paul, 117-18.
¹⁵¹ Wright, People of God, 335.
In the light of this first century context, then, Wright explains that the problem at Galatia was not that some were trying to merit their salvation. Jews, the covenant people of God, were perplexed as to how one could be justified, or vindicated before the world, on the basis of faith alone, apart from the attendant badges of covenant membership, circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath. According to Wright, Paul’s desire in his epistles to Rome and Galatia is to explain that one will be declared righteous, or a member of the covenant and vindicated before the world, not because he possesses the badges of the Torah but because he has the sign of the new covenant, faith in Christ. Though not agreeing with Wright on every point, Dunn explains the nature of justification in this understanding in its first century historical context:

God justifies (accepts) people through faith and not by virtue of works of the law. He was not hitting at people who thought they could earn God’s goodwill by their achievements, or merit God’s final acquittal on the basis of all their good deeds. That theological insight is true and of lasting importance. But it is not quite what Paul was saying. Paul’s point was rather that God accepts Gentiles in the same way that he accepts any person—by grace through faith, through their openness to receive what God wishes to give them. That is to say, God accepts Gentiles as Gentiles, without requiring them to take on a Jewish lifestyle or change their nationality or race.

It appears that for Wright and Dunn, justification is not about soteriology, but ecclesiology: justification by faith is not about how one gets saved but rather how one can identify a member of the covenant people of God. This brings us to another aspect that one must take into account in this understanding of justification: present and final justification.

Wright argues that there is a twofold division of justification: (1) present justification—the vindication that the covenant people possess in the present, which is based on their faith in Jesus, understood as faithful submission to his saving lordship, and indicates who will be vindicated on the final day; and (2) final or future justification—the actual declaration of being “in the right” before the world on the day of judgment. One should note, however, that for Wright the ground of justification becomes clear in the progress from present to final justification. Commenting on Rom 8:3-4 Wright argues that, “What is spoken of here is the future verdict, that of the last day, the ‘day’ Paul described in 2.1-16. That verdict will correspond to the present one, and will follow from (though not, in that sense, be earned or merited by), the Spirit-led life of which Paul now speaks.”
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Summary: When we summarize Paul’s doctrine of justification as it comes from the pen of Wright, and similarly from Dunn, we must recognize that it rotates upon the axis of ecclesiology. Justification is the declaration of who belongs to the covenant people of God in the present, those who are righteous or members of the covenant, who are marked out by faith, not works of the law like circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath. It is also the anticipation in the present of what will happen in the future at the final day. Present justification is on the basis of faith understood as faithful obedience which anticipates future justification on the basis of the Spirit-produced works of the believer. One can also see from this summary how the definitions of the three terms of works of the law, righteousness, and justification affect one’s understanding of the doctrine of justification. In our critique of the NPP, then, we will begin with matters of definition.

D. Critique of the NPP on matters of definition

1. Righteousness

We begin first with the NPP’s understanding of the term “righteousness.” There are some contexts where the definition of the term is genuinely a challenging exegetical question, such as the perennial question of the objective versus the subjective genitive in Rom 1:17a, “For in it the righteousness of God is revealed.” This is not to say, however, that there is not a majority view within the Reformed community regarding the interpretation of Rom 1:17a. One might be able to interpret Rom 1:17a as God’s covenant faithfulness without necessarily affecting his understanding of justification. Arguing that Rom 1:17a refers to God’s covenant faithfulness, however, raises questions regarding God’s righteousness towards those who are outside the covenant. In other words, is not God righteous towards unbelievers as well as those within the covenant? There is also the recent research of Mark Seifrid, which challenges the coordination of the ideas of covenant

157 Historically the majority of historic Protestant and Reformed interpreters on the question of Rom 1.17a have sided with the objective genitive, or more specifically the genitive of source—the righteousness is that which God imputes to the believer rather than a quality or attribute of God (K. L. Onesti and M. T. Brauch, “Righteousness, Righteousness of God,” in Dictionary of Paul and His Letters, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, Daniel G. Reid [Downers Grove: IVP, 1993], 833). See, e.g., Calvin, Romans, 27-28; Luther, Romans, 9; Theodore Haak, ed., The Dutch Annotations Upon the Whole Bible: Ordered and Appointed by the Synod of Dort, 1618 and published by Authority, 1637 (London, 1657), ad loc.; Peter Martyr Vermigli, Commentary on Romans (London, 1558), ad loc.; John Downname, Annotations Upon All the Books of the Old and New Testaments (London, 1657), ad loc.; Philip Melanchthon, Commentary on Romans, trans. Fred Kramer (St. Louis: Concordia, 1992), 70. Rom 1:17a as an objective genitive goes as far back as St. Chrysostom, whom Vermigli, for example, cites (see John Chrysostom, Homilies on Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans, NPNF, vol. 11, ed. Philip Schaff [1889; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989], 349). At the same time, however, the Westminster divines in their Annotations acknowledge that sometimes the phrase, righteousness of God, “is the accomplishment of all his promises; for so is the righteousness of God sometimes taken for his faithfulness and mercy (Rom 3:26).”
and righteousness as Dunn and Wright attempt to do.\textsuperscript{158} In other words, righteousness is a term that encompasses God’s activity beyond the covenants with his people. There are elements of Seifrid’s argument that fail to account for the covenant of works, or creation covenant, though his overall argument raises an important question, namely: Is God righteous towards those who are outside the covenant? Where the question of the definition of righteousness becomes more acute, however, is in the matter of righteousness as it is applied to the individual. In other words, can righteousness be defined as covenant membership?

We may begin by observing that there is no lexical evidence in either the OT or NT to support the claim that righteousness means “covenant membership.”\textsuperscript{159} Wright, however, has publicly stated that he questions the methodologies of lexicographers and that the absence of lexical support for his definition of righteousness is not an obstacle. Seifrid has nevertheless demonstrated from the literature of the Second Temple that the claim that “righteousness” is a term that refers to covenant membership cannot be supported (see, e.g., Sirach 9:16, 34:18-19, 35:5-6, Psalms of Solomon 2:34-35; 3:1-12; Wisdom 2:12-24; 3:1-19; Tobit 4:17).\textsuperscript{160} Additionally, Wright’s argument does not withstand close scrutiny in a brief reconnaissance of a few scriptural texts.

For example, when Abraham negotiates with God to spare Sodom he tries to convince God to spare the city on the pretense that there might be fifty righteous men within its confines. Abraham contrasts the righteous with the wicked (Gen 18:24-25). Yet, at this point in redemptive history the only ones in covenant with God are Abraham and his household (Gen 15), so the righteous supposedly dwelling in Sodom could not be members of the covenant as Wright contends. Just as in the flood judgment, righteous Noah was spared while the wicked were swept away in judgment (Gen 6:9, 12-13). Righteousness, therefore, cannot mean covenant membership. We see righteousness substantively defined, for example, in the prophets:


\textsuperscript{160} Seifrid, “Righteousness Language,” 439-40; see also idem, “Paul’s Use of Righteousness Language Against Its Hellenistic Background,” in JVN 2, 65, n. 90.
If a man is righteous and does what is just and right— if he does not eat upon the mountains or lift up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, does not defile his neighbor’s wife or approach a woman in her time of menstrual impurity, does not oppress anyone, but restores to the debtor his pledge, commits no robbery, gives his bread to the hungry and covers the naked with a garment, does not lend at interest or take any profit, withholds his hand from injustice, executes true justice between man and man, walks in my statutes, and keeps my rules by acting faithfully— he is righteous; he shall surely live, declares the Lord God (Ezek 18:5-9).  

In fact, this quotation from Ezekiel demonstrates that righteousness is not covenant membership but rather adherence or conformity to an ethical standard. It is this OT background and understanding of righteousness that informs the use of the term in the NT. This is what makes Paul’s statements regarding Abraham so stunning, namely, Abraham is counted righteous by faith, not on the basis of his moral conduct (Rom 4:3). Hence, righteousness, while often within a covenant context, is not to be identified with either God’s covenant faithfulness or reciprocating covenant fidelity. The NPP-influenced definition of righteousness is exegetically unsustainable.

2. Works of the Law

When it comes to the definition of the phrase “works of the law,” proponents of the NPP such as Dunn initially defined the term too narrowly. It is exegetically indefensible to maintain that “works of the law” refers only to circumcision, food-laws, and Sabbath observance. While “works of the law” certainly includes these three things, they are not restricted to them. This conclusion is evident, for example, when Paul explains that, “All who rely on works of the law are under a curse; for it is written, ‘Cursed be everyone who does not abide by all things written in the Book of the Law, and do them’” (Gal 3:10; cf. Deut 27:26). Nevertheless, Wright contends that Paul’s quotation of Deut 27:26 refers not to the sin of individuals but to the pattern of national sin, exile, and restoration: “What is envisaged, is not so much the question of what happens when this or that individual sins, but the question of what happens when the nation as a whole fails to keep the Torah as a whole.”

Yet, one must ask, if Wright is correct, why does Paul not bring forth examples of Israel’s national sin in his argument in Galatians? Instead, Paul brings forth the example of Abraham and Sarah, who try to lay hold of the promises of the covenant by their sinful efforts (Gal 4:22-31). Moreover, the very context of Deut 27:26 itself tells us that the people were “to keep all his commandments” (Deut 26:18; 27.1), meaning the whole body of laws in Deut 12-26. A. Andrew Das notes in this regard that, “When Paul

---
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uses the phrase ‘works of the law’ in Gal 3:10 and cites Deuteronomy 27:26 (in a com-posite quote drawing on other statements in Deut 27-30), the Deuteronomy context indicates that Paul has in mind the law in its entirety, including actions done in private.”  

This conclusion has also recently drawn support from one of the chief scholars associated with the NPP.

Dunn originally pioneered much of the exegetical ground work for the case on the ethnocentric understanding of the phrase, works of the law. In response to criticisms of his initial arguments, Dunn has conceded that “‘the works of the law,’ does, of course, refer to all or whatever the law requires, covenantal nomism as a whole.” Nevertheless, despite this concession he does not appear to have modified his argument that the works of the law primarily deal with boundary marker issues. The works of the law are far more than national boundary markers, though they do serve a boundary marking function (Gal 2:16; Rom 3:27-30). It was Israel, however, that sought to establish its own righteousness before God by works (Rom 9:30-10.3). The expression, therefore, refers to deeds done in obedience to the law of Moses, which would include not only circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath observance, but also abstaining from murder, adultery, theft, and idolatry. The works of the law, consequently, refer both to ethnic and ethical distinctives.

One can substantiate this conclusion, for example, by a perusal of the Apocrypha, the uninspired Jewish inter-testamental historical books, and its insistence upon the importance of the entirety of the law and not just its ethnic-boundary functions. One finds the following examples where almsgiving delivers from darkness (Tobit 4:6-10), or judgment, the sexually pure eunuch is shown favor (Wisdom 3:14), one can atone for sins by honoring one’s parents (Sirach 3:3-4), laying up treasures according to the law can deliver one from disaster (Sirach 29.11-12), and that Abraham’s observance of the law was the quid pro quo for God’s covenant with him (Sirach 44.20-21):

To all those who practice righteousness give alms from your possessions, and do not let your eye begrudge the gift when you make it. Do not turn your face away from anyone who is poor, and the face of God will not be turned away from you. If you have many possessions, make your gift from them in proportion; if few, do not be afraid to give according to the little you have. So you will be laying up a good treasure for yourself against the day of necessity. For almsgiving delivers from death and keeps you from going into the Darkness (Tobit 4:6-10).

164 A. Andrew Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001), 158.


Blessed also is the eunuch whose hands have done no lawless deed, and who has not devised wicked things against the Lord; for special favor will be shown him for his faithfulness, and a place of great delight in the temple of the Lord (Wisdom 3:14).

Those who honor their father atone for sins, and those who respect their mother are like those who lay up treasure” (Sirach 3.3-4).

Lay up your treasure according to the commandments of the Most High, and it will profit you more than gold. Store up almsgiving in your treasury, and it will rescue you from every disaster (Sirach 29:11-12).

He kept the law of the Most High, and entered into a covenant with him; he certified the covenant in his flesh, and when he was tested he proved faithful. Therefore the Lord assured him with an oath that the nations would be blessed through his offspring; that he would make him as numerous as the dust of the earth, and exalt his offspring like the stars, and give them an inheritance from sea to sea and from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth (Sirach 44:20-21).


Given this evidence, one must conclude that when Paul uses the phrase “works of the law,” he has in mind the attempt to create one’s own righteousness by obedience to the law, not its supposed boundary-marker function. In other words, contrary to the protestations of Sanders, Dunn, Wright, et al., legalism was present in first century Judaism, and it was an issue Paul confronted on numerous occasions (Rom 3.20; Gal 3.10; Eph 2.8-10; Tit 3.5). In fact, an examination of certain Second Temple materials will easily demonstrate the presence of legalism as it pertains to one’s justification (1 Maccabees 2:52; Sirach 44:19-21; Jubilees 16:28; 24:10-11; 4QMMT). The author of Jubilees, for example, states that “Abraham was perfect in all of his actions with the LORD and was pleasing through righteousness all the days of his life” (Jubilees 23:10). Paul, however, says that Abraham was “ungodly” (Rom 4:3-5). Similarly, one finds in the Qumran interpretation of Hab 2:4, “the righteous shall live by his faith,” that “this concerns all those who observe the Law in the House of Judah, whom God will deliver from the House of Judgment because of their suffering and because of their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness” (1 QpHab 8:1-3). This interpretation runs contrary to Paul’s, who emphasizes faith alone.

---

168 For further argumentation see Fesko, “Wright on the Works of the Law,” 67-83.


to the exclusion of the observance of the law or suffering in justification (Rom 1:17; 3:20-22).

3. Justification

Those associated with the NPP define the NT teaching on justification primarily in terms of Israel’s vindication before the Gentile nations. Foundational to this understanding of justification is one’s understanding of first century Judaism and, more importantly, whether Jesus, Paul, and the other authors of the NT understand justification in this manner. First, there has been a significant question raised regarding the uniform picture of the first century Jewish worldview as Wright describes it. Specifically, is his thesis of Israel in exile and that Jesus brings it to an end one that can withstand scrutiny? There is evidence from first century literature, for example, that points to the idea that many Jews believed that the return from exile was already in progress long before the advent of Christ (Baruch 4:36; 5:5-9). The book of Judith also speaks about the end of exile:

As long as they did not sin against their God they prospered, for the God who hates iniquity is with them. But when they departed from the way he had prescribed for them, they were utterly defeated in many battles and were led away captive to a foreign land. The temple of their God was razed to the ground, and their towns were occupied by their enemies. But now they have returned to their God, and have come back from the places where they were scattered, and have occupied Jerusalem, where their sanctuary is, and have settled in the hill country, because it was uninhabited (Judith 5.17-19; also see 4:1-5).

Based upon this and other evidence, Seifrid concludes that, “It is not at all clear, therefore, that there was a widespread sense among Jews of Paul’s day that Israel remained in exile in the way that this theory demands.” Moreover, when one surveys Paul’s statements about

---

his pre-conversion life (Phil 3:4-6), he mentions nothing that leads us to believe that he was part of a nation suffering in exile and looking for vindication before the Gentile nations.\textsuperscript{172}

One must also challenge the notion that justification is the eschatological definition of who belongs to the covenant people. As we have seen, Wright contends that justification is not so much about soteriology as it is about ecclesiology, not so much about salvation as about the church. Yet, one has to force Wright’s understanding of justification upon the standard passages of Scripture to which one might appeal to define justification. First, when Paul states that “Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him as righteousness” (Rom 4:3), Wright argues that righteousness means covenant membership.\textsuperscript{173} As we have seen above, however, defining righteousness as covenant membership is exegetically indefensible. Wright similarly contends that when Abraham believed God his faith was a badge of his covenant membership.\textsuperscript{174} While members of the covenant certainly possess faith in Christ, Paul does not attribute to faith the role of a sign of covenant membership. The new covenant boundary marker is not faith, as Wright contends, but baptism, which has replaced circumcision (Col 2:11-12).\textsuperscript{175}

Second, God’s people have always possessed faith, regardless of the covenant signs of circumcision or baptism, as Rom 4:11 and Heb 11 make abundantly clear. Wright’s attempts, therefore, to read Rom 4:1-8 in terms of ecclesiology rather than soteriology, that is, that righteousness is covenant membership rather than the imputed obedience of Christ, as it has traditionally been read, fail on at least these two fronts. Justification is about soteriology, as our confessional standards have defined it (WCF 11.1; WLC 70-73; WSC 33). Justification is “an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone” (WSC 33). We will explore the nature of the doctrine of justification in greater detail below.

4. Summary

With these matters of definition established, namely righteousness, works of the law, and justification, we may move forward to critique the NPP’s understanding of justification proper. We are beginning to see that the doctrine of justification largely, though not exclusively, hinges upon the proper definition of these key terms. If righteousness is covenant membership, and works of the law are its old badges of membership for the people of God, then the NPP is correct—justification is about the definition of who belongs to the people of God. If, however, righteousness is adherence to a moral standard, and works of the law are the attempt by Jew or Gentile to adhere to that moral standard, that is, the law, by obedience, then justification is about soteriology. We have seen enough exegetical reasons to reject the NPP’s understanding of its key definitions, which will have an impact

\textsuperscript{172} Seifrid, \textit{Christ}, 23-25.

\textsuperscript{173} Wright, \textit{Romans}, 490-91.

\textsuperscript{174} Wright, \textit{Romans}, 492.

upon the tenability of its doctrine of justification. Let us, nevertheless, move forward so we may critique its understanding of the doctrine of justification.

E. Critique of the NPP and its understanding of Paul’s doctrine of justification

In our initial survey of the NPP’s understanding of Paul’s doctrine of justification we focused largely, though not exclusively, upon N. T. Wright. Wright, as we saw, identifies three major categories that he sees connected with justification in Paul: covenant, law-court, and eschatology. Moreover, we also saw that Wright divides justification into present and future categories. We should first survey the three categories that Wright proposes.

1. Covenant

Wright is correct to state that justification for Paul is covenantal. He is incorrect, however, in his understanding of the substance of the covenant. Wright insists that one must understand by the category of covenant not the sixteenth and seventeenth century covenant theology but the worldview of first century Judaism. In other words, Israel was looking for the fulfillment of the covenant promises that God made to Abraham. God had called Israel through the call to Abraham, they were to be his covenant people, rule the nations, and put the world to rights. One surely does not want to deny the vital role that Abraham plays in redemptive history; Paul calls the people of God “sons of Abraham” (Gal 3.7).

Yet, one must ask whether Paul, for example, couches the doctrine of justification covenantally as Wright argues. Does Paul articulate the doctrine of justification in the context of the so-called covenantal understanding of first century Judaism, or is there a broader covenantal context? The answer, of course, is that Paul sees justification in a broader covenantal context. The covenant does not simply extend to Abraham, nor does Paul fix the reader’s gaze upon issues that center upon Israel’s relationship to first century history. Rather, most comprehensively Paul fixes the reader’s gaze upon the covenant historical realities of God’s dealings with mankind, not just Israel, in the first and last Adams, dealings that the Westminster divines have called the covenants of works and grace. Paul’s outlook is much broader than first century Israel, which is manifest in the evidence that Paul marshals to make his case. J. Gresham Machen observes, for example, “It is significant that when, after the conversion, Paul seeks testimonies to the universal sinfulness of man, he looks not to contemporary Judaism, but to the Old Testament. At this point, as elsewhere, Paulinism is based not upon later developments but upon the religion of the Prophets and the Psalms.” It is fair to say that Paul cites the OT

---

176 See Wright, *Climax*, p. 17.

One wonders how Wright can so easily sweep away classic Reformed covenant theology when he has admitted his own ignorance on the subject (see Wright, *Fresh Perspective*, 13). How can one categorically dismiss what he has not read?

177 Wright, *People of God*, 335.

exclusively and nowhere cites the literature of first century Judaism. Additionally, as is evident from Paul’s repeated appeals to the first and second Adams (Rom 5:12-19; 1 Cor 15:22, 45), Paul does not see any first century enemy, such as the Roman Empire, as the great threat but instead the enemies are Satan, sin, and death (Gen 3:15; cf. Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 15:54-58). It was the first Adam who brought the world under the dominion of Satan, sin, and death, and it is the second Adam who brings people out from under the dominion of this unholy triumvirate and into the kingdom of God (Col 1:13-14).

Historically, within the Reformed tradition these biblical categories have been placed under the theological constructs of the covenant of works, the failed work of the first Adam, and the covenant of grace, the faithful work of the second Adam (WCF 7; WLC 20, 30-35; WSC 12, 20). Therefore, we can formally agree with Wright that justification is covenantal. We must, however, disagree with him materially because the NT sees justification in terms of the broken covenant of works and the work of Christ through the covenant of grace. We can agree with Earle Ellis on the question of whether Paul was interested in first century questions, “If he was a ‘child of his times,’ they were for Paul the times of the Messiah, His Cross, and resurrection, and His revelation of the true meaning of Scripture. Paul was a disciple of Christ not of Gamaliel.”

2. Law-court

In Wright’s understanding of justification he correctly argues that justification is forensic or law-court language. Again, we are in formal agreement with such an assessment but must register significant material disagreement. There are two elements that feature in Wright’s understanding of the law-court: (1) its orientation, and (2) its nature. Wright argues, for example, that in first century Judaism “God himself was seen as the judge; evildoers (i.e., the Gentiles, and renegade Jews) would finally be judged and punished; God’s faithful people (i.e., Israel, or at least the true Israelites) would be vindicated.” With this understanding of the Jewish law-court, Wright also rejects the idea of the imputation of righteousness in justification. Wright states concerning the defendant and the plaintiff,

Within the technical language of the law court, ‘righteous’ means, for these two persons, the status they have when the court finds in their favor. Nothing more, nothing less. . . . If we use the language of the law court, it makes no sense whatever to say that the judge imputes, imparts, bequeaths, conveys or otherwise transfers his righteousness to either the plaintiff or the defendant. Righteousness is not an object, a substance or a gas which can be passed across the courtroom.
These two assertions concerning the direction of the law court and the rejection of imputation are fundamentally at odds with the historical Reformed understanding of this aspect of justification.

First, one must seriously question the idea that justification is about the vindication of the people of God before the world. The NT does not represent the law court facing the world but rather Paul’s concern is seeking justification before the tribunal of God: “For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight, since through the law comes knowledge of sin” (Rom 3:20; cf. Gal 3:11). According to Paul the one who has been justified has peace with God: “Therefore, since we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom 5:1). The element of vindication before the world is also based on the specious claims that first century Judaism considered itself in exile, an idea lacking sufficient evidence that has been criticized from multiple corners of the NT guild.

Second, regarding Wright’s rejection of imputation based on the Jewish law court model, one should again question this assertion. Seifrid explains:

At this point Wright is led astray by his model of the ‘Jewish law court,’ which he seems to have created without much attention to the relevant biblical texts. When Paul echoes Psalm 98.1-3 in his announcement of the revelation of God’s righteousness in Rom 1.17, he takes up the biblical tradition which expressed Israel’s hope for the establishment of God’s justice. By its very nature such justice is a gift to the world. Wright’s abstract model of the ‘court’ likewise overlooks Christ’s cross and resurrection which, according to Paul, constitutes the justifying event—the ‘law-court’ so to speak—announced in his gospel.183

Along these lines, if Wright is correct in his assertion that righteousness is something that cannot be transferred, then what does Paul mean when he writes that those who are justified “receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness” (Rom 5:17; cf. Eph 2:8)? Paul, contrary to Wright, thinks that righteousness is something that can be passed across the courtroom.

Some might counter that Wright’s rejection of imputation is not solely based upon his abstract model of the law court but ultimately upon his understanding of key biblical texts, such as 2 Cor 5:21. While Wright has put forth exegetical support for his rejection of imputation, it is less than convincing. Wright’s definition of the term righteousness, for example, colors his rather idiosyncratic exegesis of 2 Cor 5:21.184 He argues that when Paul writes, “For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him

---


we might become the righteousness of God,” the phrase, “become the righteousness of God,” means “become the covenant faithfulness of God.”185 If Wright’s definition of righteousness as covenant faithfulness is in error, which we have demonstrated above that it is, then his interpretation of 2 Cor 5:21 falls.186

Concerning Rom 5:12-19, the *locus classicus* for the doctrine of imputation, Wright argues that “Paul’s parallel between Adam and Christ, emphasizes the primal sin as somehow involving all subsequent humanity (it is not necessary, to hold this view, to espouse along with it any particular theory of the mode by which sin is then transmitted).”187 Yet, one must ask, why then does Paul set up the parallel between Adam and Christ if he is not interested in the manner of the transmission of sin? How can Paul say that when Adam sinned, all sinned? There is little trouble in understanding how Adam is subject to death: he sinned. But why does death spread to mankind? Paul answers quite succinctly, “Because all sinned.” Paul with unmistakable clarity asserts that the universal reign of death rests upon the sin of the one man Adam. This is evident in v. 12 when we compare, “sin came into the world through one man,” and what v. 18 calls, “one trespass,” and v. 19 calls, “one man’s disobedience.”188 Contra Wright, there is no question that Paul has in mind the primal sin of Adam distinct from the sins of mankind. Rather, as in 2 Cor 5:21, Paul sets up a parallel, this time between the sin of Adam and the obedience of Christ: “The parallel to the imputation of Adam’s sin is the imputation of Christ’s righteousness.

---


186 The Reformed tradition has hinged its understanding of justification upon the doctrine of imputation. See, e.g., John Calvin, *2 Corinthians and Timothy, Titus & Philemon*, CNTC, trans. T. A. Smail, eds. David W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), 81-82. In the commentary produced by the Synod of Dort we read: “For him that knew no sin [that is, who was free from all sin, 1 Pet 2.22] has he made sin for us [that is, a sacrifice for sin as Lev 7.2 Or sin by imputing our sins; as he is also said to have been made a curse Gal 3.13] that we might become righteousness of God [that is, righteousness before God. Or that the righteousness of God might be imputed to us, Rom 4.4-5] in him. [namely, Christ, in respect that we are in him, and his righteousness is imputed unto us, Rom 8.1]” (*Annotations, ad loc.*). Likewise, the commentary produced by the Westminster assembly states, “That is, a sacrifice for sin, or he has imputed the sins of the world to Christ (who was most righteous and innocent himself) and has put upon him all the punishment and malediction due to us. That all the faithful may be reputed before God as holy and perfect as righteousness itself, by virtue of Christ’s righteousness, which is given to them by God, and only is able to stand in his judgment. . . . In Christ, in regard that we are in him, and that his righteousness is imputed to us. *Non nostra, nec in nobis Ita Hieronym*” (*Annotations, ad loc.*).


Or to use Paul’s own terms, being ‘constituted sinners’ through the disobedience of Adam is parallel to being ‘constituted righteous’ through the obedience of Christ.”189

In Wright’s attempts to reject this understanding of imputation in Paul, he seems to have created two major problems. First, if Wright argues that Paul does not have the manner of the transmission of sin in view, then Wright does not merely deny that Paul teaches the imputation of Christ’s righteousness to the believer but also that he does not teach the imputation of Adam’s sin to all of mankind. Second, Wright rejects the idea of imputation because it does not fit the model of the Jewish law court—the judge does not communicate or impart anything to the plaintiff or defendant. Yet, this understanding fails to see the grandeur of justification and more broadly our redemption as taught by Paul. Yes, the law court is certainly in view when one considers his doctrine of justification, but Wright’s argumentation proves too much. Wright objects to imputation on the grounds that such conduct is uncharacteristic of the judge in the law court. On these grounds we would also have to deny that Paul teaches that the atonement is penal-substitutionary in nature, because what judge ever sends his own son to die in the place of the defendant? Wright gives his model of the law court greater weight than the actual statements of Scripture. How so?

In what law court, Jewish or not, is the judge both “just and the justifier” as it concerns sinners who place their faith in Christ (Rom 3.26)? Yes, justification is a law court concept, but the tribunal is unlike any other law court in the cosmos—it is the place where the Father sends his Son to die in the place of the one who rightly stands condemned. In all of Wright’s efforts to deny imputation in Paul, he seems to miss these important themes, namely the discontinuities between the earthly and heavenly law courts, and so misunderstands the heart of Paul’s gospel. Moreover, he commits a fundamental theological error in reversing the roles of archetypal and ectypal theology.190 All earthly courts are analogous to the one true heavenly court. The ectype, the copy or analogy, does not inform the archetype, or pattern, but reflects it. What about the last category, namely eschatology and justification?

3. Eschatology

Wright has correctly argued that justification is eschatological, in that it is the fulfillment of the long awaited covenant promises to Abraham and the covenant people of God. Where Wright goes astray, however, is in tying justification to the eschatological definition of who belongs to the covenant people of God.191 Eschatology, however, is not

189 Murray, *Imputation*, 76.


191 Wright, “Justification,” 359.
simply about defining who belongs to the people of God, or the church, ecclesiology. There is no church apart from the application of Christ’s saving work. Or, there is no ecclesiology apart from the work of the last, or eschatological, Adam. This is evident, for example, in the two-age structure of redemptive history characterized by the two Adams. Paul dwells upon this point when he writes, “Thus it is written, ‘The first man Adam became a living being’; the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit” (1 Cor 15:45). Concerning this verse Geerhardus Vos (1862-1949) observes:

Most significant of all, however, is the designation of Christ as the ‘eschatos Adam’ vs. 45, where ‘last’ is entirely steeped in eschatological meaning, for this ‘last Adam’ is the fountain-head of the resurrection, vss. 22, 23, a ‘quickening Spirit,’ ‘of heaven’ and ‘heavenly,’ vss. 47-49, all this referring to the final celestial state and the conditions pertaining thereto, such as the peculiar kind of (bodily) image to be borne by believers after their resurrection.

Christ, therefore, is the fountain head of the eschatological age.

Where the connection between eschatology and justification clearly emerges is with the resurrection of Christ, in that all soteric experience derives from solidarity in Christ’s resurrection and involves existence in the new creation age, inaugurated by his resurrection. This is no more evident than when Paul writes that Christ “was delivered up for our trespasses and raised for our justification” (Rom 4:25). The believer’s justification flows from Christ’s resurrection, which is an eschatological event, as Christ is the firstfruits of the great resurrection harvest (1 Cor 15:20-28; cf. Dan 12:1-2). Concerning Rom 4:25, though, Wright still tries to force his justification-ecclesiology connection upon the text. Wright states, “If faithful Jesus is demonstrated to be Messiah by the resurrection, the resurrection also declares in principle that all those who belong to Jesus, all those who respond in faith to God’s faithfulness revealed in him, are themselves part of the true covenant family promised to Abraham.” Yet, Paul does not make the same connection as Wright. Paul explicitly makes the resurrection-soteriology connection: “If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins” (1 Cor 15:17). Therefore, to Paul’s way of thinking, as long as Christ remains dead, Satan and sin are triumphant, or, more broadly, the dominion of the old aeon remains unbroken.

So, yes, justification is eschatological, but not in the way that Wright explains. It is not an eschatological definition of the people of God but the in-breaking of the eschatological age, the out-pouring of the power of the age to come, the Holy Spirit, manifest in the resurrection of Christ, bringing about the victory over sin and death, ensuring the justification of the people of God. Christ has been raised and therefore his people are

---
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195 Wright, *Romans*, 504.
no longer in their sin because God the Father has accepted the sacrifice of his Son on their behalf.

4. Present and Future Justification

There is the last issue that we must explore, namely the question of present and future justification. As we saw above, one of the features of Wright’s understanding of justification is that he divides it into present and future categories. Once again, commenting on Rom 8:3-4, Wright argues: “What is spoken of here is the future verdict, that of the last day, the ‘day’ Paul described in 2:1-16. That verdict will correspond to the present one, and will follow from (though not, in that sense, be earned or merited by), the Spirit-led life of which Paul now speaks.” Elsewhere, he writes: “The whole point about ‘justification by faith’ is that it is something which happens in the present time (Rom 3:26) as a proper anticipation of the eventual judgment which will be announced, on the basis of the whole life led, in the future (Rom 2:1-16).”

Wright believes, then, that present justification is a declaration in view of one’s obedient submission to Jesus as Lord, whereas his future justification is the declaration on the final day which is based upon the Spirit-led life of the believer. Wright argues, therefore, that the ground of one’s present justification is faith in Christ whereas the ground of one’s future justification is the believer’s Spirit-produced works. If anyone is in doubt that this is Wright’s view his own words clearly demonstrate it. Writing on Paul’s ground of hope at the final judgment, Wright states:

This is why, when Paul looks ahead to the future and asks, as well one might, what god [sic] will say on the last day, he holds up as his joy and crown, not the merits and death of Jesus, but the churches he has planted who remain faithful to the gospel. The path from initial faith to final resurrection (and resurrection we must remind ourselves, constitutes rescue, that is salvation, from death itself) lies through holy and faithful Spirit-led service, including suffering.

Wright’s view seems to have more in common with the Qumran commentary on Hab 2:4 than Paul (cf. 1 QpHab 8:1-3; Rom 1:17; 3:28). Dunn holds to a similar view regarding present and future justification. This construction, however, goes against the very principles that Paul sets out regarding the ground of justification and the place of works.

The Scriptures do not speak of two justifications. For example, Paul writes that “we have now been justified by his blood” (Rom 5:9a). Paul’s use of an aorist participle δικαιωθεντες and the adverb νυν indicate that justification is an accomplished reality. Nowhere does Paul state that there is a second justification to follow. The absence of

196 Wright, Romans, 580.

197 Wright, Fresh Perspective, 57.

198 Wright, Fresh Perspective, 148.

199 Dunn, Romans 1-8, 104-05; idem, Theology of Paul, 467, 488.

200 Thomas Schreiner, Romans, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 262-63.
a second justification is evident when Paul goes on to state that, “For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life” (Rom 5:10). Douglas Moo points out the parallel between vv. 9 and 10:  

**v. 9**

We have now been justified by his blood, much more

Shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God

**v. 10**

If while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, how much more, now that we are reconciled,

Shall we be saved by his life

This parallel reveals that justification is a present reality pronounced over the sinner who believes in Christ. The “now” adds the fine distinction of the continuing “just” status of those who are acquitted. Now in vv. 9-10 there is a future element of which Paul speaks, but he does not use the term “justified” but rather the phrase, “shall we be saved.”

Paul’s use of the future passive verb, σωθησόµεθα, reveals that there is a future aspect of our redemption, or our salvation, not that there is a future or second justification. As Joseph Fitzmeyer observes, “A favor still greater than justification itself will be manifested to the Christian in the eschatological salvation that is to come.” He goes on to state that, “Justification is subordinated to salvation, and the latter is regarded as something begun but still to be consummated or brought to its full expression (10:9, 13; 11.14, 26); yet that consummation is guaranteed.”

Clearly we see from Rom 5:9-10 that there is one justification and it is grounded upon the work of Christ. That there is one justification has been upheld by the historic Reformed witness, which is manifest in the creeds of the Reformed church.

Our doctrinal standards do not speak of a second justification but rather in terms of an open acknowledgement and acquittal on the day of judgment: “What shall be done to the righteous at the day of judgment? A. At the day of judgment, the righteous, being caught up to Christ in the clouds, shall be set on his right hand, and there openly acknowledged and acquitted” (WLC 90; emphasis; cf. WSC 38). Note how John Flavel (c.

---


204 See, e.g., the Belgic Confession, § 23; Heidelberg Catechism 1, 37, 38, 56, 59, 61; Second Helvetic Confession § 15; Canons of Dort, § 2, art. 3, rej. 4; WCF 11; WSC 33; WLC 69-71.
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1630-91) explains WSC 38 and how justification relates to the final judgment: “How does Christ’s acquittance now, differ from that at judgment? A. They differ in respect to publicness; this is secret in the believer’s bosom, and that open before men and angels.” So, it is fair to say that the Reformed church has recognized that our future salvation will include the declaration at the resurrection and final judgment that openly confirms our justification, in distinction from its secret reality in the present. But the Reformed church does not affirm that there are two separate justifications.

The Reformed church has historically rejected notions of a second justification not only because the idea is unscriptural but in contrast to the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification: Rome teaches that the first justification is by faith in Christ and is conferred in baptism *ex opere operato*, the second justification is based upon the believer’s sanctification. This teaching is reflected in the decrees of the Council of Trent: “Having, therefore, been thus justified . . . they, through the observance of the commandments of God and of the Church, faith co-operating with good works, increase in that justice which they have received through the grace of Christ, and are still further justified.” In other words, the second justification is the declaration that a person is actually righteous, based upon one’s faith cooperating with good works. Against this backdrop we can see why the Reformed church has rejected the idea of two justifications.

In view of these considerations, we may conclude that Wright’s NPP understanding of future justification is antithetical to Scripture and at odds with the historic witness of the Reformed community. In fact, regarding future justification, Wright’s view has more in common with the Roman Catholic view than it does with the historic Reformed view because his view of future justification is based upon the Spirit-produced works of the believer.

5. Summary

We have seen that Wright is correct to say that justification is covenantal, forensic, and eschatological. Though he is formally correct with the use of these categories, he is materially incorrect. Justification is covenantal, not in the sense of first century Judaism but in terms of the fulfillment of the first gospel promise (Gen 3:15) and the broken covenant of works. Justification is forensic but judgment is oriented towards the throne of God, not the world. And justification is eschatological, not as the ecclesiological definition of the people of God, but rather as the in-breaking of the eschaton with the salvation of God’s people. Lastly, the Scriptures neither speak of a second justification in the future nor place the ground of justification in the believer’s Spirit-produced works but in the finished work of Christ alone.


F. Concluding Observations

In our critique of the NPP one should come to the same conclusion that Alister McGrath has reached, “If Sanders or Wright is correct, Martin Luther is wrong.” The truth of McGrath’s statement has been demonstrated in this survey. While one may appreciate aspects of the NPP, there are certain elements that are incompatible with the system of doctrine contained in the Scriptures. One might argue, for example, that Reformed interpreters have sometimes relied upon a caricature of the Judaism of Paul’s day rather than a careful analysis of primary sources, and in this respect appreciate the NPP. To say, however, that righteousness is covenant membership and that the works of the law Paul opposes for justification are ethnic or national markers, conclusions that Sanders, Dunn, and Wright hold in one form or another, has the effect of locating the doctrine of justification within an entirely different matrix from that in which it has been traditionally understood. McGrath is therefore accurate: if Sanders or Wright is correct, then, Luther, Calvin, and the historic Reformed understanding of the doctrine of justification is incorrect.

This general conclusion means that the following points are out of accord with Scripture and our doctrinal standards:

1. “Righteousness” defined as covenant membership rather than moral equity, or adherence to a moral standard.
2. “Works of the law” for justification understood as boundary markers identifying Israel as God’s covenant people.
3. Justification only as vindication.
4. A second or future justification that has a different ground from one’s justification by faith.
5. Shifting the ground of justification from the finished work of Christ to the Spirit-produced works of the believer.
6. Denial of the imputation of the active and / or passive obedience of Christ.
7. Compromising the self-authenticating and self-interpreting nature of the Scriptures by giving the literature of Second Temple Judaism undue interpretive weight.

G. Suggested Reading

Officers, sessions, and presbyteries of the OPC should be familiar, therefore, with the exegetical, historical, and theological issues at stake surrounding the NPP. The bibliography on NPP and the doctrine of justification is legion, nevertheless the following resources are noteworthy and should be carefully studied:


This is an important volume and engages the NPP on an academic level. Knowledge of the biblical languages, Greek and Hebrew, is necessary. This volume has key exegesis, historical, and historical-theological information that make it a must-read.


This is a mid-level introduction and analysis of the NPP. There are helpful chapters on the history of the development of the NPP and analysis of key figures in the current debate. It is written on a semi-academic level and is more accessible for the layman.


This is a revised version of Westerholm’s *Israel’s Law and the Church’s Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988). Though Westerholm writes from a Lutheran perspective, his work is an excellent scholarly survey of the key players, issues, and biblical texts. Knowledge of the biblical languages is necessary.


In any debate it is important to hear both sides. In this regard, Wright’s volume is key reading for the officer who wants to hear one associated with the NPP apply aspects of the NPP to Paul’s doctrine of justification.

_____.* Paul: In Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

This is one of Wright’s most recently published books in which he expands material he originally developed in *What Saint Paul Really Said*. It is a broad survey of Paul’s theology in its first century setting. This book also is a precursor to Wright’s fourth installment in his *Christian Origins and the Question of God* series. This book is written at a mid-scholarly level, though the layman should be able to access the materials therein, as the book is based upon several public lecture series Wright delivered on Paul’s theology, including the 2005 Auburn Avenue Pastor’s Conference.

IV THE FEDERAL VISION

A Introduction

Among the tasks assigned to this Committee by the 71st (2004) General Assembly was a mandate to “critique the teachings of the …‘Federal vision’ and other like teachings concerning the doctrine of justification and other related doctrines…” While what follows does interact with the Federal Vision (FV) as it relates to the doctrine of justification, this part of the report also seeks to engage the FV across the broader range of its teachings inasmuch as its doctrine of justification cannot be fairly abstracted from its wider
approach and concerns. This part of our report then begins with sections detailing the rise of the FV, the background to it, and something of its positive and negative contributions before proceeding to deal with its theology, including its soteriology and doctrine of justification. It should be noted that this section of the report relies on the earlier exegetical argumentation of our report, cross-referenced at appropriate points. Insofar as we have already treated the relevant portions of Scripture, we will focus primarily on the Westminster Standards, to which many FV proponents subscribe. First of all, however, it may prove useful in these initial sections to set forth the major players, to locate the FV historically, and to give some general assessment before treating the substance of the teachings of the FV.

B. The rise of the Federal Vision

The Rev. Steve Wilkins, pastor of Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church (PCA) in, Monroe, LA, in the annual pastor’s conference held in his church in January 2002, invited several men to join him in articulating what he and they had begun to call, “The Federal Vision.” Given the location of the conference, others began to refer to what supporters called the “Federal Vision” as the “Auburn Avenue Theology.” The men invited to make presentations on the FV, along with Pastor Wilkins of Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church (AAPC), were the Rev. Steve Schlissel, pastor of Messiah’s Congregation in New York City; the Rev. Norman Shepherd, a retired CRC pastor and former professor of systematic theology at Westminster Theological Seminary (1964-1982); and the Rev. Douglas Wilson, pastor of Christ Church in Moscow, Idaho. Mr. Shepherd was unable to attend the meeting and the Rev. John Barach, former pastor of Covenant Reformed Church (URCNA) in Grand Prairie, Alberta, agreed to take his place. The project that these men (and others thereafter) undertook at that conference and in succeeding conferences and publications involved, as they saw it, a revitalization and development of the doctrine of the covenant and of the church.

210 Perhaps it is helpful here to note that “federal” is employed in this respect to indicate “covenantal.” The word “federal” derives from the Latin “foedus” which means “covenant” (cf. Richard A. Muller, “Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms,” [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986], 119-120). It has most commonly been used in this adjectival form to refer to the covenantal position of Adam and Christ as being that of federal headship.

211 It is the case that the men invited to the 2002 AAPC Pastors’ Conference, together with some associated and allied with them, as well as others not necessarily connected to these men, had been writing and speaking along these lines for some time. It is outside the scope of this report to document this other than to point to the kind of materials giving further background cited by, e.g., Guy Waters in his work on FV, Covenant Theology Improved? Assessing the Federal Vision (Phillipsburg: P & R, forthcoming). The following footnote will indicate why the lectures given in January 2002 in Monroe at AAPC (recordings available at www.auburnavenue.org) created the kind of uproar that they did.
No small dispute erupted in the wake of this conference. These men who had spoken at Auburn Avenue soon found themselves at the center of controversy in the rather small world of confessional Reformed and Presbyterian churches. Events that unfolded in the aftermath of the 2002 AAPC Conference made it clear that the FV was not monolithic and that not all who espoused it agreed on all points. Nonetheless, FV proponents agreed on enough points to raise concerns among many who regarded themselves as more confessional churchmen, seeing FV supporters as innovative and promoting novelty at best. The expression of this concern among those who question the trajectory of the FV ranges from relatively mild disapprobation to outright declarations of heresy.

The errors most often alleged by the growing body of FV opponents include but are not limited to the FV’s positions on the following: denial of the covenant of works, blurring of the law/gospel distinction, denial of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in justification, failure to affirm the definitive nature of justification in this life, tendency to merge faith and faithfulness as instrumental in justification, rejection of the visible/invisible church distinction, sacramentalism approaching an *ex opere operato* position, and mono-covenantalism that not only tends to identify covenant and election but sees only one covenant in God and between God and man. It has been noted by more than a few that there is a particular irony in denouncing this position “the Federal Vision,” when, in fact, some of what the promoters of the FV seek to forward is at odds with classic Federal theology as expressed in the Reformed confessions, particularly the Westminster Standards.

Given the outcry raised against the FV, Pastor Wilkins called Pastors Barach, Schlissel, and Wilson together again to join him in responding to opponents of the FV. Rev. Wilkins also invited some fellow Reformed churchmen who had expressed reservations about the FV to engage in personal dialog with those who supported it. Thus Dr. Joseph Pipa, President of Greenville Presbyterian Theological Seminary; the Rev. Carl Robbins, pastor of Woodruf Road Presbyterian Church (PCA) in Greenville, S.C.; Dr. Morton Smith, professor and/or president in several Reformed and Presbyterian seminaries and former Stated Clerk of the PCA; and the Rev. R.C. Sproul, Jr., editor of *Tabletalk* and director of the Highlands Study Center all came to Monroe in January 2003 to interact with and respond to the tenets set forth by the men articulating the FV. By and large, the proponents of the FV reiterated what they had said in 2002, as Schlissel wryly noted in reflecting on what he had said a year earlier: “I agree with me.” The opponents of the FV engaged in a critique that, on the whole, seemed to have little significant impact on the positions articulated by the FV men.

---

212 Following on the previous footnote, much of the controversy that ensued in the wake of the 2002 AAPC Conference was due in no small measure to the condemnation in June 2002 of the AAPC teachings by the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States (RPCUS), a small Presbyterian denomination of less than a dozen churches. Many of these materials from the RPCUS point of view are available on their website (www.rpcus.com), and one of their ministers, John Otis, has written a book-length critique, even as others from an FV stance are available on the Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church website (www.auburnavenue.org), both having links to other relevant sites.

213 AAPC 2003, recording of Schlissel’s talk, “What Does the Lord Require?”
Dr. E. Calvin Beisner, professor at Knox Theological Seminary (KTS), recounts, in the volume cited below, that he and others who have good friends on both sides of the FV debate have been distressed over not so much the debate itself but over the tone of the debate, particularly the high temperature of much of the rhetoric in the debate. An anonymous wealthy donor, desiring a more dispassionate and tempered discussion of the issues, provided an opportunity for both sides to dialog in an atmosphere conducive to gracious relaxation and bonhomie. Thus all the speakers of the January 2003 AAPC Conference in Monroe came to Florida in August 2003 to seek to iron out their differences not before an ecclesiastical audience but in private. Joining the original speakers and respondents in Florida and representing the FV were Dr. Peter Leithart, pastor of Trinity Reformed Church in Moscow, ID and teacher at New St. Andrews College; the Rev. Rich Lusk, assistant pastor of AAPC; and the Rev. Tom Trouwborst, pastor of Calvary OPC in Schenectady, NY, serving as a substitute for James Jordan, Director of Biblical Horizons. Weighing in on the side of those opposed to the FV were, in addition to the three earlier opponents (Sproul was unable to make this meeting), the Rev. Christopher A. Hutchinson, associate pastor of Trinity Presbyterian Church (PCA) in Statesboro, GA; Dr. George Knight, III, adjunct professor of New Testament at GPTS; and the Rev. Richard Phillips, pastor of First Presbyterian Church (PCA) of Coral Springs/Margate, Florida.

At about the same time in Southern California (August 8-9, 2003), there was a symposium held under the auspices of the Southern California Center for Christian Study (SCCCS) that also sought to address many of the same questions put forward by the FV. Most of the speakers at this conference on “Contemporary Perspectives on Covenant Theology” shared at least some of the same convictions as the proponents of the FV. The speakers at this conference were Randy Booth, Jeffrey D. Neill, P. Andrew Sandlin, Norman Shepherd, Jeffrey J. Ventrella, and Roger Wagner. Particularly noteworthy at this conference were the two contributions by Professor Shepherd: “Justification by Faith in Pauline Theology,” and “Justification by Works in Reformed Theology.” In the first address, Shepherd argues that justification involves simply the remission of sin and that the faith that justifies not only issues forth in repentance and other fruits but entails such in the very act of faith itself. In the second address, Shepherd asserts that the Heidelberg Catechism and Ursinus, along with the pre-17th century Reformed tradition, do not teach the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in our justification. Furthermore, Shepherd argues, those who teach that Christ’s active obedience is imputed in justification manifest that they have not completely escaped Rome’s works/merit paradigm, against which Shepherd argues for a faith/grace paradigm.

---

214 E. Calvin Beisner, ed., The Auburn Avenue Theology, Pros and Cons: Debating the Federal Vision; The Knox Theological Seminary Colloquium on the Federal Vision, August 11-13, 2003. (Ft. Lauderdale: Knox Theological Seminary, 2004). This volume (hereafter, Knox Colloquium) is key in understanding both the pros and cons of FV.

Subsequent to the Knox Colloquium and the SCCCS symposium, Athanasius Press, a press local to AAPC, published the volume entitled *The Federal Vision*. All the proponents of the FV who were involved in the Knox Colloquium are published here with the exception of Tom Trouwbourst. In addition to the proponents of the FV involved in the Knox Colloquium, *The Federal Vision* also has essays by James Jordan (identified above) and the Rev. Mark Horne, who is identified as to current service simply as “a pastor in the Presbyterian Church in America.” In *The Federal Vision*, the four who originally spoke at the AAPC 2002 conference are joined by their colleagues in further defining and defending the FV.

While the lectures and essays subsequent to the AAPC 2002 conference have manifested on the part of some of the FV defenders some thoughtful interaction with the criticisms leveled by those concerned about FV, in the main, those who hold to the FV have proceeded undeterred in their continuing to develop the FV. There has been, and continues to be, much debate and discussion in a variety of settings, not only in print and on the Internet, but by actions like the statement adopted by the Mississippi Valley Presbytery (PCA) condemning tenets of the FV, Wilkin’s Louisiana Presbytery (PCA) giving him qualified approbation, and the response to that by many on the anti-FV side from the Knox Colloquium. Perhaps the most fruitful interaction between an FV proponent and his critics has occurred on the part of Douglas Wilson, who, in being examined by his judicatory (at his request), affirmed the covenant of works, with some qualifications, as well as the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in our justification. Developments continue apace and it must be noted that this analysis takes account of matters as they stand at the end of 2005.

C. The background to the Federal Vision

The views of the FV proponents have not sprung full-blown as Athena from the head of Zeus but have been in development for some time and involve issues about which the church has conversed down through the centuries. The historic roots of this controversy, one might argue, extend back even to the apostolic and ancient church. Though it is true, for instance, that the bi-covenantalism (covenant of works and covenant of grace) and tri-covenantalism (covenant of redemption, additionally) of classic federal theology were not developed until the late 16th and early 17th centuries, many of the concerns addressed by the development of the covenant of works were present not only in Augustine’s four-fold state of man (5th century), but also hinted at in the writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Athanasius, et al. (2nd-4th centuries). Obviously, supporters of classic federal theology would also maintain that federal theology finds its true genesis in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments (and also, as some have noted, the inter-testamental literature, cf. Sirach 17:1, 11-12). So the FV supporters need to be cognizant that if they wish, e.g., to contend against a “judicial” theology, they do so not only against those who would affirm the covenant of works but also against Augustine; as well, to a lesser degree, against Justin Martyr,
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217 All of these interactions are available in some form, either recorded, print, or both, commonly on the respective websites of the particular organizations.
Chrysostom, and a host of others in the ancient and medieval church (100-1500 A.D.), and also pre-temple destruction rabbis. What was developed in federal theology was not a novelty of the 17th century but was always present in at least seed form in historical theology, being rooted in the Scriptures.  

Additionally, a number of scholars have also recognized that many of the tenets of federal theology may be found in incipient form in Zwingli, Bullinger, and even Calvin. This is important to note because some of the FV men claim to be returning to the nascent federalism of Bullinger and Calvin as if these Reformers were at odds with or significantly differed from the “scholastic” federal theology that developed in the 17th century. Both those who would oppose Bullinger to Beza and Calvin to the Calvinists of the next century have been ably refuted by more recent studies. While there were certainly some different emphases, it is unwise and unwarranted to pit Calvin against the Westminster Confession as has Perry Miller and a host of earlier scholars, though the tide now runs distinctly in the opposite direction.  

We must recognize that FV promoters are not alone among Reformed theologians, particularly of more recent times, in finding fault with classic federal theology. In the last century especially, Karl Barth and his many followers regarded classic federal theology as scholastic, rationalistic, and speculative. One may also cite several leading confessional Reformed theologians, such as Herman Hoeksema, Klaas Schilder and John Murray, who were critical of federal theology at certain points. Hoeksema rejected the covenant of works, but, unlike the FV partisans, also rejected any conditionality in the covenant of grace. Hoeksema tended to read the covenant through election. Schilder, on the other hand, while taking a cautious approach to the covenant of works (sharply rejecting any notion of condign merit for pre-lapsarian Adam, for instance), emphasized the
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221 Schilder’s position may be gathered from a speech that he gave in the Netherlands in 1944, “The Main Points of the Doctrine of the Covenant” (private rpt., Canada, 1992) and from a work on the liberation of the Gereformeerde Kerken from the Synodical Churches (J. Kamphuis, *An Everlasting Covenant* [Launceston: The Publication Organization of the Free Reformed Churches of Australia, 1985]).

conditionality of the covenant and tended to view election from the perspective of the covenant. At about the same time in mid-century, Murray argued for a recasting of covenant theology, seeing the covenant as purely an expression of God’s unmerited favor to fallen man and thus not inaugurated until the post-lapsarian situation. If Hoeksema emphasized *pactum salutis* (covenant of redemption, the eternal intra-trinitarian) above all, and Schilder, *historia salutis* (redemptive history), perhaps Murray’s genius, however he might have erred in terms of classic federalism, was not to jettison one of these in favor of the others but to hold to the eternal, redemptive-historical and existential aspects of the salvation that is ours and that is all of grace.

Of the FV men, Barach, while pointing to more recent Reformed theologians, claims some affinities with Schilder, while others, like Jordan, claim to be, in some fashion, carrying on Murray’s recasting of covenant theology. Hoeksema is lauded by FV supporters for rejecting the covenant of works, but his decretal theology, like the experimental Calvinism of so many of the Reformed and Puritan traditions, is quite out of step with the program of the FV. As a side note, one might add that many of the FV men also seem to be reacting against certain Reformed theologians as if these theologians represented most of those who hold to the classic federal theology as expressed in the Westminster Standards. Meredith Kline’s view, for instance, that one ought not to speak of grace at all in the pre-lapsarian context, arguing that grace should be defined exclusively as de-merited favor and thus applicable only in a fallen context (whether as common or special grace), is not the view of mainstream federal theology. Francis Turretin better captures the mainstream position in his asserting that one may rightly speak of grace in the pre-lapsarian state and that there was a disproportion between Adam’s obedience and the reward that would have followed, there thus being more than strict justice in view during the pre-lapsarian administration of the covenant of works. It is worth noting that while many Kline detractors regard him as viewing Adam capable of condign merit, Kline himself believes that before the fall Adam would have achieved merit within the context of the
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223 John Barach, “Covenant and Election,” in Federal Vision, 15


226 Kline’s view is ably set forth by a supporter and fairly contrasted with Murray’s (particularly in the latter’s scrupling at the covenant of works while affirming Adamic federal headship) in Jeong Koo Jeon’s *Covenant Theology* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1999).

covenant. Similar to the tendency of FV men to paint Kline as the representative of classic federal theology, FV promoters attack the view that faith consists of “assent alone” and seem to think that many hold to such a view, when, in fact, Gordon Clark himself, as a modern proponent of the view that faith is intellectual assent to a proposition, lamented that most Reformed regarded faith as involving not only notitia and assensus but also fiducia.228

In addition to the influence of Schilder, Murray, and others of a more biblical and confessional bent, some of the men who support the FV have also been influenced by the New Perspective on Paul. Rich Lusk and Mark Horne are quite open about this, though in his contribution in The Federal Vision, Horne’s debt to the NPP is not so obvious.

D. General positive and negative contributions of the Federal Vision

Given these roots and influences, it must be said that the FV has raised legitimate concerns. Being afflicted as we are, particularly in this land, with such a low view of the church, the proponents of FV strike significant chords in being supportive of an ecclesiology that has a high view of the means of grace and of the visible church. The FV promoters eschew a view of the church that would stress the invisible at the expense of the visible and that would exalt the individual and the subjective above the corporate and the objective. They are undoubtedly not wrong when they observe that much of the church is afflicted with a low view of the means of grace—preaching and sacraments especially—of the obligation to live holy lives, and of the inseparability of justification and sanctification.

Much of the critique in which the FV engages, however, seems either to apply more broadly to evangelicalism or to tiny pockets within Reformed churches. While it is true that “easy-believism” has been a problem within American evangelicalism, it has not been the same kind of problem within Reformed communions. It has been rightly observed that if Reformed churches have a tendency to err in a certain way, it is in the direction of nomism, not antinomianism. To be sure, older hyper-Calvinism tended toward an antinomian position but few would hold to such today. FV proponents seem concerned as well about the kind of morbid introspection that one found among some of the Puritans and other experimental Calvinists, and some of their contemporary descendants, who excessively emphasize ordo salutis (the order of salvation, the application of Christ’s work to the individual believer) and who required either a narrative of grace or something like it for communicant membership in the church. But few today are guilty of such morbid introspection. Few also, as noted above, follow Gordon Clark in his insistence that faith consists of intellectual assent alone. While the FV proponents do raise concerns that affect the church more widely, some of their weapons seem to be wielded against positions that few hold and in their making of and attacking straw men, they tend to over-argue their case, stressing the objective, e.g., at the expense of the subjective and thus tending toward a formalism that would not prove beneficial for the life of the church (tending, as Charles Hodge noted in another controversy, to reject rationalism only to embrace ritualism).229 Rather than heading in that direction, we need a full-orbed ecclesiology that teaches us to hunger for the

__________________________


229 See Charles Hodge, Discussions in Church polity (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1878), 38-55.
means of grace, that fully employs them, and that then waits on the Lord in his blessing of them.

As noted earlier, FV proponents do not agree on all points and the project is not monolithic. Many of them, for instance, affirm baptismal regeneration in some form, while others demur and do not adopt such terminology. The question remains, then, as to how one is to come to grips with what the FV as a whole teaches. While someone evaluating the FV might choose to deal with what the various parties personally hold, this would fly in the face of what the FV men themselves are professing to do: provide a coherent approach to the Bible from a consistently covenantal perspective. The project is thus to be evaluated not on the basis of what this or that proponent of FV might forward but on what FV in its integrity seeks to set forth. It is the proponents of FV, in other words, who must differentiate among themselves. It is incumbent on the parties participating in this movement to do so and not the outside observers of the project. The remainder of this critique, then, will proceed topically to treat the FV, mentioning the various proponents as we go along but focusing not on the men who hold the views but the views themselves. And perhaps the easiest and clearest way to organize this treatment is by examining the various loci of systematic theology, with a particular concern as to how they relate to the doctrine of justification.

E. Prolegomena and Doctrine of Scripture

Since prolegomena and the doctrine of Scripture concern the very method of doing theology, they by necessity affect every point of doctrine, including justification. In terms of prolegomena and the doctrine of Scripture, we already encounter problems with the FV. In the Introduction to *The Federal Vision*, Wilkins argues that many confessionalists have allowed their “theological formulations to have supremacy over the Scriptures.” If, in fact, such hyper-confessionalism is the real problem of those who disagree with the FV, then it is the opponents of the FV and not the supporters who are the troublemakers of Israel. The real problem here, however, is not whether some office-bearers are hyper-confessionalists (some are) but whether those who are confessional are confessional for the right reasons, viz., they believe that the confessions accurately reflect what Scriptures teach. Thus this assertion of Wilkins and others like it beg the question as to who is correctly interpreting Scripture.

Those who hold to the confessions do not hold to them, if they hold to them correctly, because the confessions are traditional, historic, etc., but because the church’s

---


secondary standards faithfully set forth what the Scriptures teach. Wilkins’s assertion that ‘we have allowed our theological system to become a filter through which we read the Word of God’ is, at best, naïve: everyone reads the Word of God through the filter of his theological system while at the same time professing to draw and develop his system from the Word of God. The claim at this level as made by Wilkins sounds something like that of the 19th century American Restorationist Alexander Campbell who claimed not to be interpreting the Word (which is all the confessions are, the church’s interpretation of the Bible on certain agreed-upon matters) but merely believing the Word as if he could somehow directly intuit it better than the church had before him. We know of no one who properly subscribes to the Standards who regards them as infallible. Only the Word is infallible and if we come to believe by the illumination of the same Holy Spirit who inspired the apostles and prophets that our confessions are wrong then we had better change them to express what it is that we now believe the Bible to teach.

Another issue related to prolegomena is the antipathy to systematizing on the part of some FV advocates. An example of this antipathy is seen in the conviction of Schlissel that the way to deal with covenant and election appears to be to “keep it simple” and to look at everything through the lens of the covenant, acting for all practical purposes as if election need not materially not concern us. The point that needs to be made here is that FV proponents frequently charge their opponents with rationalism, inasmuch as some FV opponents tend to read covenant through election or history through the lens of the decrees. But, we must ask, who is the real rationalist in this case? The FV supporter who, on the one hand, wants to read election through the covenant and see the covenant apostate as one who was truly regenerated but who does not persevere, or the traditional Reformed understanding, on the other hand, which, in being more nuanced, is not rationalistic but seeking to be faithful to the whole counsel of God? Yet, even as the open theist charges orthodoxy with rationalism when it is the open theist who lops off part of the Scripture to accommodate his humanized view of God, so many FV promoters charge the Reformed tradition with rationalism when it is they who do not deal with all of the Scripture. It is not rationalism to seek to make full sense of what the Scriptures as a whole teach, in the process of which theologians may and must formulate doctrine by way of “good and necessary consequence,” as the Westminster Confession of Faith affirms. Because there is an apparent tension between covenant and election, e.g., does not mean that one should be jettisoned in favor of the other. It has, rather, always been the mark of orthodoxy (witness the ecumenical councils of the fourth and fifth centuries) to refuse to remove doctrinal conundrums by ignoring some aspect of revelation. Those who do not seek systematically to
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235 Peter Leithart seems also reluctant to systematize, see his Against Christianity (Moscow: Canon Press, 2003), 43-68. Leithart, Schlissel, and others often note that that Scripture is a story and not a set of propositions. While that is quite true, it does not mean that one may not extrapolate propositional truth from it (if it does, then we must jettison confessions altogether).
correlate biblical revelation in its entirety may ultimately end up over stressing some aspect and land in error or heresy.

A few apologetical considerations are in order in our consideration of prolegomena, particularly as they relate to the claim of FV advocates to be following Cornelius Van Til in their anti-systematizing biases. Most, if not all, of the FV proponents would claim either to be followers of the apologetical methodology of Van Til or would otherwise not see themselves as contradicting him. The FV does, in fact, misrepresent Van Til at several points and it is a mistake to assume the FV’s misguided claim that their approach in regards to Scripture and Confession is properly Van Tilian. It is not Van Tilian simply to charge that classic federalists read the Scriptures through a theological grid as if anyone can read the Scriptures without a theological grid. Van Til believed that the Word should mold that grid and he believed that the Reformed faith had allowed the Word to do just that and had faithfully reflected that in the Reformed confessions. Van Til’s genius involved not only his refusal to reject revelation in favor of an Enlightenment concept of reason but also a refusal to give way to irrationalism. In his defense of the Synod Dort, for instance, one can see that Van Til stood with the Reformers in refusing to give way either to hyper-Calvinism or Arminianism, bowing instead to God’s teaching in his Word.
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236 See, e.g., Peter J. Leithart, “Trinitarian Anthropology: Toward a Trinitian Re-casting of Reformed Theology,” in Knox Colloquium, 64.


238 Beisner, e.g., seems to fault Van Til for the “Federal Visionists tend[ing] to object to their statements being subjected to logical critique (testing for consistency) and logical inferences (leading to conclusions that they do not wish to embrace).” He continues: “I suspect that this objection to logical systematization—and to its use as a critical tool to test for falsehood by uncovering logical inconsistency—rests, for at least some of them, on their embrace of Cornelius Van Til’s epistemology and apologetic, an important element of which is reticence as to (or perhaps even hostility to) the use of logic in theology” (“Concluding Comments,” in Knox Colloquium, 319-20). While it is quite true that Van Til was opposed to all forms of rationalism, including that of Gordon Clark, and insisted that we affirm things in Scripture that might seem rationalistically contradictory (as have, say, the first four councils of the Christian Church in the fourth and fifth centuries to the heretics then and to liberals later), he did nothing like reject the use of reason or logic but understood it to be inescapable. Van Til, believing in God’s incomprehensibility, did not render God unknowable; nor did he deny the law of non-contradiction. He did believe that the law of non-contradiction was not something that could account for itself, however, being reliant instead on the ontological Trinity and the self-attesting Christ of Scriptures. Van Til believed in a ministerial and not magisterial use of reason. So Beisner is incorrect in attributing the anti-systematization impulses of a Schlissel to Van Til.

There are those who would reduce Van Til to mere perspectivalism and thus make him sound more like Ludwig Wittgenstein, Paul Ricouer, Richard Rorty, or even Thomas Kuhn, simply because Van Til and any number of post-structuralists, deconstructionists, and a host of post-modern linguistic types all believe that we have a worldview through which we interpret all that we encounter.\(^{240}\) Van Til is not anti-systematic and those of any stripe who think that they have him on their side in this are misguided.\(^{241}\) The same is true of those who attribute the impulse to systematization to the Greeks, arguing that there is a dichotomy between Greek and Hebrew thought.\(^{242}\) Not only has this old liberal canard been debunked by James Barr and others, the use to which it has been put historically has not been in the service of orthodoxy. This impulse to systematization is wrongly assessed if it is thought only to characterize the Greeks or a Hellenized approach. The desire to make sense of things—to relate the one and the many—is a human one, a universal desire that reflects that man is made in the image of God, a God who is not the author of disorder or confusion.

**F. Theology Proper**

In terms of the doctrine of God, FV supporters also present some challenges relevant to this report. This is the case in particular because some FV advocates relate their covenant theology to the doctrine of God in a distinctive way. This is important for purposes of this report, then, because one’s conception of covenant is crucial for the doctrine of justification. Steve Wilkins, following Ralph Smith in his work, *Eternal Covenant*, defines covenant as *relationship* and thus finds covenant to be eternal since God is eternally three persons with each person in a “holy, undivided fellowship” with the others.\(^{243}\) We do not deny that the three persons of the Holy Trinity enjoy mutual interpenetration, as expressed in the doctrine of *circumincession*, being in eternal fellowship with each other in a divine communion of persons in which the act of one is, in certain senses, the act of all. This is standard Trinitarian theology. But to assert that this given relationship among the persons of the Holy Trinity entails covenant, as Wilkins argues, means, it would seem, that covenant is essential to God.

But there is no indication in any of this, as Pipa notes, that Smith or Wilkins distinguishes between the immanent works of God (*opera Dei ad intra*) and the outworking of the decrees (*opera Dei ad extra*) or that it has occurred to them seriously to ask what this does to God’s freedom in regard to covenant: Is God utterly free, even in choosing how


to relate to himself (a radical nominalism), or is there no freedom for him, even in his choosing how he relates to his creation (a radical essentialism)?

Quite ironic in all this as well is the paucity of any scriptural support for the claim that because God is truly three persons “in community” this necessarily entails that covenant is what describes and defines this relationship. FV proponents continually claim that they are being biblical over against their opponents who are being theological, scholastic, rationalistic. It is right, then, that those who question the FV demand exegesis that would support the FV position on covenant, which is one of the pillars of their project of reading everything through their understanding of covenant.

In terms of the persons of the Holy Trinity there is no relationship to be entered into (which is what covenant has always signified), the relationship simply is: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit are in an eternal relationship with each other and why covenant, without biblical proof, is the proper way of describing this relationship is murky at best. Occam’s razor would suggest that, absent Scripture, to adduce covenant to describe the essential inter-trinitarian relationship violates the law of parsimony by needlessly complicating matters: what warrant do we have to denominate the mysterious relationship between the persons of the Trinity as “covenant?” For a movement that professes to eschew theological speculation and scholasticism, as does the FV, such an assertion seems quite speculative and rationalistic and without biblical foundation. We do, however, have no problem seeing that there is in God an archetype of covenant (the covenant of redemption, e.g.) that finds its ectypes in the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, inasmuch as creation as analogy.

While we do not dispute that we find covenant in God, we see no biblical evidence offered to see covenant as the proper category for understanding God in his relationship to himself. Wilkins builds off of Smith, who cites Abraham Kuyper and Hoeksema as architects of this mono-covenantalism; but the FV takes mono-covenantalism in a decidedly different direction from Kuyper and Hoeksema, arguing that this one covenant is conditional, over against Hoeksema, in particular, who would deny any conditionality whatsoever. And what does it mean if the covenant is conditional in God himself? Is the relationship among the persons of the Trinity thus rendered conditional? This mono- or hyper-covenantalism seems unwarranted, fraught with difficulties, and altogether lacking in demonstration sufficient to overturn our historic categories, which, going back to the early church and the four councils, seem much biblically sounder.

Wilkins also makes clear what the link is between the covenant in God and the covenant into which we are brought: “The covenant into which we are brought is this very same covenant that has always existed within the Godhead from eternity.” This means, as the FV proponents routinely claim, that there is no covenant of works made by God with Adam in his estate of innocence. But it also means that, properly speaking and in any historic sense, there is no covenant of grace either. There is but one covenant, originally in God, into which Adam as God’s son was invited to live and charged to be covenantally faithful; Adam, however, failed and Christ came to do what Adam did not do, was
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covenantally faithful, paid for our sin, and, sins having been remitted, has put us back into a place where we are called to be, and given grace to be, covenantally faithful. This is the FV in a nutshell. But it is not the position of classic Federal theology, which in teaching the existence of the covenants of works and grace as established in history, lays a crucial foundation for understanding the biblical doctrine of justification.246

G. Anthropology

What is wrong with the approach of the FV, in summary, is that it flattens out God’s covenantal dealings with man. God has dealt with his people according to different covenantal arrangements before and after the fall, and the doctrine of justification rests upon a clear distinction between these two arrangements. God did not have to create man but, according to his own good pleasure, he voluntarily condescended, created man in his image, and entered into meaningful covenantal relationship with him, a relationship that reflected the full range of God’s attributes, his justice as well as his love, kindness, and goodness. For man to enjoy and to continue to enjoy access to such a God, he must have been perfect. And he was perfect. Adam did not maintain this state of perfection but disobeyed God, who had given him only one negative prohibition and by that probation tested to see whether he would continue to walk in righteousness or whether he would disobey the one who loved him so. This estate is variously styled, called by some (as in WCF 7.1-2) a “covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam; and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience.” Clearly man was created in such a state (Eccl 7:29) and failed to continue in that state. This is the first giving of the law (WCF 19.1; cf. see above I.B.3), requiring “personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience.” Not only do some FV proponents deny that God made a covenant of works with Adam, regarding such a covenant as legal, servile, etc. in opposition to whatever arrangement prevailed in the pre-lapsarian state that was supposedly more reflective of sonship, but some FV supporters deny that the rule of life (the law) given to Adam required perfect obedience. Lusk writes: “the law did not require perfect obedience. It was designed for sinners, not unfallen creatures.”247 But the law was designed for man as an unfallen creature, not as a sinner, and it required full obedience (WCF 19.1-2). Lusk cannot escape the weight of this by alleging that he has reference to fallen yet regenerate man and the way that God accepts the less than perfect obedience of his adopted children (cf. WCF 16.2-6). More on this, below, when we examine justification.

FV supporters frequently argue that a false dichotomy has been posited between law and gospel.248 To be sure, a wrong view of law and gospel has at times come to the fore and, one might argue, come to predominate in our current antinomian culture. This view runs along the lines of “law is all about rules and duties” while “gospel is about freedom and grace,” with the underlying assumption being that rules are bad, being restrictive, and that freedom from rules is thus good. Such an assumption is not one to which man in his


pre-lapsarian state would have subscribed but is rather a concomitant of the Fall. Rules are seen as bad only in a fallen world and only in a fallen world is the premium placed on freedom from rules. The rules, the law of God, were to Adam before the Fall, and become such again to renewed man, “sweeter than the honeycomb.” Freedom has become, according to man in his unregenerate state, an end in itself rather than the means to a higher end. True freedom, however, is freedom from sin, from lawlessness, and is instead freedom to serve, freedom not to sin, as Adam had before the Fall. Given this false dichotomy, law and gospel are pitted against one another as if they were absolutely antithetical when, in fact, gospel was introduced after the violation of the law, both for the justification of the ungodly and for the transformation of the law-breaker into one who is a law-keeper (sanctification).

Man was, in other words, created in law. Being in God’s image, man was created in law, possessing true righteousness and holiness (Eph 4:24; Col 3:10). In violating the law, he forfeited all the blessings and became liable to all the curses. Since the Fall did not change man’s essential nature—the Fall being ethical not ontological—this legal nature, a human nature made in law to keep law, remains. Whatever else man having a legal nature might mean (cf. Rom 2:14-15), it clearly means that the works principle, reflecting the covenant of works in which man was created, is built in as part of the very fabric of his being. That man has such a built-in legal nature is, of course, no problem before the Fall when he enjoyed not only the natural ability to keep the law, to please God, but moral ability as well. It is natural to man as man to want to work to please God. This is the way that God made Adam: He made Adam as his son wanting to please His father. There has never been any tension between the legal and the relational in this respect, as we see not only in the relationship between the doctrines of justification and adoption but also in the legal declaration that forms the basis of the doctrine of adoption itself, the doctrine of adoption strikingly bringing together the judicial/legal/forensic and the relational. It was because we were legitimate offspring before the Fall that there was a proper father/son relationship; after the Fall, however, we have become illegitimate (disinherited) by virtue of sin. It is natural, then, for man to want to work to please God, though after the Fall this is no longer possible without regeneration, man being afflicted as he is with moral inability as a result of original sin, which includes the corruption of our whole nature.

H. Christology and the Accomplishment of Redemption

The law must be properly defined as the perfect requirement for holiness that flows out of the character of a perfectly holy God. That we cannot meet its demands in our post-lapsarian state only highlights the need for one, even our Lord Jesus Christ, who will keep the law perfectly for us (active obedience) and pay the penalty for Adam’s and our having violated it (passive obedience). To deny the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in our justification, as some FV proponents do, means that we have no law-keeping of our own to accompany the remission of sin (our children in failing to obey when told to clean their rooms both are punished for the failure and still required thereafter to do what they failed to do—clean their rooms). Looking forward for just a moment, to the appli-
cation of Christ’s work, God does not merely remit our sin in justification, He declares us to be righteous; not as a judge who expels the technically not-guilty but loathsome accused from his courtroom but as a Father who receives us as cleansed by Christ’s death and made righteous by Christ’s obedience. For us to be lovely in God’s sight, we need something more than the simple remission of sin.  

FV advocates argue that even as Adam before the Fall did not work to merit life but rather simply trusted his Father, Christ as last Adam does not work to merit life for us but simply trusts and obeys his Father, as Adam did not. Adam trusted the Father before the Fall, to be sure, but Adam’s trust was not the *fiducia* that is the completing element of saving faith. Adam before the Fall did not exercise saving faith because he did not need to be saved. Saving faith looks away from itself entirely, resting and trusting wholly in the work of another. Christ, too, trusted his Father and that perfectly. But he, like Adam before the Fall, did not have saving faith; he did not, as one does in saving faith, look to another to do what he could not do himself. Rather, Christ could do, and did do, what Adam was to do but failed to do. Christ did not, in other words, trust in another to perform the necessary saving work, but he himself performed that work, not for himself but for us, so that we might look to him and exercise saving faith in him. This distinction is not sufficiently observed and maintained by the FV.

Norman Shepherd writes that Christ had a “living, active, obedient faith that took him all the way to the cross” and concludes that “this faith was credited to him for righteousness.” While it is true that Christ trusted His Father, it was not the trust that Christians exercise as a part of saving faith, the trust in another to do for us what we cannot do for ourselves. Insofar as one might properly speak of Jesus having faith, such an assertion would mean that He trusted his heavenly Father to provide good gifts and looked to the Father for the sustenance that he needed in his human nature. It never means that Jesus trusted, nor needed to trust, as do sinners, for salvation or that his faith was credited to him as righteousness.

What marked Christ’s work, then, was that active and passive obedience which might become the object of our faith and hope, not primarily his giving us an example of faith. Christ furnished us with an example of faith and obedience, to be sure, but more importantly and foundationally, he furnished us with that which is unique: his person and work whereby we are brought from death in sin to life in him. It has historically been the mark of a declining faith to focus more on how Christ is exemplary rather than unique. Our faith in him is based on who he uniquely is and what he uniquely did. Once we grasp the uniqueness of Christ in his person and work, or better, are grasped by it, then and only then are we bidden to follow his example, out of gratitude, by his grace. We trust Christ and him alone because of what he and he alone did for us, not because he was the example without parallel.

\[250\] For a fuller treatment of the FV denial of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in our justification, see the section below on “Imputation,” under the heading, “Soteriology.”


\[252\] Norman Shepherd, *Call of Grace*, 19.
Some of the proponents of the FV view Christ’s perfect keeping of the law solely as that which qualified him to be our atoning sacrifice.\textsuperscript{253} It is quite true that if Christ had sinned he would not have been qualified to atone for ours. The contention, however, that Christ’s perfect law-keeping was for him and him alone misses the point that his life was as much for us as was his death. Christ neither lived nor died for himself but he lived and died for us. Lusk asserts that Jesus’ law-keeping as a “Beloved Son” was in no sense meritorious, because “the gospels make it clear that Jesus never had to earn the favor of God.”\textsuperscript{254} It is quite true that Jesus never had to earn God’s favor for himself but he had to earn it for us who had de-merited God’s favor by Adam’s original sin to which has been added all of our own actual sins.

Lusk argues further that if Christ in his active obedience is understood to do what Adam failed to do in the covenant of works—i.e., successfully pass the probation that would result in God glorifying humanity—such a view undercuts Christ’s sonship. Why it is the case that, inherently, a legal relationship undermines a filial relationship is nowhere demonstrated and everywhere asserted. Lusk, in fact, describes the notion of Christ in the fulfilling the covenant of redemption by keeping the covenant of works so that he can save us in the covenant of grace as akin to Pelagianism, conceiving the historic Reformed view just described in this fashion: “In Genesis 1-2, God constructed Pelagian machinery for man to earn his way to blessing. Adam rendered himself incapable of operating that machinery when he sinned. But now God sends his Son into the world as One who can work the machinery flawlessly. In other words, Jesus is the successful Pelagian, the One Guy in the history of the world who succeeded in pulling off the works righteous plan.”\textsuperscript{255}

Lusk’s quarrel here is not with Pelagianism but with classic Augustinianism. It was Augustine who taught that man before the Fall was able to sin and able not to sin. Pelagius’s error was that he taught that man after the Fall continued to possess the ability not to sin and that Adam’s fall, while a bad example, did not plunge the race into sin. Augustine, on the other hand, taught that only a work of saving grace could enable fallen man, who had been rendered not able not to sin, to regain his ability not to sin (and that imperfectly until glorification). The four-fold state of man—as created, as fallen, as redeemed, as glorified—is common among the Reformed and is part of our confession (WCF 9.2-5). It is little short of bizarre to seek to turn the tables in this fashion and to accuse an Augustinianism that affirms Adam’s ability before the Fall, but not ours as fallen and unredeemed, with being Pelagian. If it is not Pelagianism to teach that Adam before the Fall enjoyed moral and natural ability to keep the law, even less is it Pelagianism to teach that the Redeemer, God and man in one person, had full ability in his own proper person perfectly to keep the law for us and to please his Father for us (hence the purpose of the Incarnation; to please God for us who had failed to do so in Adam and our own lives).

Another question associated with the person and work of Christ is that of the necessity for the Incarnation. Jordan argues that the Incarnation is necessary apart from the Fall.\textsuperscript{256} He contends that the “Son would have come into the world to bring humanity to glory” (186), apart from sin and the Fall. By such an assertion, Jordan rejects the notion

\textsuperscript{253} Lusk, “Response,” in Knox Colloquium, 139-40.

\textsuperscript{254} Lusk, “Response,” in Knox Colloquium, 137.

that a successful probation on Adam’s part would have brought humanity to glory. He gives no clear exegetical warrant for this conclusion nor for the conclusion that the Incarnation was necessary for the defeat of Satan, particularly given that neither Satan nor his angels are to be redeemed. Why an Incarnation is needed to defeat Satan is never made clear and the real purpose, then, of the Incarnation—to do what Adam and we did not do by perfect law-keeping and to undo what we did by propitiation and expiation and thus reconcile God to us—seems missed or distinctively downplayed.

The FV failure to see a proper law/gospel distinction, as we have argued, is that its proponents fail to see that law is native to every one created in the image of God. This has marked consequences not only for anthropology but also for Christology and soteriology. Created as we were in covenant with God and being marked in the core of our being with that relationship, we are at heart legal. This legal nature of man is reflected in every religion in the world, all of which can be reduced to ethics and the concern of what we must do to be in harmony with whatever ultimate reality there is. Christianity is at its heart different. It is not about what we must do. It is about what God has done for us in Christ and this is the gospel. Christianity is about the person and work of Christ, about the one who is fully God and fully man and by whose active and passive obedience we are saved. This is to say that while the law is, in its works, written on every heart, the gospel, the good news that God in Christ has done for us what we could never do for ourselves, is extrinsic to us. The gospel is an announcement of good news outside of us that there is now therefore no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus. Schlissel says that the question is not “What must I do to be saved?” but “What does God require?”257 What does God require? Perfect obedience. But I am a sinner. What must I do to be saved? The question “What must I do to be saved?” is the natural gospel follow-up to anyone who understands the answer to “What does God require?” given that we are afflicted as we are with moral inability and must therefore “be saved.”

I. The Holy Spirit and the Application of Redemption

Moving to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, we see that the FV has problems with justification itself, some of them along the lines of NPP: justification is a matter of covenant identification and, in the New Covenant, Paul is concerned with Gentile inclusion and that they need not become Jews to be in the covenant in the New Era.258

Perhaps it will be helpful at this juncture, in terms of the Committee’s primary task, to re-focus on the significance of the Protestant doctrine of justification. The doctrine of justification by faith alone has, since the time of the Reformation, been considered to be at the heart of evangelical soteriology. Luther referred to it as “the article upon which the church stands or falls”259 and Calvin said that it was “the main hinge on which religion


turns.” Any recasting of this doctrine, then, from the form developed by the Protestant Reformers and the 16th and 17th century creeds that the Reformation spawned must be viewed warily given the great care and precision that went into the careful crafting of this doctrine. The doctrine was particularly defined over against late medieval theology in which it was popularly taught that “God will not deny his grace to him who does his best.” When Rome enunciated its doctrine of justification at the Council of Trent, further Protestant definition was seen to be necessary to serve as an antidote to Tridentine teaching. And that further definition is developed particularly in the Westminster Standards, which, it should be noted, reflects not only a commitment to refute Trent but also to refute the antinomianism that the Divines perceived as threatening the church in the 1640s. Thus Westminster produced a remarkably balanced statement on justification that argued against the works-righteousness of Rome on the one hand and the antinomianism of hyper-Calvinism on the other hand.


261 See McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 83-91, for a helpful treatment of the axiom “facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam.” See also Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (1983; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 131-145, in which he sets forth that the doctrine of the *facere quod in se est* is part of the “proper disposition for justification.” It was this notion of “doing one’s best” or “doing what one could” that drove Martin Luther to discover that the righteousness that God required could not come from “doing one’s best,” but was freely given as a gift, received by faith alone.

262 *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume Two: Trent to Vatican II*, ed. by Norman P. Tanner (London and Washington, DC: Sheed & Ward Ltd and Georgetown UP, 1990), 671681. Trent produced sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons on justification at Session Six of its meeting (1547). Before this, no ecumenical council had authoritatively defined the doctrine of justification. This is significant to note, because it means that the Reformers defined justification as they did in the absence of a full and clear conciliar definition, Trent coming in response to the Reformers, as part of the counter-Reformation. Trent’s teaching remains, to this day, the definitive teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on justification, essentially untouched by the two subsequent councils of the Roman Catholic Church, Vatican I (1869-1870) and Vatican II (1962-1965).

263 Certainly the Belgic Confession (1561), the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) and a host of other Reformed Confessions and Creeds in the 16th and 17th centuries addressed Rome’s false teaching about justification. One might argue, however, that the Westminster Standards (WCF, WLC, WSC and other ecclesiastical documents), composed as they were over the course of several years in the mid-1640s, represent the “high water mark” of Reformed confessionalism.

In addressing justification more directly now, we will examine Federal Vision differences with the classic Reformed formulation of the doctrine. In so doing, it may be helpful to focus on several of the parts that constitute the doctrine of justification—righteousness, imputation, the nature of justification and Gentile-inclusion, the nature and definition of faith, and assurance and perseverance—and by such a survey see the ways in which some of the supporters of the Federal Vision tend to depart from the Federal theology of the Westminster Standards.

1. Righteousness

As noted in the previous section of this report critiquing the NPP (see above III.D) and in the General Introduction (see above I.D.3), the concept of righteousness is key to the doctrine of justification. How one defines righteousness is clearly important for Westminster’s doctrine of justification: “those whom God effectually called, He also freely justifieth: not by infusing righteousness into them …, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith…” (WCF II.1; emphases added). Westminster teaches that the righteousness that is imputed to us for our justification consists of “the obedience and satisfaction of Christ”: this is what constitutes “His righteousness” that we receive by faith. This righteousness has also earlier, at WCF 8.5, been described, in slightly more expansive phraseology, as “His perfect obedience, and sacrifice of Himself…” It is this “perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself” by which He has “fully satisfied the justice of His Father” (WCF 5.8). Westminster, then, sees the establishment of righteousness as that by which justice is satisfied. Adam, before the Fall, would have been confirmed in such righteousness had he continued in “perfect and personal obedience” (WCF 7.2). Given the first Adam’s Fall, it is the second Adam, Christ, who must establish righteousness by undoing what the first Adam did (by dying for our sins) and by doing what the first Adam failed to do (by perfectly obeying God’s law for us). Thus, for Westminster, righteousness entails the satisfaction of justice by the perfect fulfillment of the law. We have argued this above and briefly reiterate it here.

Some FV proponents define righteousness differently from the Westminster Standards, as seen below. Righteousness, as it pertains to God, according to the FV, is not simply the satisfaction of his justice but rather is His covenantal faithfulness, his loyalty to His covenant people. Leithart approves of this shift in emphasis, noting, if the view that “‘righteousness’ (Heb. zedeq or zedaqah; Gk. dikaiosune) is a covenant term, describing loyalty within a covenanted relationship…, then ‘righteousness’ and ‘justification’ have a much wider scope of application than the strictly judicial, but pertain to a whole range of covenant-relational settings.” Leithart acknowledges that Mark A. Seifrid has recently argued against this covenantal view, rightly noting that God’s covenantal faithfulness to Israel is “only one manifestation of the saving righteousness which he exercises as ruler of all.”

---

265 See Sections B (Perfect Obedience to the Law) and D (The Perfect Obedience of Christ) in the General Introduction.


ing of righteousness as much in relational terms as forensically. It should be noted that Leithart does not deny the forensic aspect of justification but sees that aspect as one of many.268 Thus his position departs from that of the Westminster Standards, which views justification in exclusively forensic terms.269

Even as righteousness means that God is covenantally faithful to his people, in the conception of some FV thinkers, so covenantal faithfulness is also what defines righteousness for man. From creation, God manifested this covenantal faithfulness to Adam and called on him to walk in covenantal faithfulness. Given this schema, one might think, then, that since God is perfect, covenantal faithfulness entails perfection. In other words, it has been commonly assumed that the law, as the standard revealing God’s perfect character, demands perfection and it is such perfection that is foundational to righteousness.270 Not so, asserts Rich Lusk, who sees the law not as the eternal righteous standard of God but as a purely post-lapsarian phenomenon: “the law did not require perfect obedience. It was designed for sinners, not unfallen creatures. Thus the basic requirement of the law was covenant loyalty and trust, not sinless perfection.”271 (It is worth re-visiting aspects of Lusk’s position, already examined above under the rubric of anthropology, in this context.) One wonders if this means that had Adam maintained covenant loyalty and trust, though not sinless perfection (whatever that means and however it might have been done), he would not have fallen.

According to the WCF, “God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which He bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience” (19.1).272 Clearly, this is an attestation, contra Lusk, that the law did require sinless perfection. If one demurs that the law that Lusk has in view is that given at Sinai and not that law that God gave to Adam in Eden, the WCF, at 19.2, links the law that God gave to Adam in paradise with the “perfect rule of righteousness” that was “delivered by God upon Mount Sinai, in ten commandments, and written in two tables.” The law is an integral whole—that given in Eden being of a piece with that delivered at Sinai—and the WCF is very clear that it demanded perfection of Adam and has always demanded such of his


269 See Section A.1 (The Forensic Character of Justification) in the General Introduction.

270 See B.2 (The Character of God’s Justice) in the General Introduction.

271 Lusk, “Response,” in Knox Colloquium, 128. This assertion flies in the face of a number of statements in the Westminster Standards, not the least among them being WLC 99, which, in its rules to be observed for the right understanding of the Ten Commandments, lists this first: “That the law is perfect, and bindeth everyone to full conformity in the whole man unto the righteousness thereof, and unto entire obedience forever; so as to require the utmost perfection of every duty, and to forbid the least degree of every sin.” Such was the requirement before the Fall and it continues to be the requirement after the Fall, contra Lusk. See also B.4 (The Post-Lapsarian demand for Perfect Obedience) in the General Introduction.

272 See B.3 (The Adamic Covenant of Works) in the General Introduction.
progeny. It is this perfection, our Confession is quite clear, that is constitutive of righteousness in God and man.273

God is righteous because he always acts in accord with his own perfect law. Man was righteous when he walked in such perfection in his estate of innocence (WCF 4.2) and is now by trusting in Christ alone.274 If such perfection did not unfailingly characterize God and would always be required of man, the justification of the ungodly would pose no challenge (God could simply do it out of thin air; He could forgive because He is God and chooses to do so). There would be, in other words, no necessity for God to be just and justifier (Rom 3-4). But there is and it is clear in Scripture that if God justifies the ungodly He must do so in a way consistent with his own righteousness (Rom 5).

Given Leithart’s definition of the righteousness of God as covenantal-relational loyalty and Lusk’s definition of man’s righteousness as “covenant loyalty and trust, not sinless perfection,” many questions come to mind. Is righteousness an essential property of God so that He would still be righteous whether or not He determined to create and whether or not He determined to save some of those whom He created? While God’s covenantal faithfulness to His people may, arguably, be a demonstration of His righteousness, is it the most basic component of righteousness, more so than moral, legal perfection? Why should the definition of righteousness be so limited? Is not God demonstrating righteousness in the condemnation of the reprobate and not simply in the salvation of the elect? To define righteousness as thinly as do some FV proponents—in relational terms—cannot be sustained by our Standards and leaves a host of important questions unanswered by the FV project that are answered within and by the Reformed tradition.

If the assertion is made, as it sometimes is, that the relational is as important, if not more so, than the forensic, then the FV constructs but a mere straw man, certainly in a church that adheres to the WCF. The relational is not dispensed with at the expense of the forensic in our standards. Rather, the relational and the forensic are inseparable; the latter (justification) is an aspect of or manifestation of the former (union with Christ, WLC 69)—a commonplace observation among the Reformed. If some of the adherents of the Westminster Standards ignore the relational and stress only the forensic, the cure for such imbalance or neglect is pastoral and not theological. Here is a major problem with the whole FV program: its proponents routinely seek a theological fix for problems that ought to be addressed pastorally. FV proponents see many genuine problems among God’s people. It seems to be thought that the problems must reflect shortcomings in Reformed theology when in fact they reflect shortcomings in Reformed practice. There’s nothing wrong with our theology except that we fail to live up to it: our Standards are not deficient; rather, our deportment is and we fail to be who we truly are in Christ. The solution to lives that are not what they should be is not theological re-formulation, as FV propo-

273 See B.5 (Merit and Perfect Obedience) in the General Introduction.

274 Heidelberg Catechism 60 is quite clear in answering the question, “How are you righteous before God? A. Only by a true faith in Jesus Christ; that is, though my conscience accuse me that I have grievously sinned against all the commandments of God and kept none of them, and am still inclined to all evil, yet God, without any merit of mine, of mere grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ, as if I have never committed any sin and myself had accomplished all the obedience which Christ has rendered for me [a strikingly clear affirmation of the imputation of Christ’s active obedience]; if only I accept such a benefit with a believing heart.”
ments would claim, but faithful living within an already well-developed theological system that is the best expression of Scripture that we have, by God’s guidance and grace, developed thus far.

2. Imputation

The Westminster Confession teaches that God is righteous, requires us to be righteous, condemns fallen Adam and his offspring for unrighteousness, establishes righteousness by Christ’s work, and regards us as righteous because of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. Imputation addresses the theological problem of how the righteousness earned by Christ for us becomes ours. It is important at this point to note that Christ does merit and earn righteousness for us (cf. WLC 55), a point that is denied by several FV men who argue that Christ did not need to earn His Father’s favor, a point more fully developed above under Christology. Since Adam and we with him have demerited God’s favor by our sin, we need Christ acting for us to merit his favor.

Our Confession teaches clearly that, in justification, the righteousness that Christ merited for us becomes ours through imputation. WCF 11.1 employs the explicit language of “imputation” but also uses it interchangeably with “accounting and accepting”: “He also freely justifieth …by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous…, by imputing the obedience and satisfaction, of Christ unto them.” A number of proof texts are given here, most notably from Rom 4:5-8, 2 Cor 5:19, 21, and Rom 5:17-19. It is made clear in this first section of WCF 11 that righteousness in justification is imputed, not infused, and that what is imputed is Christ’s obedience and satisfaction not “faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness…”

The concept of imputation is also addressed in WCF 11.3, supported by some of the same proof texts (immediately above): “Christ by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to His Father’s justice in their behalf. Yet inasmuch as He was given by the Father for them; and His obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead; and both freely, not for anything in them; their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice, and the rich grace of God, might be glorified in the justification of sinners.” This is another way of saying that the sins of the elect were imputed to Christ and that Christ’s righteousness was imputed to the elect, the guilt of our first parents’ first sin being imputed to all mankind descending from them by ordinary generation (WCF 6:3). This is the three-fold imputation taught by our Standards and classic Reformed theology. As noted in the General Introduction, the imputation of Christ’s active obedience in justification, as a part of this three-fold imputation, is a key component of the classic Reformed understanding of imputation.

The imputation of the active obedience of Christ to us for our justification is denied, however, by teaching associated with or influencing the FV. Shepherd, for example, teaches that only the passive obedience of Christ is in view and is imputed in justification, and that the active obedience of Christ is not imputed to us for our justification. He claims support for this view in both the Heidelberg Catechism and its primary author,

---

275 See E (The Imputation of Christ’s Obedience to Believers) in the General Introduction.


277 See D (The Perfect Obedience of Christ) in the General Introduction.
In fact, the Heidelberg Catechism, as well as the Belgic Confession, clearly affirms the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in justification. For our purposes here, however, it is the Westminster Standards that are our confessional concern. Regarding the Standards, Shepherd alleges “even the Westminster Confession as late as 1647 was written as a compromise document to accommodate the views of three prominent members of the Westminster Assembly (William Twisse [Prolocutor of the Assembly], Thomas Gataker, and Richard Vines) who did not subscribe to the imputation of active obedience.”

This assertion that the Westminster Assembly “accommodated the views” of those who “did not subscribe to the imputation of active obedience” is an unsurprising claim, based particularly on earlier works. William Barker, for instance, has argued that certain “figures …succeeded in getting the term ‘whole obedience’ removed from the phrase ‘imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them’ in Chapter 11 of the Westminster Confession,” all sides agreeing that “whole obedience” in that context meant both the active and passive obedience of Christ. Barker’s account, however, conflates two entirely separate events: the debate over “whole obedience” in 1643 was decided in favor of adding “whole obedience” as part of a revision of Article 11 (on justification) in the Thirty-Nine Articles. The debate over Chapter 11 of the WCF took place three years later.

---

278 Norman Shepherd, “Justification by Works in Reformed Theology,” in BOTB, 103-111.

279 The imputation of the active obedience of Christ in our justification is, if anything, arguably clearer at points in the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession than in the Westminster Standards. See HC 59-64 as well as BC 22 and 23. Note especially BC 22, which says: “Jesus Christ, imputing to us all His merits, and so many holy works which He has done for us and in our stead, is our righteousness.”


282 Barker, Puritan Profiles, 176.

283 The Westminster Assembly of Divines, it should be remembered, first met on 6 July 1643, called by the English Parliament to revise the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. The Assembly began immediate work on the articles and by October 1643 had worked on fifteen of the Thirty-Nine Articles, including Article 11 on justification. With the ratification of the Solemn League and Covenant between England and Scotland, however, work in October 1643 was suspended on the articles of religion and the work of the Assembly was redirected to the preparation of common forms for the government, discipline, and worship of the church, together with a completely new confession that would be thereafter known as the Westminster Confession of Faith (Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993], 862-865).
later, perhaps without some of the earlier disputants, and apparently did not revisit all the earlier debates about active obedience.\textsuperscript{284}

Perhaps a brief excursus on the justification debates in the Westminster Assembly of Divines is in order at this point. The original debate, in September 1643, in which Twisse was the proluctor and Vines and Gataker, among others, argued, heatedly at times, over whether the active obedience of Christ, as well as the passive, was imputed to us in our justification, focused on whether the word “whole” should be added to modify “obedience” in the article defining justification.\textsuperscript{285} Several eminent divines, most notably Gataker, believed that the addition of the word “whole” would require the affirmation of the imputation of Christ’s active obedience in justification, an affirmation that, for various and differing reasons, several of the divines were unwilling to make. The reasons that Gataker and a handful of other divines opposed “whole” modifying “obedience,” while fascinating and worthy of examination in their own right, are not germane to our task here. What is important to note is that proponents of adding the word “whole” recognized that opponents of adding it opposed it as they did because they opposed affirming that Christ’s active obedience is imputed to us in our justification. When the vote finally came on September 11, 1643, after days of intensive debate, the revised article, with the addition of “whole,” was adopted with only three or four dissenting.\textsuperscript{286} This means that the Divines, when the active obedience of Christ was being hotly debated, adopted a phrase that all concerned agreed was a positive affirmation of the active obedience of Christ being imputed in justification. It is crucial to recognize that the only time, as far as we know, that there

\textsuperscript{284} Twisse, having been ill and missed many sessions, died between Session 676 (July 17, 1646) and 677 (July 22, 1646). It was in Session 678, on July 23, 1646, that “report was made by Mr. Arrowsmith ‘of Justification and Adoption.’ The Report was debated, and upon debate agreed to; and it is as followeth [in our current WCF, Chapters 11-12]” (Mitchell and Struthers, Minutes, 258-59). Thus Twisse was not present at the debate, and it is unclear what role Gataker played, whose health “after the first two years of the Assembly … forced him to curtail his activities” (Barker, Puritan Profiles, 159).

\textsuperscript{285} The original Article 11 was as follows: “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.” The proposed revision that occasioned all the debate about the addition of the word “whole” to modify obedience was as follows: “We are justified, that is, we are accounted righteous before God, and have remission of sins, not for nor by our own works or deservings, but freely by his grace, only for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ’s sake, his whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed unto us, and Christ with his righteousness, being apprehended and rested on by faith only, is an wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort: notwithstanding God doth not forgive them that are impenitent, and go on still in their trespasses,” both the original and revised texts given in van Dixhoorn’s “Reforming the Reformation,” 270 and 320, respectively.

\textsuperscript{286} Van Dixhoorn’s entire Chapter 5 in “Reforming the Reformation,” together with his publishing (as part of the seven volumes of his dissertation) the hitherto unpublished Assembly Minutes relevant to the Sept. 1643 justification debate, is indispensable for this matter. See in re: the Assembly Minutes for this (Van Dixhoorn, “Reforming the Reformation,” 320).
was a debate in the Westminster Assembly of Divines directly focused on the question of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in justification, the Assembly determined positively to affirm the active obedience by the addition of the word “whole” to the revision of Article 11 of the Thirty-Nine Articles.287

One might rightly wonder what happened to the debate over requiring an affirmation of the active obedience of Christ as being imputed in justification because, as far as the Assembly’s records are concerned, the dispute drops out of view. Does this mean that the Assembly did require the affirmation of the active obedience of Christ and then reversed that position, that what the Assembly required in 1643 it dropped as a requirement in 1646? If so, what would account for this?288 There is a good deal of speculation as to why

287 The other citations in the Assembly Minutes, which includes every reference at the Westminster Assembly to the doctrine of justification, are located in Van Dixhoorn’s “Reforming the Reformation,” 324, nn. 234-235 which read as follows: “2 Dec. 1645; 23 July 1646; and 4 Feb. 1647 (Minutes 3:113r, 281v or 166v, 303v or 195v). For the debates on the text of the chapters, see 3, 8-11, 16 Dec 1645; for the scriptures see, 10, 11 Feb. 1647 (Minutes 3:113r-115r, 123v-124r).” There is no record for any of these dates, when checked in the Minutes concerning the Confession of Faith and catechisms, of any debate on justification, not to mention active obedience, comparable to that held in September 1643 when the Assembly voted to affirm active obedience by retaining the language of “whole obedience.”

288 It is Mitchell’s opinion that, though “far the major part [of the Westminster Assembly] voted for the affirmative, that Christ’s whole obedience was imputed to the believer,” Daniel Featley, a major advocate for affirming the whole obedience, yielded to the dissenters because the question of active obedience was new and not disputed in previous centuries; “probably,” Mitchell continues, “it was on this account [of several factors, including the newer nature of the question] that when the Assembly came to the treat of the subject of Justification in their Confession of Faith [in Chapter 11] they left out the word “whole to which Gataker and his friends had most persistently objected…so that the dissenters were content to accept Chapter 11 as less rigid than the earlier revised Article 11. Mitchell cites Simon Ashe’s funeral sermon for Gataker as maintaining that Gataker and his friends agreed to drop further controversy on the matter having been conceded” (Westminster Assembly: Its History and Standards, 155-56). Van Dixhoorn (“Reforming the Reformation,” 324-330) tends also to read all the evidence, on balance, as indicating that the Assembly ultimately adopted a consensual position (that would accommodate those scrupling at affirming active obedience), though he cites possibly counter-indicatory evidence as well, such as how the Ashe’s funeral sermon for Gataker is to be interpreted, 329: “Other comment on the conclusion of the debate is provided by Simeon Ashe, where he cites Gataker’s silence at the end of the debate as an example of his peace-loving spirit. Ashe also brings up Gataker’s “resolutions” not to publish his discourses on Romans 3:28, “that he might not publikely discover his dissent from the Votes of that Reverend Assembly.” The clear implication is that the Assembly codified a doctrine of justification with which Gataker could not agree. Unfortunately Ashe and Gataker do not say if he is referring to Gataker’s silent opposition to votes on the eleventh article (which would tell us nothing new) or votes on the eleventh chapter of the Confession, which would suggest that Gataker understood the Assembly’s final text, even with its increased ambiguity, to be teaching a view opposite to his own. Gataker’s own comment on the matter is also ambiguous: he states that Twisse and “one of the Independent partie” agreed with his views, but the majority of the Assembly did not.
the Assembly appeared not to press the issue in 1646 and did not include the word “whole” before “obedience” in 11.1. But it must be remembered that, in 1643, the revised Article 11 had to carry the burden of everything that was then proposed to be said about the doctrine of justification. In 1646, the Divines were afforded far greater luxury than when they were restricted to revising the Thirty-Nine Articles. They enjoyed the entirety of not only Chapter 11 in the newly-minted Confession but significant room in the Catechisms to express more fully their doctrine of justification. It is the contention of this Committee that the Confession and Catechisms, taken together as a whole, positively teach the active obedience of Christ. Any argument that the Westminster Assembly of Divines cast its teaching on justification to allow room for those who would deny the imputation of Christ’s active obedience is, at best, speculative, and does not comport, we would contend, with the tenor of the Standards as a whole or the church’s understanding of its Standards in subsequent years.

It is the case that what is at issue here is not only the original intent of the Westminster Divines, but also the animus imponentis of the church. While it may properly be argued that the doctrine of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in justification was a newer concept in the 1640s, particularly as to explicit development of the doctrine, such is no longer true. Since the time of the Assembly, the leading theologians of the Reformed and Presbyterian churches have developed the doctrine of the imputation of Christ’s active obedience and this has shaped the way that the church has read the Westminster Standards. Thus the

---

289 “Some divines, even some advocates of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ, felt the language of whole obedience was itself ambiguous. Featley initially urged that the Assembly use the language of the imputation of the ‘perfect satisfaction and righteousness of Christ’ (Van Dixhoorn, “Reforming the Reformation,” 328). The language of WCF 8:5 and 11:1-3 is in these very terms, 11:3 speaking even more fully about a ‘proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father’s justice in their behalf’ and distinguishing between Christ’s ‘obedience and satisfaction,’ with the word “both.” It is hard to see how this is any less than Featley, one of the stalwart defenders of active obedience, would have wanted.

290 VanDixhoorn has noted that “perhaps the strongest evidence of favour of reading the Assembly’s Confession in a consensual fashion, is the fact that when the Independents revised and then reissued the Assembly’s Confession of faith in 1658, they inserted the language of the ‘active and passive obedience’ of Christ into their version of the Confession” (p. 330). For the full text of the 1658 Savoy Declaration, see Jaroslav Pelikan, Creeds and Confessions of the Christian Faith, vol. 3 (New Haven: Yale UP, 2004), 104-35. The addition made to the Savoy Declaration in its chapter 11 is arguably stronger than what was adopted by the Westminster Assembly. There is, however, no clear evidence that Savoy’s addition was anything other than a clarification of what Westminster intended. That this addition represents a significant one to Westminster must not be simply assumed but needs to be demonstrated from primary sources. It is noteworthy that Philip Schaff did not regard Savoy’s addition to WCF 11 as one worth mentioning in the changes that Savoy made to the WCF (Schaff, Creeds, 3.718).

291 See sections B and D in the General Introduction, particularly D.3, “The Active Obedience of Christ.”
mus of the church, shaped by Turretin, Hodge, etc., has come decidedly to embrace active obedience and to read the Confession as explicitly affirming such.

Rich Lusk writes, in marked contrast to the Westminster Confession, “This justification requires no transfer or imputation of anything. It does not force us to reify ‘righteousness’ into something that can be shuffled around in heavenly accounting books. Rather, because I am in the Righteous One and the Vindicated One, I am righteous and vindicated. My in-Christ-ness makes imputation redundant. I do not need the moral content of his life of righteousness transferred to me; what I need is a share in the forensic verdict passed over him at the resurrection. Union with Christ is therefore the key.” The WCF certainly recognizes the significance of union with Christ, both explicitly (cf. WLC 66 and 69) and also under various rubrics (cf. WCF 25.1; 28.1; 29.1). But neither our Standards, nor a host of Reformed theologians who also clearly affirm the importance of union with Christ, have taught that such union swallows up every other theological consideration and solves every theological problem. We need to be reckoned or accounted (λογιζοµαι) as righteous in God’s sight and imputation is the way that we as a confession-al church understand the Scriptures to speak of that transfer of righteousness (cf. WLC 71).

3. The meaning of justification and Gentile inclusion

To this point we have seen something of the importance of understanding righteousness and its imputation to us if we are properly to understand what we as a church believe about justification. Perhaps it would be most helpful at this point to focus on what Westminster teaches justification to be over against FV promoters who teach that justification is primarily about the inclusion of the Gentiles (cf. WLC 70). Schlissel sees Paul’s teaching about justification in that light, writing approvingly of an author, “As noted by another, ‘For Paul, justification tells us how God accepts Gentiles.’ . . . Justification for him [Paul] had less to do with a guilty conscience than with the new age inaugurated with Jesus.” But justification, according to our Standards, has everything to do with a guilty conscience, both for the Jews under the Old Covenant and the Jews and Gentiles under the new, all of whom are sinners needing to be declared righteous in the sight of a holy God.

That the new covenant means at least that Gentiles can now come in as could Jews of old, and that without the requirements of the ceremonial law, is inarguable, according to our Confession (WCF 7.6). The real question is the meaning and significance of the justification of any sinner, Jew or Gentile. To reduce this vital doctrine to Gentile inclusion is to impoverish the richness of justification in both testaments.

Schlissel argues further, “It is not grace that is new in the New Testament. It is not faith that is new in the New Testament. It is not justification that is new in the New Testament.

---

292 See the discussions on Original Intent and Animus Imponentis in the “Report of the Committee to Study the Views of Creation,” Minutes of the 71st GA (2004), 257-266, applying to this doctrine what was there applied to creation views.

293 Lusk, “Response,” in Knox Colloquium, 142.
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Testament. What is new is that Gentiles are fully incorporated into Israel by faith alone...”

What confessionalists have asserted that grace, faith, and justification are not found in the Old Testament? Our confession clearly teaches that, though the covenant of grace “was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the gospel,” that “there are not therefore two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same, under various dispensations” (WCF 7.5-6). And with specific regard to this question as it involves justification, the Confession teaches that “the justification of believers under the Old Testament was, in all these respects, one and the same with the justification of believers under the New Testament.”

Thus Schlissel’s affirmation that faith, grace, and justification are not new in the New Testament are points taught by the Confession and not in contention among those who are confessional. What is in contention is what it means that God justifies the ungodly in either testament, whether Jew or Gentile. If justification is not about a guilty conscience in both testaments, what is it about? Schlissel asserts that “the inclusion of the Gentiles is not an, ‘oh yeah, that’s also important’ issue. It is THE issue occupying administrative center stage in the New Testament Scriptures.” This begs the question, however, of the way in which any sinner is made right with a Holy God, i.e., entirely by grace. Both Testaments, to be sure, teach salvation by grace alone through faith alone: the New Testament, though, teaches this with an explicitness that is not possible for the Old Testament, inasmuch as the New explicates the person and work of Christ in fulfillment. To teach that the New Testament is about Gentile inclusion more that the fulfillment of the glorious gospel of grace is quite misguided.

WCF 7.6 makes it clear that “under the gospel [as opposed to the time when the covenant of grace was administered “in the time of the law,” WCF 7.5]…Christ, the substance …is held forth [in the fewer, simpler, less outward glory means of grace] in more fullness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy…” To be sure, Christ is held forth under the gospel “to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles.” But clearly the difference is not only extensive (all nations) but intensive (more fullness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy) for all in a way that the Jews of the Old Covenant never experienced. For further confessional contrast than simply Gentile inclusion, see also WCF 20:1, which enumerates a number of blessings common to believers under the gospel and the law (to use its terms), noting the greater blessing under the gospel: “But, under the New Testament, the liberty of Christians is further enlarged, in their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial law, to which the Jewish church was subjected; and in greater boldness of access to the throne of grace, and in fuller communications of the free Spirit of God, than believers under the law did ordinarily partake of.”

Additionally, since it also falls properly under our consideration of the question of imputation, it is important to note that Norman Shepherd’s definition of justification is deficient and one-sided. In defining justification, the Reformed churches include the imputation of Christ’s active obedience, as well as his passive obedience (the forgiveness of sins). Shepherd, however, denies the imputation of active obedience and asserts repeat-


edly only that “Justification is the forgiveness of sins.” In contrast, the Reformers and the confessions of the Reformation seem zealous to affirm the imputation of active obedience.

The Westminster Standards make it clear that the concern of justification is the forensic: A holy and righteous God, who is of purer eyes than to look upon sin, declaring sinners to be righteous in His eyes on the basis of Christ’s righteousness imputed to them (their sins having been imputed to Christ) and received by faith alone (cf. WLC 70-73). This is what justification has meant in both testaments, with Old Testament believers experiencing this in shadowy form and New Testament believers enjoying the full revelation of such in the person and work of Christ. The Reformers were concerned that this be understood, over against medieval misunderstanding, that failed clearly to distinguish between justification and sanctification and that codified this confusion at Trent in its teaching about justification. This is why Leithart is misguided when he writes, “the Protestant doctrine has been too rigid separating justification and sanctification.” Classic Protestantism, especially the Reformed tradition, has not separated them, if by that one means rent them asunder so that one could be justified without subsequently being sanctified. But Protestantism has distinguished them and if there is anything for which Protestantism may be faulted, it is not its careful distinction of justification and sanctification. Rather, this is its genius and its glory (cf. WLC 77 on the distinctions between justification and sanctification).

4. The nature and definition of faith

We have seen that justification involves the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, received by faith alone. How one defines faith and what it means to affirm that faith alone is the instrument of our justification was of the utmost importance to the Reformers (cf. WLC 72-73). It is the case, as can be seen below, that some FV proponents clearly depart from the Reformed tradition in its understanding of the nature and definition of faith. FV promoters tend to merge faith (our resting and trusting in Christ) and faithfulness (our obedient response to the gospel that entails good works). To do this leads to the confusion of justification and sanctification. Faith, as it pertains to justification, as to its saving office, is extraspective, looking away from all that we are and do and have to Christ and Him alone. This faith is indeed never alone, being ever accompanied with all other saving graces (WCF 11.2; 14.2). But it must be distinguished from those other graces so that it is clear that our reliance for pardon and being declared righteous is on nothing other than the blood and righteousness of Christ. i.e., his obedience and sacrifice (WLC 73).

In speaking of justifying faith, Norman Shepherd stresses its active character, that “justifying faith is not only a penitent faith but also an obedient faith” and that faith “entails…obedience to God’s Word.” Scripture does describe justifying faith as “faith
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298 Shepherd, “Justification by Faith,” in BOTB, p. 87. Shepherd does affirm the imputation of passive obedience in the article, “Justification by Works in Reformed Theology,” in BOTB, 111, though it does not have a prominent place in his own definition of justification.
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working through love” (Gal 5:6). But as noted previously, the faith that justifies, while always accompanied by other graces (including good works), does not justify because of any of these things “which do always accompany it…but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness” (WLC 73). This biblical emphasis on faith justifying not because of all that accompanies it but only as the instrument by which we receive and apply Christ and his righteousness is an emphasis missing in Shepherd’s work. Rather, he so’emphasizes that justifying faith includes the accompanying graces of which the Catechism speaks (including the believer’s good works), that he is unclear that and how faith is the sole instrument in justification to the exclusion of all that accompanies it.

To assert, as does our Confession (WCF 11.2), that “faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification…” is to distinguish such faith from all that accompanies it. There would be no point of arguing that “faith …is the alone instrument of justification” if the act of saving faith itself was to be identified with obedience and good works. One often hears and reads “trust and obey” used by FV proponents as if they were indistinguishable. Reformed theology affirms that all who trust will obey but challenges both a priority and an exclusive instrumentality for faith, because it is our believing (“receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness”) that effectuates our justification and not the obedience and good works that flow from such. Our works play no role whatsoever in our justification, although they are evidences of it.

Schlissel criticizes a 19th century Lutheran theologian who wrote that “to equate faith with obedience …is to confuse and mix law and gospel. If faith is turned into obedience, then the gospel has been turned into a new law …and Christ has become a new Moses” Schlissel exclaims, “Of course Christ has become a new Moses! That is rather the point of the New Testament.” Given that justification in Schlissel’s schema is reduced to Gentile inclusion, this means that what Moses brought to the Israelites, Christ now brings to the nations. One would wonder whether Schlissel understands either. He claims that salvation has always been by faithful obedience whereas the historic Reformed claim is that salvation, after Adam’s fall, is by Christ’s faithful obedience which we receive by faith alone and to which we add nothing.

The historic Reformed faith, in fact, as embodied in the Westminster Standards, has never taught that the most significant divide is between the Old and New Testaments but between the pre-fall and post-fall worlds. And here is where the real divide comes in between the Westminster position and that of the FV: some of the proponents of the FV flatten out the differences between the pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian worlds and argue that the “faithfulness—or, faith-filled obedience—[that] was the basic requirement for Adam” is still the same for us, “After the fall, of course, the same posture of faith is
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required…. [F]aith is still faith.”

While it is quite proper to argue within confessional orthodoxy that God was kind and benevolent in his dealing with Adam before the Fall, what God required of Adam for him to inherit eternal life and to enter eschatological glory was indeed, as Lusk argues, “obedience,” even faith-filled obedience if by that is meant simply an obedience arising out of trusting. What is now required by faith is something quite different. Faith after the Fall involves the recognition that one cannot obey of his own power and must rest and trust in another to do for him what he could never do for himself.

5. Assurance and Perseverance

Historic Reformed theology has understood its doctrine of justification to entail a blessed sense of assurance on the part of believers and to guarantee their perseverance to the end. If faith is reconceived as faithfulness, or is thought to include such in its basic definition, as it is for many who promote the FV, then assurance, as conceived in the Scriptures and Westminster Standards, must also be re-cast. It is interesting that so many of the men who promote the FV do so explicitly with the expressed intention of addressing the problem of assurance.

The contention of these FV writers is that many Reformed and Presbyterian church members suffer from a lack of assurance that stems from morbidly introspective self-examination. The reason, say the FV men, that some Christians engage routinely in such unproductive self-examination is that their view of the faith is overly-subjective. The cure for such spiritual navel-gazing, according to FV partisans, is a healthy dose of covenantal objectivism in which baptism is said to regenerate, the Lord’s Supper to be given to all the baptized (apart from profession of faith), and election to be read through the covenant so as to avoid pesky dithering about whether one is or is not elect. If such covenantal objectivism could be properly understood and embraced, so goes the FV thinking, one would be pointed away from oneself to all the glorious objective truths and by such encouraged and assured.

Steve Wilkins seeks to ground assurance in the objective signs and seals of the covenant (baptism and the Lord’s Supper in the New Covenant) but in so doing undermines the possibility of assurance on the basis of which the Standards ground assurance. Wilkins taught at the 2003 Auburn Avenue Pastors’ Conference that “when we say … ‘look to your baptism,’ we’re talking about looking to Christ in the covenant, and realizing what you can know for certain. You cannot know if you were ever sincere. You cannot know if you really meant it when you asked Jesus into your heart and threw the pine cone into the fire. You can’t know those. Those questions are unanswerable. Were you really given a new heart? Well, you can’t answer that question. God knows. You don’t know. What you can know is that you have been baptized and you have the Lord’s Supper.”

If by “you can’t answer the question” and “you don’t know,” Wilkins means that we cannot chronologically pinpoint regeneration or even often the initial act of faith, then there are no objections. But what he seems to mean is that you cannot know whether these things have
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happened to you (subjectively) but can only look to the objective realities of the sacra-
ments. Our Confession says, quite clearly (WCF 18.1-2) that you can know that you have
“inward evidences” of faith, which taken together with the Word and Spirit constitute “in-
fallible assurance.”

To be sure, excessive introspection is unhealthy, if that is what Wilkins
seeks to warn against, and one ought to, as Horatius Bonar is said to have urged, take ten
looks at Christ for every look at oneself. But FV objectivism notwithstanding, unless it is
conceived that the sacraments are saving apart from faith (and not a single FV proponent
believes that), assurance will always be a problem when faith is redefined as faithfulness/
obedience, because every honest, sensitive soul will have questions about whether one has
been obedient enough. Looking at one’s own faithfulness (and wondering about one’s
future faithfulness) is not calculated to increase assurance.

According to the WCF, faith rests upon Christ and his work in justification,
particularly the righteousness of Christ. And, to go back further in the “golden chain,”
those who exercise saving faith are those who have been elected to such unconditionally
(WCF 3.5-6). Since the elect are, in time, effectually called and regenerated, they are also
justified, with faith, not faithfulness, as the alone instrument. Thus assurance that one is,
and will continue to be, justified and adopted as God’s child is available to all believers;
indeed, “a true believer may wait long and conflict with many difficulties before he be
partaker of [assurance]; yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely
given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of the ordinary
means, attain thereunto” (WCF 18.3). And such assurance is said to be “infallible,” found-
ed on the Scripture, the “inward evidence of those graces to which these promises are
made,” and the testimony of the Spirit with our spirits (WCF 18.2).

And assurance is tied in with justification, because, as demonstrated above,
justification is definitive. We do indeed await open acknowledgment and acquittal at the
last day (WLC 90), but we are as justified now as we ever will be. We are assured now that
we “can never fall from the state of justification” (WCF 11.5) and justification doth “free
all believers from the revenging wrath of God, and that perfectly in this life, that they never
fall into condemnation” (WLC 77; emphasis added: note that believers are secure here and
now, in this life).

The covenantal objectivism and high ecclesiology of the FV is unable to
yield the promised assurance because faithfulness/perseverance is uncertain and thus apost-
asy threatens us all.310 Perhaps it will suffice for now to note that the interpretive method
of FV often seems revealed in discussions of perseverance and covenant apostasy. The FV
claims in its covenant approach to have cut the Gordian knot of God’s sovereignty/human
responsibility by emphasizing our covenant faithfulness and not concerning ourselves with
God’s part, i.e., election, vis-à-vis Deut 29:29. But one may not permit covenant to swal-
low up election any more than one may allow election to nullify covenant. Both must be
held in biblical tension. Favoring one over the other is rationalism no matter how much
those who do may eschew such an assertion.

J. Ecclesiology.

Underlying all the preceding theological positions of FV that we have herein examined is a doctrine of the church in which ecclesiology threatens to swallow soteriology and a vibrant sacramentalism threatens to turn into sacerdotalism. Foundational to FV ecclesiology is a tendency in FV to deny the inner/outer aspects of the covenant along with the visible/invisible aspects of the church. These tendencies will need to be addressed elsewhere (and are more fully treated, e.g., in the forthcoming analysis of the FV by Guy Waters), especially since ecclesiology has assumed the all-consuming role that it has for many in FV. To be sure, much FV ecclesiological and sacramental theorizing goes beyond what we are able to consider: the impact of FV ecclesiology on its doctrine of justification. While the committee may differ with various strands of FV ecclesiology on this or that point, what is relevant in this critique is how FV ecclesiology affects the FV doctrine of justification. Given that focus, we now turn to examine some FV teaching on the sacraments and their efficacy, seeking to gauge its impact on the doctrine of justification.

Wilson on the sacraments writes, for instance:

Raise your hand if you knew that the Westminster Confession of Faith taught baptismal regeneration…. Baptism means that the one baptized has a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, the one baptized has been grafted into Christ, he has the sign and seal of regeneration, forgiveness of sins and the obligation to walk in newness of life.

Wilson’s language of “baptismal regeneration” is, at best, confusing, since the Reformed have not historically used this language to refer to baptism. One may have a high view of baptism and its efficacy without believing that the outward act of baptism itself is to be described as regenerative. No small part of Wilson’s problem here, we observe, lies perhaps in what he fails to say. In Wilson’s writing about sacramental efficacy one does not
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313 In the Catechism of the Catholic Church (Ligouri: Liguori Publications, 1994), baptism is defined as “the washing of regeneration and renewal by the Holy Spirit,” for it signifies and actually brings about the birth of water and the Spirit without which no one “can enter the kingdom of God.” (§ 1215). The RCC Catechism, as well as a host of other Roman Catholic theological works, explains how the washing of baptism removes the stain of original sin and confers the grace of initial justification (§§ 1266 and 1992). While sin after baptism tends to destroy or diminish the grace conferred in baptism, subsequent engagement of the entire sacerdotal system of Rome furnishes one with the “sanctification of the whole human being” that is necessary for final justification and admittance to heavenly glory (see, e.g., §§ 1446 and 1995). To speak, as does Wilson, of baptismal regeneration is to depart from the Reformed way of treating baptism and to place oneself in the uncomfortable position of using terminology fraught with a host of undesirable consequences.

314 For such a high view, in which the sealing aspect of baptism is strongly affirmed, see Alan D. Strange, “Baptism as a Seal,” “New Horizons” 21:7 (July/August 2000), 3-4.
find a reference to WCF 14.1 on saving faith. WCF 14.1 teaches that “the grace of faith” that enables the elect to believe “is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word”; and that this grace of faith “is increased and strengthened” by the Word, sacraments and prayer (emphasis). The Word brings about faith and faith is then increased by the Word, sacraments, and prayer. This is the order set forth in our Standards. WLC 155 and WSC 89 support this contention, asserting that the Spirit of God makes the reading and especially the preaching of the Word “an effectual means of convincing and converting sinners.” Nowhere does the Confession or Catechisms ascribe this work of convincing and converting sinners to the sacraments. It is “especially the preaching” of the Word that produces, by the Spirit’s ministration, saving faith. Anytime saving faith is in view, or at stake, so is the doctrine of justification, inasmuch as faith is a gift of God whereby He enables us to apprehend Him. Thus we would maintain that there is a distinction between the ministry of the Word and the administration of the sacraments that many of the FV promoters seem to be missing.

Furthermore, Wilson tends to stress that the sacraments are efficacious regardless of the recipient’s subjective condition, which is not what the WCF teaches. Time and again the Confession ties the efficacy of the sacraments to being in the covenant of grace (WLC 162) or to being those who by faith receive them (WSC 91). Wilson does mention the need for evangelical faith in the use of the sacraments, but blunts or negates this assertion by his insistence on what he calls the objectivity of the sacraments. In Wilson’s teaching the sacraments constitute one as a real branch of Christ. It might prove to be a fruitless branch, but it is a real branch nonetheless: “A true son is brought into the covenant and is nourished there. A false son is brought into the covenant and by his unbelief incurs the chastisements of that covenant. Objectively, both the true and the false son are brought into the same relationship.” In this way the sacraments work in all, according to Wilson. But WCF 27.3 envisions them as working in “worthy receivers,” correlative with WCF 28.6, which notes that baptism is efficacious “to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto,” i.e., the elect. Wilson, however, sees both true and false sons brought into the same relationship. Again this follows because of Wilson’s tendency to reject the Confession’s teaching on the visible/invisible distinction of the church and the internal/external standing of the individuals in the covenant.

Protestantism has historically enjoyed a high view of preaching. Many have in recent years powerfully argued for the recovery of a high view of the sacraments, like the view that Calvin held. It would be deadly for the church, however, if in recovering a high view of the sacraments she loses a high view of preaching, particularly the centrality of preaching. It is the case that our Standards have a high view of the sacraments, but they see them as distinctly accompanying the ministry of the Word, which is primary. See Cornelis P. Venema, “The Doctrine of Preaching According to the Reformed Confessions,” 135-183 and Alan D. Strange, “Comments on the Centrality of Preaching in the Westminster Standards,” 185-238, in “Mid-America Journal of Theology 10 (1999) for a discussion of the historic Reformed commitment to a high view of preaching; and Alan D. Strange, “Sacraments, the Spirit, and Human Inability,” Mid-America Journal of Theology 12 (2001) 223-246 for a high view of the sacraments that does not entail the kind of errors that either Rome, on the one hand, or FV, on the other, make.

Reformed is Not Enough, 96, emphasis; cf. Federal Vision, 268.
Lusk, too, manifests confusion in relating preaching to the sacraments and in understanding the role of faith in receiving the grace offered in the sacraments. In an internet article, “Some Thoughts on the Means of Grace: A Few Proposals,” Lusk argues that preaching makes one desire what God offers them in the sacraments. In Proposal 4 he comments on Peter’s sermon in Acts 2. He offers these thoughts tentatively:

At this point, the word has done its work. The hearers have been aroused and convicted, but, apparently they still aren’t saved. Preaching alone is insufficient to make them participants in Christ’s work of redemption. Thus Peter tells them what they must do. They must respond to the preached word with repentance and be baptized to enter into the way of salvation. Baptism, not preaching per se, is linked with forgiveness and the reception of the Spirit. Clearly, Peter believes God will give them something in baptism that they have not received through preaching alone. Baptism will consummate the process of regeneration begun by the Word preached.

In the next proposal Lusk asserts, “Preaching communicates truth, the sacraments communicate life.” Lusk wants to put the sacraments into the role of converting ordinances. On Lusk’s construction, as presented here, faith comes by hearing and the sacraments, not by hearing alone. At least one could assume that hearing the Word preached is not sufficient for conversion but requires baptism to complete what was begun in the preaching of the Word, with the sacrament assuming the decisive place in conversion.

Lusk, seeking to secure a central place for baptism in conferring the grace of salvation, writes, “Sacraments are not merely signs: they are signs cojoined with the gracious work of Christ and the Spirit.” By this he means,

Baptism is a work of both water and the Spirit (cf. John 3:5). Water alone is not baptism, it is an empty symbol. Nor is the work of the Spirit apart from the means of water a baptism. The sacrament includes both. Baptism is more than just a sign; it is also the grace signified.

In support of this understanding he quotes WCF 27.2-3, from which he concludes that, “The sacrament is constituted by both the material sign and Christ with his new covenant benefits. The two are so closely related that we may collapse them together in our sacramental language. The claim ‘Baptism saves’ really means, ‘Christ saves through baptism.’” He further states, “The Westminster Standards teach that in baptism, the thing signified which is nothing less than union with Christ, regeneration, and forgiveness – is truly sealed (WCF 28.1), conferred (WCF 28.5), applied (WSC 92), and communicated (WSC 88). Baptism is an “effectual means of salvation” (WSC 91). Lusk asserts to believe otherwise is sub-confessional because baptism is a saving ordinance.
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After giving us examples of those who fall prey to this revivalism and enlightenment understanding, he calls us to reconsider our view of signs. In looking at the signs in Exodus and John “we find that signs are powerful, transformative, saving actions of God.” On this basis we may think of the sacraments mechanically, but because there is, “a sacramental union of the creaturely element and the active presence of Christ, Christ has joined himself to these elements, even as deity joined itself to humanity in the incarnation.”

Recognizing that what he has said previously might open him to the charge of sacerdotalism, Lusk now wants to say that “We must combine the waters of baptism with living faith.”

By contrast, at the same time, the reformed confessions do bind us to believe in a certain limited version of _ex opere operato_: everyone baptized, no matter their subjective heart condition, is joined to the “visible church” at the time of their baptism — automatically and without exception, right then and there, you might say (cf. WCF 28:1).

This is claiming quite a lot for baptism. Recall that Lusk, with other Federal Vision proponents, says that there is ultimately only one aspect to the church. Though he adduces the language of “visible church” here, putting it in quotes—is he implying by such that he means the—“so-called” visible church?—he does not otherwise agree that there is, properly, an invisible/visible distinction. What Lusk is saying is that no matter what the subjective responses of baptized individuals are, they are joined to the body of Christ. “Baptism doesn’t cease to be a real means of real grace just because the one baptized doesn’t exercise
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321 Both Lusk and Wilson claim that their view of baptism is merely that of the Westminster Standards and that the problem they seek to address is that Presbyterians have departed from Westminster’s high view and have embraced a sub-confessional view. _The Directory for the Publick Worship of God_, adopted by the Westminster Assembly of Divines in 1645 as a part of its work, sheds significant light on this matter. Reading the Directory together with the Confession points us in a rather different direction from that urged by Lusk and Wilson. Both the word of instruction at baptism and the prayer following baptism make it clear that the Divines embraced neither a baptismal regeneration view nor an _ex opere operato_ view (limited or otherwise). The prayer following baptism is particularly noteworthy, beseeching the Lord that if the infant should live “and attain the years of discretion, that the Lord would so teach him by his word and Spirit, and make his baptism effectual to him” (_Westminster Confession of Faith_ [1647; Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1995], 382-84): the whole tenor of the baptismal service runs along this line, i.e., beseeching the Lord by His Spirit to effectuate in the baptized that which was signified in their baptism, not seeing the sign and its efficacy so inextricably linked as to render such a prayer superfluous. Had the divines had such a view as that for which Wilson and Lusk contend, one would expect the prayer following baptism to be more purely one of thanks to God for what He has by baptism done to and in the child rather than involving, as it does in the Directory, an earnest pleading that God would do for and in the child that which baptism represents.
faith.” He goes on to write, “It is always a blessing to receive God’s heavenly rain (cf. Heb 6:7-8). But if the one baptized rejects what God offers and gives in baptism – namely, Christ Himself – then those waters of life become waters of drowning and judgment.” But is it a real means of grace if what is conveyed is judgment and not grace? Since when do means of grace that are truly “means of grace to me” convey judgment?

The question of paedobaptism and faith also presents no problem for Lusk, at this point, because he maintains in his book on paedofaith that the norm for covenant children is that God gives them faith in the womb.322 This is, of course, a conception of faith from which notitia (the intellectual content of faith) has been evacuated. In turning faith into either faithfulness or a feeling of trust/dependence, the FV, at such points, sounds more like Rome, on the one hand, and Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), on the other hand, than it does Geneva or Westminster. Paedofaith, on this construction, bears little resemblance to the biblical and confessional conception of saving faith.

Lusk also seeks to answer the question, “What is the relationship of paedobaptism to conversion?”323 In answering this question, Lusk sets forth what he calls the organic model of viewing covenant children. From the moment of conception, covenant children have a promise from God to be inheritors of His covenantal blessings. Lusk says they are betrothed to the Lord. They are then married fully to God at their baptism.324

God is already in the process of drawing the child to Himself from the moment of conception. The examples of David (Psalm 22: 9-10) and John the Baptist (Luke 1:41) show God’s in utero, pre-sacramental work. But the work isn’t complete until the child receives the sign of initiation. The child remains in a liminal transitional state until then. The threshold into union with Christ, new life in the Spirit, and covenant membership in the family of God is actually crossed when the child is baptized.324

This notion that the child does not enjoy covenant membership until baptism contradicts WLC 166 which reverses that order, arguing that “infants descending from parents, either both, or but one of them, professing faith in Christ, and obedience to him, are in that respect within the covenant, and to be baptized.” We do not baptize our children, in other words, so that they may be in the covenant.325 We baptize our children because they already are “in that respect within the covenant.”

Aside from this point, however, Lusk maintains that this organic model (that children have union with Christ, new life in the Spirit, etc.) should be the controlling pre-

325 Here again, the baptismal service in the Directory for the Publick Worship of God is instructive: it is not baptism that makes our children Christian or federally holy but rather, by virtue of their having at least one Christian parent, “they are Christians, and federally holy before baptism, and therefore are they baptized [emphasis],” WCF (Free Presbyterian Publications), 383.
supposition in our dealing with covenant children. There is no need to speak to covenant children about conversion because they (all who are baptized) are already in a saving union with Christ. Lusk further writes,

A baptized person is a Christian until and unless he apostatizes. Let us learn to treat our baptized children as the Christians that they are. This is what it means to receive little ones in Jesus’ name (Luke 18:16). Counting and treating our baptized children as Christians is not a matter of pretending or presuming. It is more than a judgment of charity.326

In baptism they were incorporated into Christ’s body, inducted into the royal priesthood of the church, and initiated into the new creation.327

How are we to view our children? The same as we would view any and all members of Christ’s body: “We are not to try to convert our baptized children, as though their spiritual experience had to fit the revivalistic paradigms, rather, we teach them to persevere in the faith and grace that they have already received in baptism.” For Lusk, since baptism is a converting ordinance there is no necessity to look for fruits of regeneration in a baptized child because we know they are converted. This is not a pretension or presumption, it is real, it is true. God normally gives faith to covenant children at conception; therefore after baptism we are to help them persevere in the redeemed life and encourage them in all the means of grace (paedocommunion). Given all that baptism gives them it is little wonder that we should give them, at the earliest ages, communion. Paedofaith qualifies for paedobaptism and paedocommunion.

Perhaps it would be helpful then to enumerate some of these rather serious problems that we discover in Lusk’s teaching on baptism:

1. Lusk’s view of the sacrament as being a converting ordinance is not the teaching of the Westminster Standards (WCF 14.1; WCF 10.1, 3; WLC 67; WSC 31).

2. Lusk’s view that preaching alone is insufficient to make the hearers participate in Christ’s work of redemption is not the teaching of the Westminster Standards (WLC 155; WSC 89).

3. Lusk’s view of the sacramental union of the creaturely elements and the active presence of Christ, even as deity joined itself to humanity in the incarnation, is not the teaching of the Westminster Standards. (WCF 2; WLC 163).

4. Lusk’s view of a limited version of ex opere operato with regard to the sacraments is not the teaching of the Westminster Standards (WCF 27.13, 28.6; WLC 161; WSC 91).


5. Lusk’s view that paedofaith is the norm for covenant children is not the teaching of the Westminster Standards (WCF 28.6, 14:1; WLC 67,68; WSC 31).

We have taken one of the more moderate FV men (Wilson) and one of the more radical FV men (Lusk) and examined them in ecclesiology, particularly the sacraments, and have found them downplaying the need for faith, or the intellectual content of faith, or some such thing, so that they may stress the objectivity of the sacraments, the covenant, the church, etc. But we must subjectively exercise faith to enjoy God’s justifying and sanctifying acts in which he both forensically declares and transformatively works. This faith is a gift of God, worked particularly by the preaching of the Word. It is our concern that in the attempt to recover a high view of the sacraments, FV runs in the opposite direction and downplays the preaching of the Word as the primary developer of saving faith. And the nature of saving faith is and always will be crucial for a right understanding of the doctrine of justification.

K. Eschatology

Finally, in terms of eschatology these men are largely, if not entirely, post-millennial and this comes into play even in the view they have of this controversy. They expect, it seems, the church to come to some different understandings about many of these issues than she has thus far (a not uncommon version of *ecclesia reformata semper reformanda*, “the reformed church is always to be reformed”). This means, for some, that there is a provisional aspect not merely to our confessional formulations but even to their substance, and that further historical development necessitates the modification of the way we conceive covenant, righteousness, merit, etc., all which impacts our formulation of justification. Some FV advocates believe that there is an ecumenical imperative that should militate against what they judge to be excessive precision in our theological formulation. This ecumenical impulse often manifests itself in the conviction that the church ought to seek to achieve broad agreement, even across confessional lines, without insisting upon all the substance of the Reformed confessions. It is often observed that the world is in such a bad state that the church can ill-afford theological niceties and must compose her theological differences so that a hostile world may be met by a unified ecclesial front. The FV proponents think that too much is being made of the present controversy over FV and that, given the poor state of the church (and society as a whole), it behooves us who otherwise have so much in common not to attack each other over minor differences; rather, we should seek to work together more and work harder to overcome these differences.328 There is much wisdom in this if indeed we are talking about minor matters. But we do not consider the matters discussed in this report to be minor.

L. Concluding Remarks

The Federal Vision must be assessed as a whole package and if some of its advocates object that they do not believe this or that aspect that others who are part of the project affirm, it is incumbent on them to differentiate themselves. One ought not to complain too loudly about being subjected to criticism when one is engaging in vigorous ques-

328 See the essays by Sandlin (xvii-22) and Ventrella (63-84) in *BOTB* and Schlissel, in *Knox Colloquium*, 18-39; and *Federal Vision*, 237-61.
tioning of much of what has come to be regarded as the heart of the Reformed faith. All of us need to conduct ourselves with charity, wisdom, and maturity in this situation. Our prayer is that this report will contribute to clarifying the issues raised by the FV controversy and to their resolution.

M. Suggested Reading

Officers, sessions, and presbyteries of the OPC should be familiar with the exegetical, historical-theological, and theological issues at stake surrounding the claims of the FV. The following books are offered as suggested reading for those who desire to read primary sources involved in this debate and some of the preliminary critique of the movement.


This includes a number of essays by both proponents and critiques of the FV exploring various aspects of the debate.


This contains a series of essays originally presented at the August 2003 SCCCS meeting by speakers generally sympathetic to the FV. Most of these essays consider topics relevant to this report.


This is a full-scale critique of the FV which delves into the relevant primary sources from a confessionally Reformed perspective.


This is a book of essays from proponents of the FV written in the wake of the 2002 Auburn Avenue Pastor’s Conference.

V. SUMMARIES

A. General Summary

There is perhaps no better confessional summary of the biblical, Reformed doctrine of justification than that found in WLC 70:

Justification is an act of God’s free grace unto sinners, in which he pardoneth all their sins, accepteth and accounteth their persons righteous in his sight; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone.
In this statement, one can see all of the major aspects of the doctrine, which the following paragraphs summarize.

First, the nature of justification may be described as both forensic and definitive. Justification is forensic in that it is a judicial declaration of God, proclaiming a person righteous in his sight, rather than a transformative, renovative work by which a person is made subjectively holy. The very word Greek word used in the NT to describe justification (δικαιουν) is ordinarily forensic in meaning and is clearly forensic in the contexts in which Paul expounds the doctrine of justification (e.g., in Rom 3:19-20; 5:16; 8:33-34; for OT background, cf., e.g., Exod 23:6-7; Deut 25:1; Prov 17:15; compare also the judicial language in WCF 11.3; WLC 67, 70, 75; WSC 31, 33, 34). Justification is definitive in the sense that it is a once-for-all accomplished, completed, and perfect act in this life, upon a person’s coming to faith. Justification by faith puts one at peace with God and secures his final destiny for eternal life (e.g., see Rom 5:1, 9; WCF 11.4-5; WLC 77).

Very important background to this doctrine of justification is that God requires perfect obedience to his will, measured by the standard of his law, and that all of us, as fallen sinners, are unable to meet this requirement and thus stand condemned apart from Christ. God is a just God. As the just judge of the whole earth, he cannot but condemn the sinner and acquit the righteous (e.g., Exod 23:7; Deut 10:17; Prov 17:15; Nah 1:3). In creation God entered a covenant of works with Adam in which he promised eschatological life upon perfect obedience and death upon disobedience (see Gen 2:16-17; WCF 7.2; 19.1; WLC 20; WSC 12). In accord with his justice, God condemned Adam and his posterity when he fell, and he continues to demand perfect obedience from all people after the Fall (e.g., Gal 3:10; 5:3 WLC 99). We rejoice that God is merciful as well as just, but his merciful justification of sinners cannot be other than a just act (WLC 71). It is for this very reason that sinners, judged upon the basis of their own works, can never be justified by our holy and righteous God (e.g., Rom 3:19-20; WCF 16.4-6).

In his justice and mercy, God has provided justification for sinners by sending his Son to satisfy the just demands of the law and by imputing the benefits of his work to believers. Sinners are justified by the righteousness of Christ, that is, by his passive and active obedience. Christ’s passive obedience refers to his suffering obedience, his bearing the penalty of the curse of the law throughout his life and especially in his crucifixion. By this work our sins are forgiven (e.g., see Isa 53:4-6, 10; Heb 10:5-10; 1 Pet 2:24). Christ’s active obedience refers to his keeping the commands of the law throughout his life. By this work we are reckoned to have kept the law perfectly, as originally demanded of Adam in the covenant of works (e.g., Rom 5:15-19). In this great work, the demands of God’s justice are satisfied and the glorious riches of his grace are displayed. The Westminster Standards speak of this twofold obedience as the ground of our justification in numerous places (e.g., WCF 8.4-5).

This righteousness of Christ, his passive and active obedience, must be applied to believers if it is to be of benefit to them. The application of this benefit of Christ comes through union with Christ, by means of imputation; that is, when sinners are united to Christ by faith, Christ’s righteousness is judicially reckoned or credited to sinners so that their sins may be forgiven and the perfect obedience of Christ accounted as their own (e.g., see Psa 32:2; Rom 4:5-11, 22-24; 2 Cor 5:19, 21; Phil 3.8-9; WCF 11.1; WLC 69-71; WSC 31-33).

This imputation of the righteousness of Christ is received by the sinner by faith, and by faith alone. Scripture sets forth faith as that by which a sinner is justified in numerous places, and often does so in sharp contrast to the other alternative, that is, justification by works (e.g., Rom 3:21-22; 3:28; 4:4-5, 13-14; 9:30-32; 10:5-6; Gal 2:16; 3:11-12; Phil 3:9; Eph 2:8-9). For this reason, the Westminster Standards properly speak of faith as the
“alone instrument” of justification (e.g., WCF 11.2; WLC 70, 71, 73; WSC 33). This truth is properly understood when the nature of saving faith is appreciated: it is unique and distinct from “works” in that faith is an extraspective trust that looks outside of one’s self and rests only upon the perfect work of another, namely, Jesus Christ (e.g., Hab 2:4; John 3:16, 18; Acts 10:43; Rom 3:22; 4:20-21; 1 Pet 1:8; WCF 11.1-2; 14.2; WLC 72-73; WSC 33, 86). As such, faith expresses the gracious character of salvation and thus is indeed the appropriate instrument of justification (e.g., Rom 4:16; 11:5-6).

Finally, the doctrine of justification is properly understood when justification is seen as both absolutely distinct as well as inseparable from sanctification, that work of God by which sinners are inwardly renewed in holiness. Never is God’s forensic work of justification to be confused with his transformative work of sanctification, yet never does God fail to sanctify those whom he has justified (e.g., Rom 6:1-2, 15; Gal 2:17; 5:13; WLC 77).

B. New Perspective on Paul

Difficulty has surrounded the interpretation of Paul throughout the history of the church, which was acknowledged by the apostle Peter (2 Pet 3:16) and evidenced in the debates between Augustine and Pelagius, the use of the quadriga, the debates over justification in the Reformation, and the question of the center of Paul’s theology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is especially against the backdrop of the NT scholarship of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries that one sees the development of the NPP.

1. Development of the NPP

There are four major figures that play a significant role in the development of the NPP: Krister Stendahl and his essay, “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West;” E. P. Sanders and his Paul and Palestinian Judaism; N. T. Wright, and his essay, “The Paul of History and the Apostle of Faith;” and James D. G. Dunn, and his essay, “The New Perspective on Paul.” These individuals played important roles in the development of the NPP and represent its concerns in one way or another. Though, for those interested in how the NPP bears upon the Reformed community, the writings of N. T. Wright must be explored more thoroughly, as it is his writings that have been most influential.

2. Major Elements of Consideration

Under the major elements of consideration there are three key issues that require exposition: prolegomena, key definitions, and how those key definitions impact the NPP doctrine of justification.

a. Prolegomena

Seldom do participants in this debate take note of the presuppositions that those associated with the NPP bring to the table. Dunn, for example, believes that Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles were not written by Paul. While Wright affirms the Pauline authorship of Ephesians, he nonetheless bases his argumentation and interpretation of Paul’s theology primarily upon the so-called undisputed Pauline letters like Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians. When one associated with the NPP writes, “Paul says,” it might not mean the same thing for one who holds to the Pauline authorship of all the NT epistles that bear the apostle’s name, since appeal is being made to a truncated Pauline corpus. Moreover, Wright approaches the study of the NT largely as a historical phenomenon and makes no mention of the inspiration of the Scriptures or the work of the Holy
Spirit in comprehending the Scriptures in his prolegomena, outlined in his *New Testament and the People of God*.

b. Key Definitions according to the NPP:

*Righteousness*—defined not as moral equity, or adhering to a moral standard, but as covenant membership. The term, as it is applied to God, is defined as covenant faithfulness.

*Works of the law*—not the moralist’s ladder by which one tries to earn or merit God’s favor but rather markers that separate Jew from Gentile, especially circumcision, dietary food laws, and the Sabbath. The works of the law are ethnic boundary markers.

*Justification*—the forensic declaration that one is already “in,” or a member of, the covenant. Moreover, in terms of its first century context, justification is about the vindication of God’s people, that act by which God declares his people to be “in the right,” over and against the Gentile nations and radical sectarian Jewish groups.

3. The Doctrine of Justification according to the NPP

Justification is both the declaration of who is a member of the covenant as well as God’s vindication of his people before the world. In Israel’s past, loyalty to and membership in the covenant was demonstrated by the works of the law, that is, the law functioning as badges of covenant membership, especially circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath. With Christ’s advent, God has replaced such badges of covenant membership with faith in Christ. Hence those who look to Christ in faith are declared to be members of the covenant and vindicated in the present, which anticipates a future justification based upon the believer’s Spirit-produced works.

4. Critique of the NPP on Matters of Definition

a. Righteousness

The term *righteousness* cannot mean “covenant membership,” as various theologians associated with the NPP maintain. Such a definition is untenable in the face of texts such as Gen 18:24-25, where Abraham negotiates the deliverance of Sodom and Gomorrah on the premise that there might be fifty righteous men within its confines. Given that God was only in covenant with Abraham, it is impossible here to define righteousness as covenant membership. Clearly, righteousness is moral equity. When one considers the term *righteousness* as it is applied to God, it cannot universally mean his covenant faithfulness. What, for example, of God’s righteousness towards those who are outside the covenant? Is God righteous in his dealings with unbelievers? The Scriptures affirm that God is righteous with both those inside and outside the covenant. To understand righteousness as covenant membership and God’s covenant faithfulness is exegetically indefensible.

b. Works of the law

It has proven exegetically unsustainable to define the “works of the law” as only referring to circumcision, food laws, and the Sabbath. This definition has now been modified by Dunn, for example, to include the entire law functioning as a boundary marker, though Dunn has left his overall understanding of justification unchanged. When Paul quotes Deut 27:26 in Gal 3:10, the reference cannot be only to boundary markers but
to the entire law, which is evident from the broader context of Deut 27-30. Moreover, to argue that there was an absence of legalism in first century Judaism ignores indisputable primary source evidence to the contrary.

c. Justification

Faith is not the new boundary marker that replaces circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath. Rather, faith has always been necessary for salvation on the part of God’s people (Heb 11). Baptism is the new boundary marker (Col 2:11-12).

5. Critique of the NPP and its Doctrine of Justification

Focusing on Wright’s understanding of justification, as his view has been particularly influential within Reformed circles, he argues that justification is covenantal, forensic, and eschatological. Wright also maintains that there is a present and future justification.

a. Covenantal

Wright is correct to say that justification is covenantal, though he understands “covenant” in terms of first century Judaism. Paul’s understanding of covenant, however, is much broader than the first century, evidenced by the absence of any citation of first century literature in his writings. Rather, justification is covenantal in terms of the broken covenant of works and the covenant of grace, or as Paul explains it—the first and second Adams.

b. Law-court

First, Wright is correct to argue that justification is forensic, though his understanding hinges upon a declaration before the world of who is in the covenant and therefore “in the right.” In other words, justification is a forensic declaration of vindication before the world. Paul, however, does not place the law court before the world but before the presence of God. Second, Wright rejects the doctrine of imputation on the basis of his understanding of the Jewish law court. The judge does not transfer anything to the one who stands accused. Wright, however, imposes his understanding of the Jewish law court upon the Scriptures. Wright misunderstands the heart of the gospel by imposing an earthly human court and its proceedings upon the heavenly court. What judge, for example, sends his own son to die in the place of the accused?

c. Eschatology

Wright is also correct to state that justification is eschatological, but is wrong to say that justification is the eschatological definition of the people of God. Justification does not deal with ecclesiology exclusively, as Wright maintains. Rather, justification deals with soteriology, which is eschatological. The connection between eschatology and soteriology is evident in Rom 4:25, when Paul links justification to the eschatological event of the resurrection of Christ.

6. Present and Future Justification

Wright clearly affirms that there is a present justification, which one receives by looking to Christ in faith, understood as faithful submission to his lordship, and a future justification, based upon one’s Spirit-produced works. The Reformed church has historically rejected such a construction because of its similarity to the Roman Catholic
understanding of justification, where one is declared righteous on the basis of his sanctification. Historically, when Reformed theologians have spoken, they have done so not in terms of a future justification, but in terms of an *open* acknowledgement and acquittal on the day of judgment (cf. LC 90; SC 38). In other words, our justification occurs in *secret* now but that same justification will be *open* or *public* on the day of judgment.

7. Conclusion.

The general conclusions of this critique mean that the following points are out of accord with Scripture and our standards:

1. “Righteousness” defined as covenant membership rather than moral equity, or adherence to a moral standard.
2. “Works of the law” for justification understood as boundary markers identifying Israel as God’s covenant people.
3. Justification only as vindication.
4. A second or future justification that has a different ground from one’s justification by faith.
5. Shifting the ground of justification from the finished work of Christ to the Spirit-produced works of the believer.
6. Denial of the imputation of the active and / or passive obedience of Christ.
7. Compromising the self-authenticating and self-interpreting nature of the Scriptures by giving the literature of Second Temple Judaism undue interpretive weight.

C. Federal Vision

The movement that has come to be called the Federal Vision (FV), while having roots in the more distant past, has particularly emerged in more recent years through a series of addresses given in 2002 and 2003 in conferences at Auburn Avenue Presbyterian Church (Monroe, LA) and in the aftermath of those conferences. Though a number of men have come to be identified as FV advocates, it is the Auburn Avenue speakers, together with those who have published essays in *Backbone of the Bible* and *The Federal Vision*, whom we have identified as those chiefly representing the FV and whose works we address herein.

To be sure, the movement is not monolithic and every view critiqued may not properly be attributed to every FV follower. The committee, however, believes that it remains incumbent on us to seek, as we have been charged, to understand the FV in its integrity and to treat the project with a coherency and clarity that we pray will edify the church. We are particularly charged with critiquing the FV as it engages the doctrine of justification. We do so not simply by focusing on the FV doctrines of salvation and the Holy Spirit, to which areas the doctrine of justification most narrowly belongs, but by looking more broadly at the FV, seeing how it treats a number of issues across the range of theology. We believe that such an approach as we have taken is warranted because the doctrine of justification, rightly understood, brings into focus a host of considerations in the whole field of theology: from prolegomena to the doctrines of God, man, Christ, and the church, as well as the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

It may also be noted that in the section of this report critiquing the FV, we engage in minimal scriptural exegesis and reflection. While we do have some direct scriptural citation and engagement in the FV section, most of our biblical/exegetical argumentation is
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contained in the General Introduction and need not be repeated here. A further reason that
direct biblical exegesis need not be repeated here is that there is a good deal of indirect
scriptural engagement through confessional citation and explication. It is the case that most,
if not all, of the men cited in the FV part of the report subscribe to the Westminster Stan-
dards or to the Three Forms of Unity: frequent appeal is thus made to these Reformed
confessions and catechisms (primarily the Westminster Standards) because they contain
the church’s agreed-upon doctrine in the matters under consideration. Thus it is particu-
larly important in dealing with the FV that we do so from a confessional stance, not only
because of the OPC’s confessional commitment but also because of the confessional sub-
scription of most, perhaps all, those who promote the FV.

It should be understood that few FV promoters, so it seems, have undertaken
their project with the purpose of revising the Protestant/Reformed doctrine of justification.
Rather, the FV involves, as its proponents see it, a revitalization and development of the
document of the covenant and of the church. Much of their focus has been, and continues to
be, in these two areas, which impacts their theology proper, anthropology, Christology, and
ecclesiology. Thus our survey of FV teaching in all these areas of theology is always with
a view to its impact on the doctrine of justification. The committee points out that, in regard
to the doctrine of justification more narrowly considered, FV problems include a failure to
affirm the imputation of Christ’s active obedience along with a redefinition of faith that
merges Christ’s trust in the Father with our faith in the work of Christ and that also includes
good works in the very definition of faith itself. Some may wonder why we did not focus
our critique solely on these “justification issues” and allied matters (like the definition of
righteousness or the law/gospel distinction). The answer is that the integral connection of
justification to the whole of the theological enterprise compelled us to make the kind of
analysis that we have. Any errors in the doctrine of justification may be likened to the loose
thread that, when pulled, unravels the sweater. We cannot, in other words, examine the
document of justification without engaging a host of others throughout the whole system of
doctrine.

Rather than taking further space in this summary to explain at any length the
difficulties that we believe the FV to have, perhaps it would be better simply to enumerate
the ways in which we believe that the FV is misguided. All of these points are developed
within the body of our report. The committee believes that the following points that are
held by some one or the other advocates of FV are out of accord with Scripture and our
doctrinal standards:

1. Pitting Scripture and Confession against each other.
2. Regarding the enterprise of systematic theology as inherently ratio-
nalistic.
3. A mono-covenantalism that sees one covenant, originating in the in-
tra-trinitarian fellowship, into which man is invited, thus flattening
the concept of covenant and denying the distinction between the cov-
enant of works and the covenant of grace.
4. Election as primarily corporate and eclipsed by covenant.
5. Seeing covenant as only conditional.
6. A denial of the covenant of works and of the fact that Adam was in a
relationship with God that was legal as well as filial.
7. A denial of a covenant of grace distinct from the covenant of works.
8. A denial that the law given in Eden is the same as that more fully
published at Mt. Sinai and that it requires perfect obedience.
9. Viewing righteousness as relational not moral.
10. A failure to make clear the difference between our faith and Christ’s.
11. A denial of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ in our justification.
12. Defining justification exclusively as the forgiveness of sins.
13. The reduction of justification to Gentile inclusion.
14. Including works (by use of “faithfulness,” “obedience,” etc.) in the very definition of faith.
15. Failing to affirm an infallible perseverance and the indefectibility of grace.
16. Teaching baptismal regeneration.
17. Denying the validity of the concept of the invisible church.
18. A overly-objectified sacramental efficacy that downplays the need for faith and that tends toward an *ex opere operato* view of the sacraments.
19. Teaching paedocommunion.
20. Ecclesiology that eclipses and swallows up soteriology.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

With the submission of the critique in this report, as mandated by the General Assembly, the committee also offers the following recommendations in order to promote the purity, peace, and unity of the church concerning the doctrine of justification.

**Recommendation 1.** That the General Assembly recommend that presbyteries include the following topics in the examination of candidates, with a view to ensuring each candidate’s fidelity to biblical and confessional teaching on justification and his ability to articulate that teaching:

1. The self-authenticating and self-interpreting nature of the Scriptures
2. The covenant of works
3. The covenant of grace
4. The definition of righteousness
5. The definition of the works of the law
6. The nature of union with Christ
7. The definition of faith
8. The difference between faith and works
9. The definition of justification
10. The instrument of justification
11. The ground of justification
12. The imputed active and passive obedience of Christ
13. The distinction between justification and sanctification
14. The nature of the sacraments as signs and seals of the covenant

**Recommendation 2.** That the General Assembly recommend that presbyteries, sessions, and pastors be proactive in addressing teachings of the New Perspective on Paul and of the Federal Vision and other like teachings that compromise the purity of the gospel.

**Recommendation 3.** That the General Assembly:
a. Distribute this report to the presbyteries, particularly to their candidates and credentials committees, and to all sessions of the OPC, commending the report to them for study.

b. Request the Committee on Christian Education: (1) to distribute this report to seminaries with which it has contact; (2) to post this report on our denominational web site for easy access by interested parties; and (3) to consider publishing it separately for distribution.

c. Request the Stated Clerk to mail copies of this report to those churches with whom the OPC has fraternal relations.
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I PURPOSE

The purposes of the Committee are to recommend to the General Assembly a combined budget for the three program committees (Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension) for the succeeding year so as to help the church maximize the use of its resources for the fulfillment of its tasks, to support the ministry of the pastors and sessions in their responsibility to teach and encourage the practice of biblical stewardship in the church, to help coordinate the promotion of the work of the three program committees in the development of support for their work.

II OPERATION

A. Membership

1. Elected by the General Assembly [year elected]
   a. Class of 2006
      (1) Ruling Elder Ted A. Weber [2003]
      (2) The Rev. James L. Bosgraf [2000]
   b. Class of 2007
      (1) Ruling Elder John D. Mazunik [2004]
      (2) The Rev. Stephen D. Doe [2004]
   c. Class of 2008
      (1) Ruling Elder Paul H. Tavares [1999]
      (2) The Rev. Stephen W. Igo [2005]
2. Elected by the Program Committees
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3. General Secretaries (ex officio)

B. Officers
   2. Vice-Chairman – The Rev. Ross W. Graham
   3. Secretary – The Rev. Stephen W. Igo
   4. Treasurer – Ruling Elder Ted A. Weber

C. Standing Subcommittees
   1. Administration
      The Administration Subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Doe, Mazunik and Weber, is principally responsible for arranging for the orderly receiving and accounting of funds for the program committees.
   2. Promotional Guidelines and Stewardship Education
      The Promotional Guidelines and Stewardship Education Subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Bosgraf, Igo and Tavares, is principally responsible for approving guidelines for promotion of the work of and developing support for the program committees, developing and preparing programs to encourage the practices of good stewardship, encouraging the procurement of support from individuals through both current and deferred giving, and providing counsel, assistance and literature aimed at increasing the commitment of each member of the Church in the use of his or her means, time and talents in the work of Christ’s kingdom.
   3. Program Review
      The Program Review Subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Davenport, Deliyannides and Hoogerhyde, plus the three general secretaries, is principally responsible for organizing the review of the program committees’ programs and budgets and preparing a proposed Worldwide Outreach budget for the following year for the Committee’s approval.
   4. The Chairman serves ex officio on all standing subcommittees.

D. Meetings

   The Committee met four times since the last Assembly: June 6, 2005; November 18, 2005; March 6, 2006 and March 31, 2006.

III ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Worldwide Outreach Program

   Calendar year 2005 was a significant year in terms of giving by Orthodox Presbyterian Church members. The year began with many members and congregations providing financial relief to victims of the Tsunami in Asia as well as a late summer
outpouring of assistance both financially and donated time to those devastated by the hurricanes. In total, more than $500,000 was given by OPC members for these two causes. Yet despite the significant and generous outpouring of help, the Church experienced a 6.6% increase in giving to Worldwide Outreach, with total Worldwide Outreach receipts for the year up from $2,402,960 in 2004 to $2,562,072 in 2005. These 2005 receipts represented a surplus over the approved 2005 budget by $12,072, and for the first time since 1997, the overall budget was received.

The New Horizons magazine received 100% of its full budget amount of $220,000, while the Committee on Coordination utilized 85.5% of its $280,000 approved budget. The Committee on Christian Education and the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension each received 101.8% of their approved budgets and the Committee on Foreign Missions received 103.9% of its approved budget.

After considering recent patterns of giving, the Committee is recommending a total Worldwide Outreach program for 2007 of $2,879,758. This represents a 5.52% increase over the approved 2006 WWO budget and also incorporates the expected revenue (3.07%) associated with “folding in” the China direct missionary support (DMS) funds. It should also be noted that this recommendation is for full funding of each of the program committees requests.

B. Coordinated Promotional Efforts

The Thank Offering was the only coordinated promotional effort of the three program committees for most of 2005. Based upon the survey taken at last years General Assembly, it was determined to discontinue the quarterly publication called In Session in its present format. It is anticipated that a reworked replacement will be utilized in 2006 and consideration is being given to distributing it electronically. The purpose of this publication is to promote and provide instruction concerning the work of Worldwide Outreach.

C. Administrative

Our Director of Finance and Planned Giving, Mr. David E. Haney, continued his full-time work for the Committee. However, during 2005 the committee did release him to assist the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension in its oversight and coordination of our denominational response to Hurricanes Katrina and Wilma. The Rev. Douglas A. Watson continues his service as Staff Accountant. Mrs. Janet L. Giandomenico labors as Assistant to the Director of Finance, and also serves as Office Manager for the three program committees.

D. Estate and Gift Design Policy Guidelines

The Committee submitted the proposed Estate and Gift Design Policy Guidelines to the 66th (1999) General Assembly. It continues to follow the guidelines in their provisional form. The Committee is in the process of updating its Operating Manual. It is anticipated that the revised Operating Manual will incorporate the Estate and Gift Design Policy Guidelines and be completed during 2006 and reported to the 74th General Assembly.

IV ITEMS REQUIRED TO BE REPORTED TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
A. Pursuant to paragraph E.4.o of the *Instruments of the General Assembly*, the Committee on Coordination has granted its approval to the undertaking of the special relationships below which must be reported annually to the Assembly.

You will note in the Committees recommendations that for calendar year 2007, the field of China is being “folded into” the Foreign Missions General Fund, and consequently its funding. This is further reflected in the proposed 2007 Worldwide Outreach budget recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Missionary</th>
<th>COC Meeting</th>
<th>2005 % Funded</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China (a)</td>
<td>March 1995</td>
<td>March 1995</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Presbytery of New York and New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 2004</td>
<td>Nov. 2004</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea (b)</td>
<td>Falk</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>A group of congregations in the Presbytery of the Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wingard</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Curto</td>
<td>Mar. 1995  (c)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Presbytery of Connecticut and Southern New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Baugh</td>
<td>Nov. 2004</td>
<td>53.67%</td>
<td>Presbytery of the Midwest and Presbytery of the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Westerveld</td>
<td>Mar. 2001  (c)</td>
<td>69.05%</td>
<td>Congregations in the Presbytery of Philadelphia and a group of congreations in the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okken</td>
<td>March 2001</td>
<td>42.65%</td>
<td>Congregation in the Presbytery of Southern California and Presbytery of the Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prawius</td>
<td>April 1997  (d)</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
<td>A group of congregations in the Presbytery of the Midwest and a group of congreations in the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>April 2004</td>
<td>41.87%</td>
<td>Presbytery of the Northwest and Presbytery of the Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tricarico</td>
<td>Nov. 2004</td>
<td>40.71%</td>
<td>Presbytery of the Mid-Atlantic, Grace OPC, Vienna, Virginia, and Presbytery of Northern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>April 2000</td>
<td>19.68%</td>
<td>Congregations in the Presbytery of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(a) The eligibility of the work in China and Uganda for special relationships described under paragraph E.4.o of the *Instruments of the General Assembly* was extended by the 71st (2004) General Assembly for no more than five years, 2005–2009 (*Minutes*, Articles 62–64, pages 17–19. The Committee on Coordination is recommending to the 73rd General Assembly the inclusion of China into the General Fund effective January 1, 2007,
as well as an indefinite extension of the special relationship described under paragraph E.4.o. (see recommendation #4 below).

(b) After a five-year interruption, the Committee resumed sending missionaries to reside in Eritrea in July 2002.

(c) While Mr. Westerveld is not technically an OPC missionary, the 68th (2001) General Assembly determined “that, notwithstanding the restricting provisions (“missionary” and “new foreign missions work”) of E.4.o.(1) therein, the labors of the Rev. Bernard Westerveld, Jr., pursuant to the Committee on Foreign Missions’ Québec Project, be deemed eligible for the special relationship described under paragraph E.4.o of the Instruments of the General Assembly” (Minutes, Articles 64(2) and 65, pages 15–16).

(d) Originally approved for Kenya and later reassigned to Uganda. See also Minutes of the 65th (1998) General Assembly, Articles 62(2) and 63, page 17.

(e) Originally approved for Uganda and later reassigned on a part-time basis to Ethiopia.

B. The Committee also took the following action at its November 18, 2005 meeting in regards to the cooperative agreement reached between the Committee on Foreign Missions (CFM) and the Presbytery of New Jersey (PNJ) with respect to the missionary activities of the Rev. Calvin Cummings, Jr.:

“Due to the uniqueness of the cooperative arrangement between the CFM and the PNJ, and the silence of Instrument E in this matter, funds received directly from the Presbytery of New Jersey to meet its own obligation to support the Cummings be treated as not falling within “the Cap” as found in Instrument E, paragraph 4.i, but as pass-through funds;

and further, the COC believes that this treatment of these specific funds should not be interpreted as a model for future arrangements, but is rather a specific action, for a specific two-year appointment, for a specific foreign missionary;

and further, the COC requests the Presbytery of New Jersey to furnish, on a quarterly basis beginning November 2005 and running through October 2007, statements in summary form of the contributions it receives from OP congregations and individual members from outside the bounds of Presbytery, including through the ad hoc committee, to help the COC ascertain the effect of this arrangement on Worldwide Outreach;

and further, the COC determined to report this action to the 73rd General Assembly.”

V 2007 BUDGET FOR THE COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Outreach</td>
<td>239,340</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>297,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>22,781</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Fee</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>287,145</td>
<td>311,000</td>
<td>317,500</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>110,699</td>
<td>109,804</td>
<td>115,295</td>
<td>119,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Allowance</td>
<td>25,560</td>
<td>26,455</td>
<td>27,381</td>
<td>28,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Benefits</td>
<td>46,111</td>
<td>47,472</td>
<td>49,529</td>
<td>50,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Giving Program</td>
<td>48,826</td>
<td>67,024</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>66,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Travel &amp; Training</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rent</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment/Maintenance</td>
<td>5,407</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier/Office Expenses</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Meetings</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Material</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>8,572</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (Thank Offering+In Session+&quot;Kits&quot;)</td>
<td>9,309</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software Support/Upgrades</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>288,157</td>
<td>311,000</td>
<td>317,500</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excess/(Deficiency)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1,012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Committee recommends that the 73rd General Assembly approve the following Worldwide Outreach program for 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Requests</th>
<th>COC Proposal</th>
<th>Increase over 2006 approved budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>299,320</td>
<td>12.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>1,083,438</td>
<td>46.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>40.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>2,332,758</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>297,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Worldwide Outreach</td>
<td>2,879,758</td>
<td>2,879,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase over 2006 approved budget</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Folded in DMS support [China]</td>
<td>-3.07%</td>
<td>-3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase over 2006 approved budget</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. That the 73rd General Assembly propose to the 74th General Assembly the amendment of Standing Rule X, 2, i, by the deletion of the words “No voting member shall be eligible for reelection to any full or partial term which would extend his continuous service on the Committee beyond seven years.”

3. That, for the purposes of elections to the Committee on Coordination to the class of 2009, the 73rd General Assembly suspend the last sentence of Standing Rule X, 2, i, which reads: “No voting member shall be eligible for reelection to any full or partial term which would extend his continuous service on the Committee beyond seven years.”

4. That without prejudice to recommendations coming to the 73rd (2006) General Assembly from the Special Committee on Financial Review, Instrument E of the Instruments of the General Assembly be amended by inserting a new subparagraph E.4.o. (2) (e), as follows:

(e) The continuation of the special relationship, whether or not support for the missionary has been folded back into the Worldwide Outreach combined budget or the field continues to qualify under paragraph o.(3) (b), for as long as the parties to that relationship so desire.

VII ELECTIONS

The terms of the Rev. James L. Bosgraf and Ruling Elder Ted A. Weber expire at this Assembly. Under Standing Rule X.2.i., Mr. Weber is eligible for re-election. Mr. Bosgraf is not. (See recommendation VI.2 above.) This Assembly should elect one minister and one ruling elder to the Class of 2009.
WORLDWIDE OUTREACH
Total Budgets and Receipts: 1988 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Receipts</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Receipts as % of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1,276,283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1,329,261</td>
<td>52,978</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1,386,000</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,179,160</td>
<td>-150,071</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,202,440</td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,606,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,284,485</td>
<td>82,045</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>-205,000</td>
<td>-12.9%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,388,158</td>
<td>103,673</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,484,604</td>
<td>96,746</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>102.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,536,379</td>
<td>51,475</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1,545,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,658,804</td>
<td>123,425</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1,660,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,859,364</td>
<td>199,590</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>1,760,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>102.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,849,357</td>
<td>-10,027</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>1,880,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,971,040</td>
<td>121,663</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2,050,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,124,270</td>
<td>133,230</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2,225,000</td>
<td>179,000</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,136,711</td>
<td>32,441</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2,318,475</td>
<td>93,475</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,190,459</td>
<td>53,747</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2,350,000</td>
<td>31,525</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,371,197</td>
<td>180,739</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,402,960</td>
<td>31,763</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2,425,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,562,072</td>
<td>159,112</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2,550,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>100.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>[adopted]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,552,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>[unapproved]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,877,758</td>
<td>225,758</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Averages: $70,417 4.2%  $76,983 4.7%  56.0%

WWO: Receipts and Budgets 1988-2007

* includes $88,438 China DMS funding
## WORLDWIDE OUTREACH
### Sources of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$2,562,072</td>
<td>$2,652,000</td>
<td>$2,877,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>27,646</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>52,940</td>
<td>40,700</td>
<td>44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$2,642,657</td>
<td>$2,715,200</td>
<td>$2,944,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH RESERVES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161,064</td>
<td>211,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SOURCES OF FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$2,642,657</td>
<td>$2,876,264</td>
<td>$3,156,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WWO: Sources of Funds 2005-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Reserves**
- **Misc**
- **Non OPC**
- **OPC**
### WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

#### Use of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>$177,563</td>
<td>$217,750</td>
<td>$233,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Missions</td>
<td>$524,868</td>
<td>$586,964</td>
<td>$753,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Missions &amp; Ch. Ext.</td>
<td>$573,949</td>
<td>$696,660</td>
<td>$735,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons</td>
<td>$221,947</td>
<td>$233,971</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Services</strong></td>
<td>$1,498,328</td>
<td>$1,748,345</td>
<td>$1,971,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORTING SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,038,432</td>
<td>$1,127,919</td>
<td>$1,184,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH RESERVES</strong></td>
<td>$105,898</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDS USED</strong></td>
<td>$2,642,657</td>
<td>$2,876,264</td>
<td>$3,156,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing WWO: Use of Funds 2005-2007](image-url)
### WORLDWIDE OUTREACH PROGRAM COMMITTEE FUND BALANCES
1996-2005 balance sheets based on Auditor’s report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12/31/96</th>
<th>12/31/97</th>
<th>12/31/98</th>
<th>12/31/99</th>
<th>12/31/00</th>
<th>12/31/01</th>
<th>12/31/02</th>
<th>12/31/03</th>
<th>12/31/04</th>
<th>12/31/05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRISTIAN ED.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$18,036</td>
<td>$23,934</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,403</td>
<td>$20,741</td>
<td>$40,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Plant</td>
<td>201,819</td>
<td>221,056</td>
<td>234,543</td>
<td>236,664</td>
<td>255,441</td>
<td>255,674</td>
<td>269,930</td>
<td>279,443</td>
<td>290,498</td>
<td>296,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>492,734</td>
<td>475,212</td>
<td>493,657</td>
<td>590,587</td>
<td>644,053</td>
<td>577,435</td>
<td>528,523</td>
<td>537,842</td>
<td>559,367</td>
<td>555,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CF</strong></td>
<td>$712,709</td>
<td>$690,202</td>
<td>$729,209</td>
<td>$802,231</td>
<td>$899,494</td>
<td>$834,127</td>
<td>$792,655</td>
<td>$809,766</td>
<td>$870,595</td>
<td>$892,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREIGN MISSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$9,121</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,647</td>
<td>$135,448</td>
<td>$186,471</td>
<td>$171,253</td>
<td>$20,355</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$132,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Plant</td>
<td>1,060,450</td>
<td>1,076,283</td>
<td>1,163,839</td>
<td>1,222,359</td>
<td>1,305,141</td>
<td>1,207,313</td>
<td>1,111,641</td>
<td>939,485</td>
<td>640,008</td>
<td>1,186,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>464,181</td>
<td>471,100</td>
<td>485,914</td>
<td>533,962</td>
<td>477,664</td>
<td>581,155</td>
<td>543,789</td>
<td>507,609</td>
<td>507,076</td>
<td>507,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CFM</strong></td>
<td>$1,549,744</td>
<td>$1,674,396</td>
<td>$1,836,348</td>
<td>$2,083,304</td>
<td>$2,182,417</td>
<td>$2,189,027</td>
<td>$1,939,864</td>
<td>$1,867,864</td>
<td>$1,586,840</td>
<td>$2,075,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOME MISSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$153,210</td>
<td>$193,117</td>
<td>$154,301</td>
<td>$41,227</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$47,910</td>
<td>$36,615</td>
<td>$82,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>705,714</td>
<td>719,111</td>
<td>769,312</td>
<td>772,675</td>
<td>756,405</td>
<td>644,811</td>
<td>710,323</td>
<td>876,333</td>
<td>948,130</td>
<td>1,143,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Ext.</td>
<td>585,342</td>
<td>570,342</td>
<td>497,628</td>
<td>540,759</td>
<td>632,203</td>
<td>683,861</td>
<td>134,749</td>
<td>99,149</td>
<td>67,775</td>
<td>38,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Proj</td>
<td>132,676</td>
<td>83,053</td>
<td>61,365</td>
<td>35,365</td>
<td>13,958</td>
<td>15,079</td>
<td>16,029</td>
<td>16,832</td>
<td>17,630</td>
<td>17,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>201,819</td>
<td>221,056</td>
<td>234,543</td>
<td>236,664</td>
<td>255,441</td>
<td>255,674</td>
<td>269,930</td>
<td>279,443</td>
<td>290,498</td>
<td>296,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23,011</td>
<td>23,628</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>24,929</td>
<td>32,694</td>
<td>41,307</td>
<td>1,088,347</td>
<td>1,139,746</td>
<td>1,338,185</td>
<td>1,525,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CHMCE</strong></td>
<td>$1,777,972</td>
<td>$1,820,387</td>
<td>$1,793,279</td>
<td>$1,653,019</td>
<td>$1,690,792</td>
<td>$1,641,733</td>
<td>$2,218,377</td>
<td>$2,461,214</td>
<td>$2,692,498</td>
<td>$3,107,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COORDINATION / G.A.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>$291</td>
<td>$4,522</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,946</td>
<td>$3,101</td>
<td>$4,528</td>
<td>$3,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Budget</td>
<td>56,844</td>
<td>76,554</td>
<td>101,991</td>
<td>137,121</td>
<td>163,698</td>
<td>191,629</td>
<td>212,157</td>
<td>206,658</td>
<td>189,881</td>
<td>182,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Travel</td>
<td>31,040</td>
<td>35,321</td>
<td>56,980</td>
<td>69,942</td>
<td>64,530</td>
<td>93,870</td>
<td>102,685</td>
<td>110,662</td>
<td>142,466</td>
<td>157,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$89,469</td>
<td>$121,266</td>
<td>$172,453</td>
<td>$216,653</td>
<td>$237,228</td>
<td>$294,498</td>
<td>$325,793</td>
<td>$319,219</td>
<td>$345,874</td>
<td>$351,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>$4,239,884</td>
<td>$4,315,553</td>
<td>$4,476,300</td>
<td>$4,778,617</td>
<td>$5,039,632</td>
<td>$5,916,385</td>
<td>$5,313,804</td>
<td>$5,280,085</td>
<td>$5,505,857</td>
<td>$6,427,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORLDWIDE OUTREACH
Combined General Funds: Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$2,562,072</td>
<td>$2,652,000</td>
<td>$2,877,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>27,646</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>52,940</td>
<td>40,700</td>
<td>44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$2,642,657</td>
<td>$2,715,200</td>
<td>$2,944,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENSES**         |             |               |                |
| Program Services     |             |               |                |
| Christian Education  | $177,563    | $217,750      | $233,250       |
| Foreign Missions     | 524,868     | 596,964       | 753,513        |
| Home Missions & Ch. Ext. | 573,949   | 699,660       | 735,000        |
| New Horizons         | 221,947     | 233,971       | 250,000        |
| Total Program Services | $1,498,328 | $1,748,345    | $1,971,763     |

| Supporting Services  |             |               |                |
| Christian Education  | $109,045    | $130,305      | $136,820       |
| Foreign Missions     | 375,381     | 391,303       | 408,132        |
| Home Missions & Ch. Ext. | 265,849   | 288,811       | 308,340        |
| Coordination         | 288,157     | 317,500       | 331,000        |
| Total Supporting Services | $1,038,432 | $1,127,919    | $1,184,292     |

| Total Expenses       | $2,536,759  | $2,876,264    | $3,156,055     |

| **EXCESS (Deficit)** |             |               |                |
| $105,898             | ($161,064)  | ($211,597)    |

**Funding of Deficit (Surplus):**

| From (to)            | $6,076      | $60,947       | $64,250        |
| CFM cash reserves    | (58,748)    | 19,461        | 57,007         |
| CHMCE cash reserves  | (56,185)    | 81,685        | 90,340         |
| NH cash reserves     | 1,947       | (1,029)       | 0              |
| COC cash reserves    | 1,012       | 0             | 0              |

| Deficit (Surplus) funded | ($105,898) | $161,064 | $211,597 |

**Notes:**
- Actual 2005 Based on Auditor's reports
- Approved 2006 Based on Committees' reports, allocated in same manner as the Auditor.
- Requested 2007 Based on amounts requested by the Committees in their annual reports, allocated in the same manner as the Auditor.
- Supporting Services All salary and benefits for staff are allocated as Supporting Services
COMMITTEE ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
General Fund: Revenue and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$270,473</td>
<td>$280,608</td>
<td>$299,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,821</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$280,532</td>
<td>$287,108</td>
<td>$305,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training services</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministenal training</td>
<td>$95,441</td>
<td>$129,000</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates Conf.</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTI-OPC</td>
<td>36,810</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>42,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Ministries</td>
<td>22,824</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordained Servant</td>
<td>14,754</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Services</strong></td>
<td>$177,563</td>
<td>$217,750</td>
<td>$233,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative and Promotion</td>
<td>109,045</td>
<td>130,305</td>
<td>136,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$286,609</td>
<td>$348,055</td>
<td>$370,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>($6,076)</td>
<td>($60,947)</td>
<td>($64,250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding of Deficit (Surplus):**
- Inter-fund transfers: $25,000, $59,918, $64,250
- Decrease (increase) in cash: (-18,924), 1,029, 0

**Deficit (Surplus) funded:** $6,076, $60,947, $64,250

**Note:**
The salary and benefits paid to the General Secretary have been allocated as follows: 33.3% to New Horizons, 66.6% to Christian Education.
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN MISSIONS  
General Fund: Revenues and Expenses  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$947,132</td>
<td>$947,606</td>
<td>$1,083,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>11,789</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$958,998</td>
<td>$968,806</td>
<td>$1,104,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary support</td>
<td>$524,868</td>
<td>$596,964</td>
<td>$753,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; administration</td>
<td>$358,897</td>
<td>$372,003</td>
<td>$379,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>16,484</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>26,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supporting Services</td>
<td>$375,381</td>
<td>$391,303</td>
<td>$408,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$900,249</td>
<td>$988,267</td>
<td>$1,161,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$58,748</td>
<td>($19,461)</td>
<td>($57,007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding of Deficit (Surplus):**

|                      |             |               |                |
| Inter-fund transfers | $73,291     | $0            | $0             |
| Decrease (increase) in cash | (132,040) | 19,461        | 57,007         |
| Deficit (Surplus) funded | -$58,748 | $19,461       | $57,007        |

**Notes:**
The salary and benefits paid to all employees have been allocated to administration.

Missionary Support figures include funding of shortfalls and anticipated shortfalls in the Direct Missionary Support Fund. The shortfalls are $226,396 and $225,381 for 2006 and 2007 respectively.
### COMMITTEE ON HOME MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION

**General Fund: Revenues and Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>$885,127</td>
<td>$903,786</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non OPC</td>
<td>11,719</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>(863)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$895,983</td>
<td>$906,786</td>
<td>$953,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXPENSES</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field support</td>
<td>$360,110</td>
<td>$501,850</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional home missionaries</td>
<td>157,400</td>
<td>148,150</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other church extension</td>
<td>56,439</td>
<td>49,660</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Services</strong></td>
<td>$573,949</td>
<td>$699,660</td>
<td>$735,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Supporting Services    |             |               |                |
| Office & administrative| $259,455    | $260,341      | $294,449       |
| Promotion              | 6,394       | 8,470         | 13,891         |
| **Total Supporting Services** | $265,849 | $268,811      | $308,340       |

| **Total Expenses**     | $839,797    | $988,471      | $1,043,340     |

| **EXCESS (Deficit)**   | $56,185     | ($81,685)     | ($90,340)      |

**Funding of Deficit (Surplus):**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-fund transfers</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$81,685</td>
<td>$90,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease (increase) in cash</td>
<td>(56,185)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit (Surplus) funded</strong></td>
<td>($56,185)</td>
<td>$81,685</td>
<td>$90,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

The salary and benefits paid to all employees have been allocated entirely to administration.
### NEW HORIZONS
*General Fund: Revenues and Expenses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221,947</td>
<td>233,971</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>($1,947)</td>
<td>$1,029</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding of Deficit (Surplus):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-fund transfers</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease (increase) in cash</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>(1,029)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,947</td>
<td>-1,029</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMITTEE ON COORDINATION
*General Fund: Revenues and Expenses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2005</th>
<th>Approved 2006</th>
<th>Requested 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - OPC</td>
<td>$239,340</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>47,805</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$287,145</td>
<td>$317,500</td>
<td>$331,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Services</td>
<td>288,157</td>
<td>317,500</td>
<td>331,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>($1,012)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding of Deficit (Surplus):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease (increase) in cash</td>
<td>$1,012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

### Percent of Approved Outreach Budget Funded: By Committee 1986-2005

#### CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% Funded</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% Funded</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>221,486</td>
<td>241,800</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>431,160</td>
<td>393,390</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td>272,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>197,630</td>
<td>227,850</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>407,054</td>
<td>393,390</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>279,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>205,875</td>
<td>225,382</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>582,203</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>346,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>198,293</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>594,146</td>
<td>556,000</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>345,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>166,770</td>
<td>254,680</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>477,275</td>
<td>662,270</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>354,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>95,650</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>492,016</td>
<td>632,000</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>397,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>114,950</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>539,491</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>385,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>145,035</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>541,013</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>456,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>163,628</td>
<td>157,016</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>576,401</td>
<td>554,173</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>477,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>153,628</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>608,044</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>166,251</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>674,646</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>529,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>173,324</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>750,120</td>
<td>710,000</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>601,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>138,567</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>786,687</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>590,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>187,691</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>815,530</td>
<td>815,000</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>624,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>205,665</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>882,455</td>
<td>870,000</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>691,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>191,596</td>
<td>242,725</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>861,432</td>
<td>864,500</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>695,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>216,986</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>806,395</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>739,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>254,620</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>866,728</td>
<td>865,000</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>801,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>261,969</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>870,362</td>
<td>865,000</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>809,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>274,611</td>
<td>269,780</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>946,705</td>
<td>911,225</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>884,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1986-2005 Average:**
- **Christian Education:** 89.9
- **Foreign Missions:** 100.5
- **Home Missions:** 94.0

**Last 5 Years Average:**
- **Christian Education:** 96.1
- **Foreign Missions:** 99.9
- **Home Missions:** 97.1

### Percent of Budget Funded: By Committee 1986-2005

![Chart showing percent of budget funded by committee from 1986 to 2005](image)
WORLDWIDE OUTREACH

Percentage Distribution of Budgets Approved by the General Assembly
1990 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>CFM</th>
<th>CHMCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
<td>46.60%</td>
<td>33.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>48.20%</td>
<td>40.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>47.30%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>47.30%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>47.20%</td>
<td>39.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>47.60%</td>
<td>39.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>49.10%</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>11.60%</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>38.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>39.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
<td>38.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>48.40%</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12.81%</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>41.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13.09%</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
<td>42.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
<td>44.25%</td>
<td>42.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.55%</td>
<td>44.25%</td>
<td>42.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>44.45%</td>
<td>42.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>44.45%</td>
<td>42.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 [proposed]</td>
<td>12.83%</td>
<td>46.44%</td>
<td>40.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: Last 5 years
13.36% 44.35% 42.30%

Average: 1990-2006
13.04% 46.98% 39.98%

---

Budgets Approved by the GA: 1990-2005
Percent Distribution by Committee
Report of the Special Committee on Financial Review
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I. MANDATE

At the 71st (2004) General Assembly, the following motion was passed as it pertains to the establishment of the Special Committee for Financial Review (hereafter “The Committee”):

That, in light of the financial needs laid out by the Committee of Foreign Missions, Home Missions and Christian Education in their reports to the 71st General Assembly, the General Assembly elect a committee of five members, none of whom is a member or an employee of the Committee on Coordination or the three program committees, to study the present means of providing funds for the work of the program committees of the Church, to consult with representatives of the Committee on Coordination and the three program committees, and to present recommendations to the 72nd General Assembly for possible structural changes to the present system of funding” [Minutes of the 71st (2004) General Assembly, Articles 62–64 and 67, pages 17–19].

PLEASE NOTE: Something that must be clearly kept in mind with regard to the mandate of the Committee is that this Committee is to consider the financing of the “work of the three program committees” of the General Assembly. There may be and are other programs run by local churches or presbyteries that may affect this financing but they are not in the purview of the Committee.

II. MEMBERSHIP

The Committee members are: Messrs. Robert L. Broline, Jr. (chairman), Donald J. Duff, Timothy K. Jackson, Joseph LoGiudice (Vice-chairman), and Bruce Stahl (Secretary).
III. MEETINGS

The Committee met a total of eleven times since the 71st Assembly (2004) up to the completion of this report: July 1, 2004 (conference call), August 27–28, 2004 (at Grace OPC in Sewickley, PA), September 30, 2004 (conference call), December 2–4, 2004 (at the OP home office, Willow Grove, PA), March 11–12, 2005 (at the OP home office), June 6, 2005 (conference call), August 25–27, 2005 (at the OP home office), December 2–3, 2005 (at Grace OPC in Sewickley, PA) and March 30–April 1, 2006 (at the OP home office); April 24, 2006 (conference call); April 27, 2006 (conference call).

IV. OPERATION OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee reported to the 72nd GA the following:

At the first meeting of the Committee (conference call on July 1, 2004), the Committee elected officers and agreed in principle on ideas for a strategic plan to meet the mandate, and to schedule our first face-to-face meeting.

The Committee met together to work on the agreed upon strategic plan on August 27-28, 2004 at Grace OPC in Sewickley, PA. As part of that meeting, the Committee scheduled time at its next meeting (December 2-4, 2004) in Willow Grove, PA, to meet with representatives of the Committee on Coordination and the three program committees (Foreign Missions, Home Missions, and Christian Education) [Hereafter Committee on Coordination (COC), Committee on Foreign Missions (CFM), Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension (CHMCE), and Committee on Christian Education (CCE)], and three individuals. To facilitate our discussions with the representatives of the COC and the three program committees, the Committee sent a letter to the COC, and the three program committees, asking them to respond to the following five questions regarding the Worldwide Outreach program and related matters [Hereafter Worldwide Outreach (WWO):

1. What are the amounts and sources of funding for your program along with their percentages of the total receipts? [E.g. for CFM, WWO (designated and non-designated), DMS, non-OPC sources, and special projects; for CHMCE, WWO (designated and non-designated), direct Presbytery support, and direct local support; and for CCE, WWO (designated and non-designated) and MTI designations] [Hereafter: DMS = Designated Missionary Support, MTI = Ministerial Training Institute]

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses in the current structure of WWO and Instrument E?

3. What changes would you recommend to the current WWO structure (including, but not limited to Instrument E)?

4. What is your view of the Presbytery’s role in the work of WWO (e.g. determination of need, source of funds, division of funds, promotion, and administration)?
5. Do you have any other recommendations or other matters you want us to consider as we strive to meet our mandate?

The Committee received specific written responses to these five questions from the three program committees. The Committee on Coordination responded that it “believes that sufficient breadth of positions regarding the financial condition of the OPC are represented by the responses of the program committees, and therefore the Committee does not plan to present a report of its own.”

The Committee met via conference call on September 30, 2004 to discuss and address correspondence in a timely manner and to deal with other logistical matters in preparation for the December 2-4, 2004 meeting.

At our December 2-4, 2004 meeting, the Committee met with representatives of the three program committees to discuss their responses to the five questions and other pertinent information. The COC chose not to send any committee representation to this meeting. The Committee thanks each of the program committees for their written responses and for the informative input received in meeting with commissioned representatives of the respective program committees. The Committee determined to have each of the Committee members draft their own written responses to the same five questions posed, taking into account the written responses of the three program committees.

At our meeting on March 11-12, 2005, the Committee members presented their individual reports based on the five questions noted above for internal discussion and debate. The Committee reported on its progress at the 72nd GA recommending that the Committee be continued in order to complete its work and to report at the 73rd GA. The Committee with its current membership was continued.

At the meeting of the Committee in December 2-3, 2005, the Committee finalized two different proposals which were sent electronically to the program committees (FMC, CHMCE, and CCE) and COC on December 7, 2005. Each of the program committees and the COC were asked to comment on the two proposals. These committees considered these two proposals and by March 14, 2006 each committee had replied concerning them. The replies of the committees to the proposals of the Committee differed on several important matters showing a division of opinion with regard to the present operation under Instrument E.

The Committee met with the General Secretaries and various program committee representatives on March 31, 2006 to discuss their respective responses to the two proposals of the Committee. The Committee dealt with several different concerns about Instrument E. Some of them with the program committees’ responses are as follows:

1. Some on the Committee suggested changes to the term limits on those elected to the COC by the GA and limits on the ex officio members in terms of their making motions, even restricting the making of motions only to the six members elected by GA. There was agreement about taking off the limits on terms for the six elected members, but there were strong objections to the other proposed limitations [E. 2].

2. Some on the Committee suggested that the COC be required to seek a statement of goal from each congregation regarding its support of WWO. CCE and CHMCE were against this. CFM is “probably opposed.” [E.4.f].
3. Some on the Committee suggested funding the CCE off the top much in the way *New Horizons* is funded presently. The CCE and CFM were against this while the CHMCE was in favor [E.4.i.(1)].

4. Some on the Committee suggested simply removing the “Cap” [Hereafter: CAP]. Both CFM and CHMCE were in favor of this but CCE was not [E.4.i.(3) and (4)]. [To understand CAP, see Appendix A and the discussion of the CAP in VII below.]

5. Some on the Committee suggested making the “Thank Offering” for a special cause. CCE and CFM were against this; CHMCE was silent. [E.4.j.].

6. Some on the Committee suggested doing away with special relationships for foreign missions under *Instrument E.4.o*. The CFM was against this and the CHMCE was in favor of it. CCE said if the CAP was excised, then there was probably no need for this provision [E.4.o].

7. CFM and CHMCE (and COC) expressed disappointment and/or criticism for what it judged to be the Committee’s silence and/or failure to offer any specific suggestions (other than excising the CAP) in the matter of promotion and development of additional resources.

8. Some on the Committee suggested notifying congregations of specific program committee needs in advance of the Thank Offering, so as to offset developing shortfalls. The program committees’ common reaction focused on the notion that normally too few receipts are generated in advance of notifications for the Thank Offering to know whether a shortfall in a committee really exists for the year.

9. Some on the Committee suggested elimination of the COC so as to reduce expenses, by having the COC staff report to the Trustee Board which would also approve of the undesignated funds allocation. Their *grounds* included the notion that the General Secretaries of the program committees work together toward an agreeable allocation of funds, and the presence of an approving body is normally all that is needed to ensure they did so. The program committees’ common reaction was that the presence and activities of the COC offered much stronger support to the work of WWO than this implied.

10. Some on the Committee suggested decentralized assistance in promotion and planning through regular communications between the presbyteries and the GA program committees. The *grounds* included the recognition that the program committees were already seeking more presbyterial involvement to some degree or other. The program committees agreed with the *grounds*, though not with the suggestion, for a variety of reasons.

There are some significant differences of opinion among the program committees as to the way the whole WWO program should be promoted and funded. This has been obvious in the past when there was no unanimity on the COC as to structural changes (cp. V. Historical
Overview below). This was obvious in the answers given by the program committees to the five questions posed to them by the Committee (see above).

V. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

In view of the mandate placed before the Committee by the 71st GA, a review of the mechanism for funding of WWO of the OPC seems prudent. Prior to 1960 each committee was funded by direct solicitation of funds for the work of that committee. Over the past forty-three years, the general assembly has adjusted the structural mechanisms by which the work of the general program committees (CCE, CHMCE, and CFM) is funded. The mileposts in the development of the current structure of WWO and Instrument E are compiled below. By far, the most significant of these occurred in 1963 (establishment of the Combined Budget with a CAP), with other significant mileposts appearing in 1984 (establishment of the Committee on Coordination), 1986 (ratification of Promotional Guidelines), and 1987 (authorization to develop foreign missions special relationships outside of the CAP).

1962 The general assembly, especially facing ongoing deficits in the production of Sunday school materials, accedes to requests from the CCE and the CHMCE and requests the three program committees:

1. To consider ways and means of coordinating their efforts, including financial appeals to the churches, and to report their findings to the 30th General Assembly, and

2. To study the feasibility of a unified budget and report with recommendations to the 30th General Assembly. Minutes of the 29th (1962) General Assembly, pages 22, 33, and 41.

1963 The general assembly receives a joint communication from the CCE and the CHMCE proposing the establishment of a Budget Committee and a Combined Budget (including a CAP). The communication from the Committee on Foreign Missions (CFM) does not include a proposal to establish either a Budget Committee or a Combined Budget. After hearing the report of its own Temporary Committee on a Combined Budget, the general assembly discards the general funding structure that had been in operation since the earliest days of the OPC, and adopts the Plan for the Establishment and Operation of a Combined Budget (including the establishment of a Stewardship Committee and a CAP). Minutes of the 30th (1963) General Assembly, pages 8–13 and 73–76.

1972 The general assembly adopts a Plan for the Committee on Stewardship as an Instrument of the General Assembly, which includes both a Combined Budget and a CAP. Minutes of the 39th (1972) General Assembly, pages 103–105.

1973 The general assembly amends its Standing Rules to add the Committee on Stewardship to the list of Standing Committees. Minutes of the 40th (1973) General Assembly, page 91.

1982 In response to a communication from the CHMCE, the general assembly erects a Committee on Methods of Worldwide Outreach (CMWWO) “to consider how the CFM, CHMCE, CCE, and the Committee on Stewardship may more
effectively carry out a fully integrated worldwide outreach program in the OPC, such consideration to include, but not be limited to, the recommendation of the CHMCE for reorganization of the present standing committees to form one Worldwide Outreach Committee.” Minutes of the 49th (1982) General Assembly, pages 17–18 and 131–133.

1983 The general assembly instructs the Committee on Stewardship not to fill the position of general secretary prior to the 51st General Assembly (when the report of the CMWWO is anticipated). Minutes of the 50th (1983) General Assembly, pages 67–69 and 76–77.

1984 The general assembly receives the report of the CMWWO and adopts its recommendations (after making minor amendments to the recommendations), replacing the Committee on Stewardship with a new Committee on Coordination (COC) and rewriting Instrument E accordingly (still including both the Combined Budget and a CAP). Minutes of the 51st (1984) General Assembly, pages 33–39 and 130–134.

1985 In response to a paragraph in the report of the COC, in which it indicates that it “is studying the direct appeal to our members for funds by mail,” and to a suggestion from the advisory committee, the general assembly instructs the COC “to develop guidelines for advertising the missionary and educational activities of the Church and for soliciting funds to support the same,…” and to submit the guidelines to the 53rd General Assembly for ratification. Minutes of the 52nd (1985) General Assembly, Articles 91 and 98, pages 15–16 and 103.

1986 The general assembly ratifies, with minor amendments, the Promotional Guidelines for the Committees on Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension presented by the COC. Especially significant is the state of a general principle in the Solicitation Guidelines (that is accompanied by a general ban, with limited exceptions, on direct mail solicitation to the residences of members): “As the bringing of tithes and offerings is a proper part of corporate worship, members and adherents of OPC congregations shall be encouraged to give towards the support of activities of the program committees through the budgetary processes of their local congregation.” Minutes of the 53rd (1986) General Assembly, Articles 84-85, pages 19-20 and 149-151 [See AppendixC].

1987 The general assembly adopts two recommendations of the COC to amend Instrument E to permit the establishment of special relationships between congregations or presbyteries and new missionaries and to provide a mechanism for the “over and above” funding of new missionaries outside of the “Cap.” Minutes of the 54th (1987) General Assembly, Articles 117–121, pages 37–39.

1995 The general assembly combines the two new missionary funding and special relationships paragraphs adopted in 1987 into one paragraph (essentially, the current version of E.4.o) of the Instruments, and significantly reduces the scope of the mandate given to the COC by Instrument E. Minutes of the 62nd (1995) General Assembly, Articles 81–83, pages 23–32.
1998 The general assembly corrects the language in sub-paragraph E.4.i.(5) of Instrument E to clarify that contributions from OP sources to GCP fall under the CAP—“but only to the extent that financial support for GCP was included in such approved program.” Minutes of the 65th (1998) General Assembly, Articles 61–63, pages 16–17.

1999 The general assembly expands the scope of paragraph E.4.o to include all missionaries (not just missionary evangelists), and adopts the following:

“1. That the Assembly inform the COC that this Assembly does not approve the use of extra offerings (after the year 2000) for the program committees for already established or planned work that involves ongoing expenses except the Thank Offering; the COC, however, on request, may authorize extra offerings for needs that arise which it judges to be emergencies of short duration.

“2. That the Assembly advise the COC to include provision for the growth of Worldwide Outreach: (i) in the budgets for the work of the program committees it proposes to the Assembly, and (ii) in other ways.


2001 The general assembly receives the following report from the COC—

“The Committee (as well as the three program committees) has spent considerable time over the past two years looking at Instrument E. We reluctantly report that we have abandoned consideration of possible amendments and are unable to recommend any changes to Instrument E since there is no agreement among us regarding fundamental issues relative to the ‘cap’ found in this Instrument.” Minutes of the 68th (2001) General Assembly, page 170.

2004 The general assembly adopts the recommendation of the COC to amend the Promotional Guidelines (see Appendix C) by adding the clause, “(6) Each of the three program committees shall be encouraged to promote, both unitedly and separately, its own work, as part of Worldwide Outreach, to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church,” to the Advertising Guidelines, and establishes a Special Committee for Financial Review “to study the present means of providing funds for the work of the program committees of the Church … and to present recommendations to the 72nd General Assembly for possible structural changes to the present system of funding.” Minutes of the 71st (2004) General Assembly, Articles 62–64 and 67, pages 17–19.

A joint communication from the CCE and the CHMCE, which proposed a Combined Budget (with a CAP) to the 30th (1963) General Assembly, identified several items, which it labeled as “dangers” of a combined budget, including—

• “Centralization of authority.”
• “Jeopardizing the goals of the denominational budget by solicitation from organizations outside the church, which are not bound by the voluntary restrictions imposed by the budget on the denominational agencies.”
• “Formalism in individual giving; undue emphasis on dollars-and-cents giving rather than on proportionate giving; regarding the minimum budget as one’s full responsibility.”
• “Possible nullification of the intention behind certain designated contributions.”
• “Stifling of the initiative of the agencies of the church in the promotion of their causes.”

[Minutes of the 30th (1963) General Assembly, pages 10–11, numbered items III.C.2.]

VI. SOME CONSIDERATIONS

A biblical and covenantal basis or model for funding the work of the program committees of the OPC as it seeks to fulfill the Great Commission is grounded in and flows out of our presbyterian and reformed ecclesiology. As a presbyterian and reformed church our approach is grounded in what we understand to be the biblical emphasis upon the corporate, familial character of the New Testament (NT) church – e.g. “the visible church…is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation” (WCF XXV.II)

We are “members one of another, the “body of Christ, the “household of faith”, the “church of God”, the “church of Christ” the “bride of Christ.” These NT designations for believers all emphasize and put the preeminence upon the corporate, familial character of the visible church. Our evangelical brethren place the preeminence upon individual believers and their personal, individual relationship with Jesus, and their membership in the visible church comes second, at best. For them the church community exists to serve the individual and their desires and objectives and not the other way around. Congregationalism, as a form of church government, promotes such an emphasis upon individualism.

Further, in distinction from evangelicals and their congregationalism, we are presbyterian in our form of government as we are convinced that this is the form of government taught in the NT (FG I:3). In our presbyterian form of church government, ruled by elders, the session is charged with maintaining the government of the local congregation. “It shall oversee all matters concerning the conduct of public worship; it shall concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual growth and evangelistic witness of the congregation” (FG XIII:7). This means that individual members of the local congregation are not left to themselves to determine these matters for themselves as individuals.

Included in the authority given to the session is the area of Christian stewardship. The individual member of the church is not left to decide by himself what ministries of the church he will or will not support with his regular tithes and offerings. The member entrusts that authority and responsibility corporately to his brethren and to the session and/or gives his consent corporately in adopting the annual budget proposed by the session.

Further, as presbyterians, we hold to the wider connectedness of the church through its governing assemblies (e.g. sessions, presbyteries, and general assemblies) to “maintain truth and righteousness and to oppose erroneous opinions and sinful practices that threaten the purity, peace or progress of the church.” (FGXII:1). In keeping with our covenantal, corporate character of the church, we have structured these governing bodies and ordered them such that they share in and mutually oversee one another in the areas of worship, edification, and evangelism. We have already noted the session’s authority in these three areas over the local congregation.
Note in this regard what our Book of Church Order states about the power of the presbyteries:

The presbytery has the power to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under its care, always respecting the liberties guaranteed to the individual congregations under the constitution. In the exercise of its jurisdiction the presbytery has responsibility for evangelism within the bounds of its region, especially in areas which are not within the sphere of service in any one congregation. Similarly the presbytery shall seek to foster fellowship in worship and nurture in the church as a whole within its region (FG XIV:5).

Finally, note what our Book of Church Order says about the purpose and scope of the general assembly’s authority and duties:

The general assembly shall seek to advance the worship, edification, and witness of the whole church. It shall seek to resolve all doctrinal and disciplinary questions regularly brought before it from the lower assemblies. It shall seek to promote the unity of the church of Christ through correspondence with other churches (FG XV:6).

Further, our Book of Order declares that the congregations of the OPC as a whole are represented in the general assembly, as the governing body of the whole church. (FG XV:1,2). The WWO combined budget is determined and agreed upon by the church as a whole as represented in the general assembly and churches should support the basic program of the whole church. Our biblically based presbyterian and reformed ecclesiology supports a system of funding the work of the program committees of the Church via a combined budget for the maintenance of a consistently corporate and unified (e.g. presbyterian) approach in its prescribed mandate to “seek to advance the worship, edification, and witness of the whole church.”

The WWO combined budget for our three program committees as overseen by the COC is consistent with our presbyterian approach. This part of the present structure discourages and mitigates a functional congregationalism at the denominational level. The present model for the designation and distribution of the funds is determined by the ordained governors of the whole church, as represented in the governing assembly of the whole church, the general assembly, rather than by individual congregations. Put positively the combined budget (see Instrument E) facilitates a presbyterian approach in the priority and emphasis upon the corporate character and unity of the church through our three program committees in seeking to do the glorious work of the whole Church in the part that the OPC serves in our Lord’s Great Commission given to the church universal (Mt. 28:16-20). Further, Instrument E does allow a church or individual person to designate a gift for a particular program committee or cause. The combined budget with the corporate responsibility principle that stands behind the CAP together with the right to designate gifts seems to maintain a proper balance in the tension between corporate responsibility (noted above) and individual freedom in giving (as outlined in our tertiary standards): “… If a member of the church designated his gift to a particular cause, the session shall respect his wish unless it is convinced that the specified cause is unworthy, in which case the gift shall be returned to the donor” (emphasis added) [Directory for Worship III.7, page 141]. The balancing of this “tension” was well
expressed in the joint communication from CCE and CHMCE to the 30th (1963) General Assembly that included the following among the principles, which guided it in proposing a combined budget with a CAP:

In providing the funds for the church’s work recognition must be made of both the corporate responsibility and the individual freedom of each member of the church. The principle of corporate responsibility requires that each congregation and individual member of the church recognize the necessity of supporting the program of their church as God has prospered them. At the same time the scriptural principle of freedom in giving must and can be preserved in recognizing and making possible the right of each individual to give without the constraint of the commandments of men (Minutes of the 30th (1963) General Assembly, pp. 8–9, numbered item I.F.)

And, again in 1974, the Stewardship Committee (predecessor to COC) reiterated this biblical understanding when in its report to GA:

The Lord in his Great Commission assigned one responsibility to the church. It was clearly not his intention that the work be viewed as separate competitive ministries. Therefore, the plan for a Combined Budget, formulated from the requests of the three committees, recommended by the Committee on Stewardship, and adopted by the GA, represents the total budgeted program for the church as a denomination in seeking to fulfill the Great Commission of our Lord, and it is carried out through the ministries of the three major committees (Minutes of the 41st (1974) General Assembly, p. 97)

For further biblical support for the WWO combined budget (including the annual Thank Offering) and specific explanation as to its accounting see Appendix A. [Worldwide Outreach – What, Why, and How by Don Poundstone and Larry Wilson, reprinted with permission from New Horizons, April 2004. The Rev. Donald M. Poundstone, regional home missionary for the Presbytery of Southern California, is a former member of the Committee on Coordination. The Rev. Larry E. Wilson, a church planter in Indianapolis, IN, was the previous general secretary of the Committee on Christian Education (also available on the OPC WebPage)].

VII. REVIEW OF INSTRUMENT E

The system or structural mechanism presently in place to carry out this concept is codified in Instrument E, and guided by the Promotional Guidelines [see Appendix C] for the three program committees. The COC has been entrusted with the responsibility to coordinate the Church’s programs of Witness and Edification among the three program committees. In what follows, the Committee presents a commentary on the current mechanism in terms of its purpose, structure, functions, operation, and staff, along with its analysis as to the execution and administration thereof. The Committee presents the following step by step analysis of Instrument E in order to provide the basis and grounds for our proposed recommendations [Instrument E in its current form is boxed throughout this commentary]
E. COORDINATING THE PROGRAMS OF WITNESS AND EDIFICATION

1. PURPOSE

There shall be a Committee on Coordination whose primary purpose shall be to recommend to the General Assembly a combined budget for the three program committees (Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension) for the succeeding year so as to help the Church maximize the use of its resources for the fulfillment of its tasks, to support the ministry of the pastors and sessions in their responsibility to teach and encourage the practice of biblical stewardship in the church, and to help coordinate the promotion of the work of the three program committees in the development of support for their work.

Analysis:

The Committee judges that the purpose is well stated and does not need to be changed. However, in keeping with what we noted above about the significant differences of opinion as to how the work of the program committees ought to be promoted and funded the Committee offers the following elaboration and explanation. The title of this section of the Instruments (“Coordinating the programs of witness and edification”), the establishment of a “Committee on Coordination,” the provision for a “combined budget,” together with the stated purpose (“so as to help the Church maximize the use of its resources for the fulfillment of its tasks”) and goal (“to help coordinate the promotion of the work of the three program committees in the development of support for their work”), reflect a particular understanding of the worldwide outreach privilege and responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. That understanding may be summarized in a word — one. The Church has not been given three tasks, but one. It is biblical — consider Matthew 28:19, 20, “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you.” The word translated “go” is a participial form — “going.” The verses could be translated: “In your going, therefore, disciple all the gentiles, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to keep everything that I have commanded you.” Thus, the Church’s commission is single — go. Yet, in that one going, the Church is charged to accomplish three related tasks, namely, (1) evangelization, (2) identification and establishment of the church visible, and (3) catechesis. One could say: missions, church growth, and Christian education. A single commission consisting of three inter-related tasks, none of which may be omitted or demoted without culpability; none of which is pre-eminent among the others. All are equally important and must be pursued with the same diligence and attention. Thus, coordinating the one work of three program committees in a way outlined in this Instrument seems to reflect well this understanding.

Further, this stated purpose locates the primary responsibility of promotion and funding (stewardship) with pastors and sessions: “to teach and encourage the practice of biblical stewardship in the church” (cp. 2 Corinthians 8:6; Hebrews 13:1-3, 17). This stated purpose, together with its implementation outlined in the Instrument, makes provision for the whole Church, through its commissioners of the general assembly who are provided with the informed recommendations of a servant committee (COC), to coordinate its response to Christ’s commission by giving thoughtful and wise consideration to its components, how
the three together shall be funded, accomplished and enlarged so as to contribute fruitfully to the one task.

Negatively, the procedure outlined in the Instrument for the fulfillment of this stated purpose seeks to protect against the temptation into which the three program committees could fall, namely that of competing against each other for the funding of the Church. The Reverend Stephen Doe, current member of the COC, in a recent New Horizons’ article affirms this biblical, presbyterian understanding. What follows is an excerpt from that article:

The concept of Worldwide Outreach in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is nothing less than an attempt to be Presbyterian in giving to the work of the gospel at the denominational level. The gospel is being advanced on three fronts: (1) covenant training, through the work of the Committee on Christian Education, (2) evangelism around us, through the Committee on Home Missions and Church Extension, (3) evangelism beyond us, through the Committee on Foreign Missions. These three committees are not in competition for the gifts of God’s people any more than the believers in Antioch were in competition with the believers in Judea to have their needs for food met.” (New Horizons, April 2006, 4).

Such a united approach to funding the work of the whole church is explicitly reflected in the solicitation guidelines established by the COC (see Instrument E. 4. k.) in particular: 2.a. “As the bringing of tithes and offerings is a proper part of corporate worship, members and adherents of OPC congregations shall be encouraged to give towards the support of activities of the program committees through the budgetary processes of their local congregation.” 2.c. “…all solicitations for such funds shall identify the donee as ‘The Orthodox Presbyterian Church’ or ‘Worldwide Outreach’” [See Appendix C].

The stated purpose for the COC’s existence is consistent with the considerations noted in VI. (above). In terms of the tasks assigned to the COC within this stated purpose, the Committee notes the following duties:

1) To recommend to the GA a combined budget for the program committees,
2) To maximize the use of its resources for the fulfillment of its tasks,
3) To support the ministry of the pastors and sessions in their responsibility to teach and encourage the practice of biblical stewardship in the church,
4) To help coordinate the promotion of the work of the three committees in the development of support for their work,
5) To provide oversight to the General Operation Fund.

Of these five duties, based on our consultations with program committee members, and other individuals who serve or served in the past on the COC, it seems that 1 and 5 are done. Those duties articulated in 2-4 are more difficult to measure and evaluate. The Committee found that the COC members, current and past, as well as program committee members had different opinions as to the ability and effectiveness of COC in these areas. The potential reasons for this are expanded upon below in addressing the structure, functions, and operation of COC.
2. STRUCTURE

The Committee shall consist of (a) one member each of the three worldwide outreach program committees above, elected by his representative committee; (b) six members at large, elected by the General Assembly (see Standing Rule X. 2); and (c) the General Secretaries of the three program committees as ex officio members without vote.

Standing Rule X.2.i states:

i. The Committee on Coordination shall consist of nine voting members, ministers and ruling elders. Three members shall be elected by the Committees on Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension, one from the membership of each committee; and six members shall be elected by the General Assembly, in three classes consisting of one minister and one ruling elder in each class, who shall be neither members nor employees of these three program committees. The General Secretaries of the three program committees shall be ex officio members (without vote) of the Committee on Coordination. No voting member shall be eligible for reelection to any full or partial term which would extend his continuous service on the committee beyond seven years.

Analysis:

This structure combines in one Committee three “types” of members: (a) representatives of the interests, vision and goals of each of the three program committees, (b) men chosen by the General Assembly for their demonstrated giftedness in matters of biblical stewardship and budgeting, but not representing the program committees, and (3) three servants (e.g. the General Secretaries) of the Church who are particularly knowledgeable in the day-to-day operations of the program committees.

There does not seem to be any inherent flaw in the structure of COC in terms of its diverse representation of the Church. However, the “six members at large, elected by the General Assembly” category, seems to be at a disadvantage in its understanding and therefore its effectiveness in carrying out its assigned duties due to the seven year limitation placed upon its membership on COC. The other six members, as members of the program committees and General Secretaries, could serve in those positions for many years. This is the way the COC has operated. However, a strict reading of the Instrument would seem to say that all “voting members,” including the committee representatives should have their term limited to seven years, which has not been the case historically.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Standing Rules X.2.i be revised to read:

i. The Committee on Coordination shall consist of nine voting members, ministers and ruling elders. Three members shall be elected by the Committees on Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension, one from the membership of each committee; and six members shall be elected by the General Assembly, in three classes consisting of one minister and one ruling elder in each class, who shall be neither members nor employees
of these three program committees. The General Secretaries of the three program committees shall be \textit{ex officio} members of the Committee on Coordination without vote.

3. FUNCTIONS

The Committee shall seek to develop the financial support needed to achieve the short- and long-range goals set by the program committees.

To this end its functions shall include:

a. reviewing the program (including budgets) desired by each program committee each year;

\textbf{Analysis:}

The COC is mandated to keep in view both the short- and long-range goals of each of the three program committees as it considers ways of developing the financial support needed. By this means, they combine both practicality and vision, to avoid the extremes, on the one hand, of short-sightedness and, on the other, of unrealistic “dreaming.” The plan calls for COC to review both the program and budgets of each program committee each year. The problem the Committee encountered in its discussions with the program committee representatives is that there was varied interpretation as to what “reviewing the program,” meant. There were those who contended that this provision means that COC is not concerned with bottom lines and balances alone, but also with the work sought to be accomplished. Others contended that COC’s review did not extend to giving it any authority to determine what specific work the respective committees would be approved for funding (e.g. “no line-item veto”) [See recommendations under Instrument E. 4 .g.].

b. recommending a combined budget for the program committees for submission annually to the General Assembly for its commendation and approval, and to the sessions and churches for their commendation and support;

\textbf{Analysis:}

The recommendation of a combined budget annually to the general assembly for its commendation and approval was designed, and has proven over the years, to provide assistance that has saved many man-hours that would otherwise have been spent in floor deliberation. See recommendations below under \textit{Instrument E. 4 h}.

c. Arranging for the orderly receiving and accounting of funds for the program committees;

\textbf{Analysis:}

It makes sense for the accounting function to be centralized. The COC, via its Director of Finance and staff accountant, fills the role of accounting for the finances of the three program committees, which has proven to be a quite practical, successful and economical means.
d. approving guidelines for promotion of the work and for development of support;

*Analysis:*

Approving guidelines for promotion of the work and development of support has aided the three program committees in working together as colleagues rather than competitors [See Appendix C].

e. developing and preparing programs to encourage the practices of good stewardship;

*Analysis:*

The encouragement of the practice of stewardship is a highly desirable, and potentially fruitful, task assigned to COC. The COC produces a Stewardship page in *New Horizons* and assigns the Director of Finance and Planned Giving the task of teaching Stewardship through seminars. Beyond this, the Committee judges that in keeping with the stated purpose of *Instrument E* that the primary responsibility for encouraging the practices of good stewardship belongs to the local pastors and their sessions.

f. acting as fiscal agent for the General Assembly in receiving, disbursing, and keeping account of receipts and disbursements of the General Assembly Operation Fund and making monthly reports to the Stated Clerk and the Trustees of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

*Analysis:*

The functions are well stated and do not need to be changed.

4. **OPERATION**

The method of operation to carry out the functions of the Committee shall be these or similar activities:

a. Elect its officers annually.

b. Meet at least two times a year.

c. Review, early in each year, the programs (including budgets) desired by each program committee for the ensuing year.

d. Obtain and review, early in the year, the programs (including budgets) conducted by the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the programs of the program committees separately from those programs.

e. Recommend to the next General Assembly a combined budget for the succeeding year reflecting the committee’s judgment as to the most desirable apportionment of the anticipated resources of the church.

f. Consider, and if possible implement, a means of seeking annually from each session and/or congregation a statement of a goal for the support of the work of the program committees.
Analysis:

Based on conversations with some current and past members of the COC, it appears that this operation in 4.d and f. has not been attempted by the COC for sixteen years (e.g. 1990). Further, the Committee notes the following fruitful results as testified to by the COC back in 1990:

Several years ago the Committee wrote presbyteries and sessions requesting a copy of their annual report/budget and many responded. Since much of that material has become too dated to be of much use, the Committee again wrote the presbyteries and sessions for a copy of their annual report that would cover their activities during calendar year 1989, together with a copy of their budget for 1990. At the time of this writing, your Committee had heard from at least 100 sessions and hoped that this material can be digested during the summer months. Even a quick scan of the reports reveals that the Lord is indeed doing some marvelous things through his church [See 57th GA Minutes (1990) p. 197].

The Committee notes that the response rate COC received was 100 out of 171 or 59% [See 57th GA Minutes (1990) p. 141]. Despite this good start, and the intention expressed by the COC to use and continue to pursue this data, no mention is made again of any further results or efforts.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4 d. and f be revised to read:

   d. Obtain and review, yearly, the programs and budgets of the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the WWO programs separately from direct contributions to WWO programs.

   f. Implement a means of seeking annually from each session and/or congregation a statement of a goal for the support of the work of the program committees.

Grounds:

1. The removal of the “early in the year” provision gives the COC more flexibility in obtaining this data.

2. This will help the COC and the program committees to plan their promotion and solicitation efforts.

3. This is expected to engage ministers and sessions to promote the programs to their congregations.

4. The program committees are already making plans to engage presbytery promotion to some degree.

5. There will be greater visibility of the total Church effort.

6. This had been done with sessions about sixteen years ago, with a high 59% response rate.

7. The advances in technology (electronic mail etc.) should increase the response rate.

8. To improve the clarity of this provision.

9. To gather pertinent information to aid the COC in determining the WWO budget and apportionment percentages of the respective program committees.
g. Report annually to the General Assembly. The report shall include (1) information concerning the Committee’s work (including the costs of the operation of the Committee); and (2) recommendations for a combined budget for the program committees for the Assembly’s approval and commendation to the churches for their support.

Analysis:
This provision is well stated so far as it goes and does not need to be changed. However, the Committee notes in light of the underlying financial need and desire of three program committees to expand their respective programs in doing the work of the whole church that fuller and more frequent disclosure of COC and the program committees’ respective promotion and solicitation plans is advisable and may prove beneficial.

In order to disclose more fully and compactly the promotion and solicitation plans of the program committees and COC, the Committee offers the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION: That the parenthesis in E. 4.g. (1) be revised to read (including the costs of the operation of the Committee, the promotion, and solicitation activities of the Committee).

RECOMMENDATION: That the following be inserted as E. 4. g. (3): recommendations for combined promotion and solicitation plans for the Assembly’s approval.

RECOMMENDATION: That the following be inserted as E. 4. g. (4): a compilation of the promotion and solicitation activities of the past year of the program committees along with that of COC.

RECOMMENDATION: That the following be inserted as E. 4. g. (5): a compilation of the promotion and solicitation plans for the ensuing year of the program committees along with that of COC.

In keeping with these recommendations with regard to E. 4. g., the Committee offers the following with regard to the COC’s function and operation in reviewing the programs desired by each program committee:

RECOMMENDATION: That the parenthesis in E. 3.a. be revised to read (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans).

RECOMMENDATION: That the parenthesis in E. 4.c. be revised to read (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans).

h. Inform the churches of the programs approved and commended by the General Assembly.

Analysis:
The Committee recommends direct reporting and more frequent disclosure beyond the annual report to general assembly because it notes that only approximately one-third of
the local churches have a minister or elder attend GA as a commissioner in a given year due to GA being a representative assembly (based on the last two years). The Committee notes that the minutes of GA are presently the only vehicle that contains such information.

Further, along these same lines, in terms of charting the progress in reaching the approved combined budget throughout the year, the Committee notes that presently the churches are kept informed only via the Stewardship page in NH in bar graphs that contrast actual contributions received to the goal (e.g. the approved WWO combined budget as a whole). The Committee judges that it would be helpful to put the financial needs of the respective program committees before the local churches more directly and concretely by providing quarterly updates (detailing actual contributions received vs. goal/budget) directly to the sessions and pastors via electronic mail, wherever possible.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E 4. h. be revised by adding the following paragraph [numbering the first paragraph (1)], as h. (2) so that this whole section would be revised to read:

h. (1) Inform the presbyteries and churches of the programs (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans) approved and commended by the General Assembly; (2) Provide the presbyteries and churches with quarterly updates reporting the progress in reaching the approved combined budget of the respective program committees directly to the presbytery clerks, sessions, and pastors via electronic mail (wherever possible).

_Grounds:_

(1) To reflect the recommendation noted above with reference to Instrument E. 4. g.
(2) To inform the local churches more directly and concretely of the financial needs of the respective program committees.

---

**i. (1) Contributions designated for the attainment of the approved budgets of all the program committees shall be allocated to each program committee in the proportion which each program committee’s budget bears to the total budget; checks for this purpose shall be made payable to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” with the notation “Worldwide Outreach.”**

_Analysis:_

Section i. as a whole describes how contributions are to be divided up among the program committees. However section i. (1) leaves out the fact that the present practice (as adopted at a prior Assembly) is to fund the cost of _New Horizons_ and COC off the top of the WWO receipts based on their approved budgets. In this regard, the Committee cites the rationale offered in a 2004 article in _New Horizons_ co-authored by Larry Wilson and Don Poundstone: ‘The General Assembly mandates that both COC and New Horizons be funded ‘off the top.’ This assures both COC and New Horizons of adequate funding. The reason for this is that both are support ministries for the other ministries, and each has relatively fixed ongoing expenses. COC handles finances, does administration, and helps promote the Worldwide Outreach ministry of the church. Even though _New Horizons_ is a ministry of the Committee on Christian Education, it also serves the other committees. It exists to propagate the Reformed faith and to keep people informed of the OPC’s ministries and the needs of its program committees” [see Appendix A for full article].
RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E 4. i. (1) be rewritten as follows:

i. (1) Contributions designated for the attainment of the overall approved budget of all the program committees shall be allocated first to the funding of the Committee on Coordination and New Horizons, and then to the program committees in the proportion which each program committee’s budget bears to their combined budget; checks for this purpose shall be made payable to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” with the notation “Worldwide Outreach.”

(2) Other designated contributions shall be allocated to the causes designated by the donors.

(3) If a program committee shall receive the amount set forth in its approved budget, it shall not share further in the allocation of contributions described in paragraph i.(1) until all other program committees receive their approved budget amounts.

(4) When all the program committees have received the amounts specified in their approved budgets, contributions described in paragraph i.(1) in excess of the approved combined budget shall be allocated to each program committee in the proportion which each committee’s approved budget bore to the original approved combined budget.

Analysis:

The Committee notes that there has historically been both confusion and significant debate about this section in Instrument E that describes the method for dividing up the contributions among the program committees with the use of a CAP. To deal with the confusion itself first, the Committee offers the following excerpt from the April 2004 New Horizons’ article that describes this mechanism to allocate received contributions among COC, NH, and the program committees:

How Does This Work?

When your church sends money to the Worldwide Outreach ministry of the OPC, what happens to it? The Committee on Coordination (COC) divides it among the various program committees. The General Assembly established COC to support its Worldwide Outreach program. COC distributes contributions according to percentages that the General Assembly has previously set. Each year the General Assembly reevaluates and approves new percentages.

Let’s trace the path of a dollar donated to Worldwide Outreach according to this year’s percentages. The General Assembly mandates that both COC and New Horizons be funded “off the top.” That means that each month COC and New Horizons receive 1/12 of their annual approved budget. This assures both COC and New Horizons of adequate funding. The reason for this is that both are support ministries for the other ministries, and each has relatively fixed ongoing expenses. COC handles finances, does administration, and helps promote the Worldwide Outreach ministry of the church. Even though New Horizons is a ministry of the Committee on Christian Education, it also serves
the other committees. It exists to propagate the Reformed faith and to keep people informed of the OPC’s ministries and the needs of its program committees.

If giving matches the budget, COC would receive 11 cents of each dollar donated to Worldwide Outreach, and New Horizons would receive 8 cents. COC would then divide the remaining 81 cents of the dollar among the three program committees. It would dispense 36 cents to the Committee on Foreign Missions, which uses the money to serve the OPC in its ministry of sending missionaries around the world to preach the gospel of the kingdom. It would give 34 cents to the Committee on Home Missions, so that it can help OP presbyteries plant biblically Reformed churches throughout North America. And it would assign the Committee on Christian Education the final 11 cents, to use the money to provide biblically Reformed resources and training to help equip members, officers, ministers, and prospective ministers to serve the OPC in its mission of making disciples.

It sounds relatively simple. But what if giving to Worldwide Outreach falls short of the budget? (That happens all too often.) What if contributors designate their gifts just to one committee or just to a favorite cause? (That often happens, too.) Those contributions are of course received and their specific intentions are honored. But how do they affect the combined budget?

Suppose that enough churches and individuals designate gifts to Foreign Missions that it reaches its total annual budget by November. When COC divides the next undesignated dollar, Coordination and New Horizons will get their regular amounts. However, Foreign Missions will have to wait for additional funding out of undesignated giving until the other committees meet their budgets. COC will divide the remaining funds between Home Missions and Christian Education until they reach their budgets, too. The General Assembly has adopted rules or “instruments” for itself, and this procedure is prescribed in the General Assembly’s “Instrument E.” It is nicknamed “the cap.” “The cap” is designed to help all the committees advance together financially, so that the full-orbed mission program of the Church is not crippled. Once everyone has met their budget, any remaining giving to Worldwide Outreach is distributed to the three program committees according to the same percentages as before (see Appendix A).

Having explained the mechanism of allocation of contributions with the CAP, the Committee presents its understanding of the historical debate offered for and against the provision of the CAP.

Arguments offered in support of the CAP

In response to the Committee’s Five Questions [noted above], one member of the CCE argued in support of the CAP as a “good and commendable feature.” What follows is his argument reproduced in full:

Contrary to concerns that are often voiced, the CAP is a good and commendable feature:

1) Undesignated gifts go where they are intended, to the whole work of OPC world-wide outreach, divided among the three program committees according to General Assembly’s allocation;
2) Designated gifts go where they are intended, to the particular program committee noted;
3) When one program committee meets its approved budget, via both undesignated and designated gifts, it does not share further in undesignated gifts, until the other two committees receive theirs;
4) When all program committees have met their approved budgets, they all share undesignated gifts.

This feature of the plan permits the Church actually to fulfill, as much as possible, the Worldwide Outreach Program approved and commended by the General Assembly, representing the whole Church, while not prohibiting individuals and Churches from acting in a way that will promote the meeting of one particular program committee’s approved budget.

Without this provision or something like it [emphasis the Committee’s], one local Church or one person could, given sufficient funds, measurably amend the General Assembly-approved combined budget in a given year. This is not desirable. Otherwise, why have a General Assembly? Why study and determine, through our Assembly commissioners, the way that we believe we should go together in fulfilling our Savior’s one Commission with its three components, and in such proportions as the need of the hour dictates? Should individual Churches and persons be allowed to vote on the programs and budgets of Worldwide Outreach via their checkbooks? Is that the way we should labor in fulfillment of the Great Commission as an Orthodox Presbyterian denomination?

Better to give each program committee the privilege to wait for the others, when it has met its budget before the end of the fiscal year. That seems to be the loving thing to do. And, it is hard to believe that donors making designated gifts truly begrudge other committees (than the one they have selected for special treatment) being allowed to “catch up.”

Arguments offered against the CAP

On the other hand, there are those who argue just as strongly for the elimination of the CAP. The Committee on Foreign Missions presented the argument that follows as part of its response to the Committee’s Five Questions [All five arguments have been reproduced, but truncated at points by the Committee, with the permission and review of the General Secretary of CFM].

There are many good reasons why we believe the CAP needs to be excised from the WWO funding structure, and we cite five—

1. It is an anachronism that has outlived whatever usefulness to the church it may have had in the past. The “Cap” was implemented forty years ago, at a time when the church was incurring ever-increasing amounts of debt just to keep its Sunday school materials publication operation afloat:

At the same time it is necessary to express grave concern for the future of the committee’s work. The cost of the first year of operation in the Sunday school program has been met entirely with loans, resulting in a net loss for the year of $11,890—a loss which follows upon one of
$3,600 during the two preceding years. The committee’s indebtedness is over $40,000 with the development of the Sunday school program hardly more than begun [Report of the Committee on Christian on its work in 1963 to the general assembly, Minutes of the 31st (1964) General Assembly, page 72. In 2003 dollars, the $40,000 debt would be over $240,000].

It was a pragmatic solution to a serious problem facing the whole church at that time. But, in God’s wonderful providence, that need has been abundantly met and the CCE has not needed to draw on WWO funds to support its joint publishing venture (GCP) since 1989. [Minutes of the 57th (1990) General Assembly, pages 189–191]. That’s fifteen years ago, and yet the “Cap” continues, much to the detriment of our foreign missionary outreach.

And the most easily quantified cost to the OPC’s foreign missionary enterprise—for there are other less quantifiable costs as well (see below)—of that anachronism just over the past ten years is the more than $290,000 that have been redirected away from the pursuit of foreign missions by the “Cap”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-Year Total $295,000

Notes:
(a) Adverse effect on the OPC’s foreign missionary outreach due to the allocation of funds away from foreign missions by operation of the “Cap.”
(b) There was zero adverse effect this year because none of the three program committees reached the “Cap.”

2. It leads to situations in which the church may end up undermining a member’s liberty of conscience in giving and not properly honoring a donor’s intention. The now familiar joint communication to the 30th (1963) General Assembly included the following among the principles, which guided it in preparing its report:
In providing the funds for the church’s work recognition must be made of both the corporate responsibility and the individual freedom of each member of the church. The principle of corporate responsibility requires that each congregation and individual member of the church recognize the necessity of supporting the program of their church as God has prospered them. At the same time the scriptural principle of freedom in giving must and can be preserved in recognizing and making possible the right of each individual to give without the constraint of the commandments of men [Minutes of the 30th (1963) General Assembly, pages 8–9, numbered item I.F].

While we appreciate the tension between corporate responsibility and individual freedom in giving that is identified in this statement, we believe the solution proposed, especially regarding the “Cap,” failed to achieve the appropriate balance. Depending on the timing of when a gift is received, the “Cap” does actively operate to defeat the intention of a donor of a designated gift, which appears to be contrary to the intention of our tertiary standards [Cf. Directory for Worship III.7, page 141; “… If a member of the church designated his gift to a particular cause, the session shall respect his wish unless it is convinced that the specified cause is unworthy, in which case the gift shall be returned to the donor” (emphasis added)]. (For example, in late December 2003, a member of the OPC called the office and spoke with a member of the CFM staff regarding making an end-of-the-year contribution. The staff member went through the usual response to direct the prospective donor towards a gift to WWO, but in the end, after a conversation lasting almost an hour, the donor decided to give $25,000 to the CFM general fund and immediately put a check in the mail. Due to the operation of the “Cap,” none of that designated gift, in effect, ended up going to foreign missions and, indeed, the donor’s intention was frustrated. The arbitrariness of this outcome becomes even clearer when we note that, had the donor’s check been processed only one or two days later, after the CFM had already “hit the Cap,” the result would have been exactly the opposite, and the spirit of the donor’s intention would have been honored.)

Further, we believe that the “Cap” comes perilously close to falling into the category of “commandments of men.” While we believe Christ has indeed established a government in His church in the hand of church officers, and that it belongs to synods and councils to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government in His church, we also believe that all synods and councils may err, that the “Cap” is neither a good and necessary consequence deducible from Scripture (for we see no evidence for such a strange device in Scripture), nor is it simply a “circumstanc[e] concerning the worship of God [or] the government of the church, common to human actions and societies,” for—

God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in any thing, 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 [Confession of Faith XX.2].

And the application of the “Cap” to a donor’s gift, especially one designated for a particular purpose and made to God in worship, appears to enter into the forbidden territory of requiring an implicit faith and an absolute and blind obedience.

3. It is fundamentally hostile to the sending of additional foreign missionaries. The work of the CFM is notably different from that of the other two program committees. Unlike the work of home missions, where the same dollars are more or less able to be recycled every four years, when the CFM calls someone to foreign missionary service, it is usually looking at a commitment of substantial dollars to a particular man that is measured in decades, especially if language acquisition is to be a necessary component of the work. The funding of a regional home missionary (“RHM”) may be more similar to that of a foreign missionary in terms of duration, but it is significantly different in at least two respects: (i) the numbers of men involved—the OPC presently has only sixteen presbyteries, while the foreign mission staffing needs of the CFM are at least thirty-four (of which we have thirteen, see Minutes of the 71st [2004] General Assembly, pages 160–161); and (ii) RHMs are called by their presbyteries and are largely supported directly by their presbyteries (which, not going through the books of the CHMCE, is all outside of the “Cap”), while foreign missionaries are largely called by the CFM and their support is run through the books of the CFM (and is automatically, unless falling under some exception, subject to the “Cap”). The funding requirements of the work of Christian education remain relatively constant year by year, unless entirely new components are added to the program. However, a Combined Budget that is enforced by a “Cap” and administered by a separate committee that restricts the total growth of the Combined Budget to an average of around five percent a year, Minutes of the 71st (2004) General Assembly, page 181]—perhaps a suitable arrangement for the other two committees—effectively means that, in the work of foreign missions, no new foreign missionaries can be sent to the field without either bringing an equal number of foreign missionaries home or finding a way to pierce the “Cap” that is enforcing the Combined Budget ceiling. In fairness to the Committee on Coordination, the church may well be asking it to perform the nigh unto impossible, for what single committee is ever really able to look at the whole outreach program of the church (at all three levels of operation: general assembly, presbytery, and local congregation) and see it clearly enough to effectively evaluate it, so as to be able to make informed recommendations concerning priorities for funding? Yet the command of our Lord, to “go and make disciples of all nations…,” [Matthew 28:19] compels us each year to seek to extend the OPC’s foreign missionary outreach to the billions of souls who are still lost in darkness.

4. It exerts a chilling influence on the promotion of the various ministries to the church. This was conceded in the joint communication to the 30th (1963) General Assembly, which originally proposed a Combined Budget with a “Cap.” Forty years later, in our increasingly autonomous society, there is even less threshold interest in supporting a “faceless” program or committee,
as opposed to supporting specific individuals who are personally known. But a promotional effort that fails to close with the congregation because it is barred from encouraging a direct response from God’s people to the needs of the particular work being presented seems doomed to producing only a tepid degree of support [Cf. Advertising Guideline 1.b.(6), “(6) The laying of specific financial needs before the churches shall be done in such a manner as to promote giving to the church as whole rather than by designated giving to a particular committee or activity of such committee.” Minutes of the 53rd (1986) General Assembly, Articles 84–85, pages 19–20 and 149–150.]

5. “Band-Aid” partial remedies to the “Cap” (e.g., DMS) result in a bifurcated funding structure, which makes it more difficult to communicate to the member in the pew exactly where the church stands on a monthly basis with respect to her annual goals for the support of the entire program of Worldwide Outreach. It is worth noting that the Worldwide Outreach bar chart that appears in each monthly issue of New Horizons does not reflect giving to DMS, and may, therefore, from time to time, present an inaccurate glimpse of the true state of giving to OPC foreign missions.

Finally, please note that we are not arguing for an abolition of the Combined Budget, only the excision of the “Cap.” We believe the Combined Budget may be a reasonable mechanism for the general assembly to employ for the allocation of undesignated gifts among its several programs. This is particularly so if one concurs with the principle behind Solicitation Guideline 2.a—

As the bringing of tithes and offerings is a proper part of corporate worship, members and adherents of OPC congregations shall be encouraged to give towards the support of activities of the program committees through the budgetary processes of their local congregation [Minutes of the 53rd (1986) General Assembly, Articles 84–85, pages 19–20 and 149–150].—which, together with the required inscription on return envelopes (“please place this envelope in the local offering” [Minutes of the 53rd (1986) General Assembly, Articles 84–85, pages 19–20 and 149–150.]), suggests that, as agencies of a Presbyterian church, the program committees should not be encouraging individual members of the OPC to bypass their local budgetary structures (which are under the oversight of their respective sessions) in favor of mailing checks directly to the home office for the benefit of one or more program committees. Just because the parachurch is able to do this—and does it very well—that does not mean that the church and her agencies ought to follow suit. Nevertheless, the OPC needs to do better in encouraging each of her congregations and mission works, not only to include a contribution to Worldwide Outreach in their annual budgets, but also to seek to increase it each year as the Lord prospers them. [Excerpted from the CFM’s Response to the Committee’s Five Questions – see above]

Given the strong arguments offered on both sides for and against the provision of the CAP, the Committee offers the following recommendation to eliminate the CAP provision while maintaining the presbyterian and servant principle of equity and unity set forth by
those who favor the CAP. Note in this regard that the grounds offered in support of this recommendation are drawn from both sides of the argument.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.i (4) be deleted, and that E.4.i.(3) be replaced with the following:

(3) The Committee shall annually report and recommend to the General Assembly how to address any shortfalls in the most recent year’s planned revenues (e.g. designated giving, undesignated giving, and DMS) of any program committee.

Grounds:
(1) Maintains the unified and equitable effort that the CAP seeks, by making corrections in subsequent periods.
(2) The argument for the CAP (noted above), favored the CAP provision or “something like it”.
(3) The CAP offers potential gaming for giving designated gifts.
(4) The CAP stifles promotion.
(5) Some have argued that the CAP is immoral.
(6) Offers greater visibility to the General Assembly of any shortfalls for each program committee annually.

The Committee notes that the COC could recommend different ways to the general assembly for the program committee(s) to make up any shortfalls. The Committee offers a few examples: (a) the COC could recommend the taking up of a special offering; (b) the COC could recommend that the shortfall be addressed by raising the apportionment percentage(s) for the program committee(s) that fell short of their respective approved budgets; (c) the COC could recommend that the program committee(s) absorb the shortfall for that year if it has adequate reserves to do so.

(5) Funds received by bequest or from sources outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees. Contributions from Orthodox Presbyterian sources to Great Commission Publications, Inc., shall be reckoned as contributing to the responsibility of Orthodox Presbyterian churches to the approved program of the Committee on Christian Education, but only to the extent that financial support for Great Commission Publications was included in such approved program.

Analysis:
The last part of Instrument E.4.i. (5) regarding contributions from OP sources to GCP is no longer applicable and the CCE has recommended its deletion.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.i. (5) be deleted and the section renumbered as (4) and be revised to read:
(4) Funds received by bequest or from sources outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees.

j. Arrange for the receiving of a Thank Offering each year for the worldwide outreach of the program committees.

**Analysis:**
The Thank Offering began years ago to give an added boost to our ministries (beyond the budget). But the Lord so prospered it, and it proved to be such a blessing to the church, that the general assembly decided to make it an annual event. It was originally intended to help the program committees to be able to make a strong start in their ministries as a new fiscal year begins. Local churches also find it to be a great opportunity for mission and outreach emphasis and education. Each year, the churches in the OPC contribute to Worldwide Outreach. That is each congregation’s “regular giving.” The Thank Offering is intended to be “special giving,” voluntarily donated over and above that amount, to encourage and enable the expansion of ministries. However, regular giving has often lagged behind budget, turning the Thank Offering into a “catch-up” offering.

k. Establish guidelines for promotion of and development of support for the work of the program committees, unitedly and separately, keeping the Church informed with regard to the progress and opportunities of their work

**Analysis:**
By this means the program committees are kept “on the same page” with respect to promotion and development of their support. COC established written “Promotional Guidelines” (including advertising/solicitation), which was originally adopted by the 52nd General Assembly (1986), with the addition of the new article (article #6) at the 71st GA (2004). “Each of the three program committees shall be encouraged to promote, both unitedly and separately, its own work, as part of Worldwide Outreach, to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.” The Committee judges that these guidelines are consistent with Instrument E and a biblical and covenantal model as argued above (VI. Some Considerations). See recommendations above (for E. 4. g.) regarding full and more frequent disclosure of promotion and solicitation activities and plans. See Appendix C for the promotional guidelines established by COC.

l. See to it that each program committee provides to the churches an annual report, including finances, and to the General Assembly an annual financial report subjected to a review engagement or an audit engagement by certified public accountants.
m. Encourage the enlargement of the work of the program committees and the procurement of support from individuals through both current and deferred giving, and from churches outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.
n. Provide counsel, assistance, and literature aimed at increasing the commitment of each member in the use of his means, time, and talents in the work of Christ’s kingdom.

Analysis:
The Committee recommends adding a provision that parallels the other recommendations regarding promotion and solicitation disclosure.

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E. 4. l. be revised to read:

See to it (1) that each program committee provides to the churches an annual report including finances, and to the General Assembly an annual financial report subjected to a review engagement or an audit engagement by certified public accountants; (2) that each committee provides to the General Assembly its past year’s activities and its current plans for promotion and solicitation of funds.

o. The purpose of this paragraph is to provide flexibility in the funding of support for new missionaries being sent to new foreign missions works, to promote closer ties of such missionaries with existing congregations, and to foster greater interest in the pursuit of foreign missions within the church as a whole.

(1) The Committee on Foreign Missions may, with the approval of the Committee on Coordination, undertake a special relationship with one or more session(s) or presbytery(s) (“the participant”) with respect to a missionary being sent to labor in a new foreign missions work.

(2) The contemplated special relationship includes:

(a) A commitment for an initial period of not less than two years to provide the financial support (or portion thereof) for the missionary from sources that are over and above the participant’s regular giving to the Worldwide Outreach combined budget;

(b) The establishment of a committee by the participant to actively promote the work (and the “over and above” support therefore) of the missionary, to serve as the liaison between the participant and the Committee on Foreign Missions, and to be available for consultation and encouragement as major decisions are taken regarding that work;

(c) An intention for the missionary to concentrate his activities for up to one-half of each furlough period among those with whom the Committee on Foreign Missions has undertaken a special relationship(s) with respect to his work; and

(d) A review of each special relationship every five years by the Committee on Coordination to ascertain whether it is then possible to include support for the missionary within the Worldwide Outreach combined budget (which is the desired objective).
(3) The following rules shall apply:

(a) Prior to seeking the approval of the Committee on Coordination under (1) above, the Committee on Foreign Missions shall certify that its current financial position is such that additional funding (beyond its portion of the Worldwide Outreach combined budget) must be developed in order to support the missionary through his first term of service;

(b) The term, “new foreign missions work,” refers to a foreign mission field to which the Committee on Foreign Missions has been sending (without interruption) missionary evangelists for ten or fewer years;

(c) Discussions regarding the undertaking of a special relationship may be initiated by either the Committee on Foreign Missions or by one or more sessions or presbyteries;

(d) Funds received for the support of missionaries approved under (1) above shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees;

(e) After its approval by the Committee on Coordination, the special relationship shall commence at a mutually agreeable date; and

(f) All special relationships under this paragraph shall be reported to the General Assembly annually.

Analysis:

*Instrument E.4.o* was designed to provide somewhat of a relief valve from the restrictions of *Instrument E.4.i*, specifically for foreign mission work. The Committee rejoices in seeing new foreign mission work undertaken by the church. However, this provision seems to have contributed to serious financial consequences for the CFM, specifically the fact that the CFM has run through its reserves rapidly over the past five years [*72nd GA (2005) Minutes* pp. 187-189]. Missionaries have been sent out without full funding or at least a good portion thereof [See E.4.o.(2).(a)]. The result is that there have been large transfers from the general fund every year to cover the short fall in DMS ($187,682 in 2004). DMS shortfall for the last five years totals approximately $1,102,000 (see 68th - 72nd GA Minutes (2001-2005). During 2004, the COC approved four new special relationships and not one of them at the time of approval contained a two-year fully funded commitment (ranging from 75% to 25%) [*72nd GA (2005) Minutes* pp. 190-191, 197]. Three of these partially funded special relationships were approved near year-end (November 2004) even though the CFM had informed the church for the past two years that it was facing solvency issues in the near future [*72nd GA (2005) Minutes* pp. 187-189]. The COC had not attempted to fold DMS for any person or field back into WWO (E.4.o. (2). (d) nor has it followed the 10 year provision for new fields but has rather asked the GA for an extension for five years for two fields when they reached the ten year mark (*71st GA (2004) Minutes, Articles 62-64*, pp.17-19). This recent practice frustrates this provision’s stated desired objective that each DMS relationship is eventually to be folded into the WWO combined budget.

In order to help prevent or mitigate such significant shortfalls in partially funded special relationships, the Committee proposes that the amount of the “or portion thereof” [E. 4. o. (2) (a)] be specified to require a minimum level of support.
RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that *Instrument E. 4. o. (2) (a)*. be revised to read:

(a) A commitment for an initial period of not less than two years to provide the financial support the special relationship (with at least 50% in any given year being funded by the special relationship and the remainder being provided for as part of Committee on Foreign Mission WWO annual approved budget) for the missionary from sources that are over and above the participant’s regular giving to the Worldwide Outreach combined budget;

*Grounds:*
(1) To prevent or mitigate significant shortfalls due to special relationships that are severely under-funded in the initial two-year commitment.
(2) Specifying 50% seems reasonable and corresponds to the provision that provides for “an intention for the missionary to concentrate his activities for up to one-half of each furlough period among those with whom the Committee on Foreign Missions has undertaken a special relationship(s) with respect to his work” [E. 4. o. (2) (c)].
(3) Requiring 50% places the mission on a stronger financial plan with less opportunity to jeopardize already existing missions.

Further, the Committee notes that if this proposed revision were adopted by the general assembly that a transition period to implement would be fair and wise given that there are existing special relationships that do not meet this proposed threshold. Therefore, in order to provide for a reasonable transitional period the Committee offers the following recommendation:

RECOMMENDATION:The Committee recommends that if the previous recommendation is adopted, that the general assembly direct the CFM and COC to prepare a plan to bring all existing relationships into compliance with the revision to Instrument E.4.o.(2)(a), within three years.

*Grounds:*
(1) A transition period is necessary to avoid disruption of existing missions that may not be in compliance.
(2) Three years allows one year for the CFM and COC to derive a two year promotion and solicitation plan to bring existing relationships into compliance.

Analysis:
The Committee notes the following activities that are undertaken presently by the COC and program committees:
Separately: CFM – Telenews, Missionary letters, projects list, prayer cards; CHMCE – Home Missions Today; Church Mission Works brochures; CCE – New Horizons; General Secretaries or representatives of the program committees have held meetings with chairmen and/or representatives of related Presbytery committees.
Unitedly: Thank Offering; In Session; New Horizons (CCE coordinates with other program committees and COC). The CCE presently provides space in every issue for the other program committees and COC to promote the work of their respective programs.

The Committee commends the program committees and COC for these united and separate activities of promotion for the unified development of resources to fund the WWO program of the whole church.

5. Staff

The Committee may employ a Director of Finance and Planned Giving and shall secure such clerical staff as needed to carry out its functions. The Committee may also engage the services of the necessary personnel for the purposes of promoting the work of and developing financial support for Worldwide Outreach. Costs shall be borne by the program committees in proportion to their General Assembly-approved budgets.

Analysis:

These further provisions do not need reworking in themselves. However it does seem that the COC needs to be much more active in seeing to it that good analysis is made of (a) budgeting done by the COC and the program committees, (b) patterns of giving by the churches etc. The COC needs to be more than mostly a receipting and disbursing agency. The COC could look to its Director of Finance and its Staff Accountant for much more direct input for its work.

VIII. FURTHER ANALYSIS

In the review of Instrument E there has been some serious consideration given to the question of whether the COC should be abolished and replaced with a budget committee made up of representatives of the program committees who would propose a combined budget to recommend to the general assembly. If the task of the COC is essentially a budget committee, such a substitute committee would seem to be adequate. The COC has been most successful as a committee in presenting a proposed combined budget to the general assembly. On the other hand, the COC does not seem to have been as successful in accomplishing other tasks assigned to them by Instrument E. There seems to be a good deal more that the COC could and should be doing. The Committee has recognized this and is presenting recommendations that ask the COC to do more. Having assigned tasks, however, does not necessarily mean they will be carried out. Committees generally do not do the work needed to carry out such tasks. They assign tasks and oversee those doing the work. The present staff, serving the COC, is mainly involved in the day-to-day accounting. There is some work done in stewardship seminars and in estate planning, but there is not the overall analysis of the church’s giving and training of church leaders in Christian stewardship. For the COC to accomplish much of what is being proposed and envisioned in the recommendations found in this report, the COC will have to make specific assignments to someone who can gather the data, analyze it, and make recommendations that will prove helpful to the COC and to the church. He will also have to ready to see that adopted polices and plans are carried out on a day-by-day basis.

RECOMMENDATION: That the General Assembly direct the COC to present to the 74th General Assembly a specific set of goals for those things which the COC understands to be
its assigned functions along with an evaluation of how these goals are to be, and are being, accomplished.

**Grounds:**

1. *Instrument E* is so obscure that many in the church probably do not know it exits much less understand how to evaluate what COC does.
2. This will lead the COC to study its mandate and do a self-evaluation of its performance.
3. This will lead the COC to assess and determine what resources are, or may be, required to fulfill its mandate.

IX. **RECOMMENDATIONS** (see Appendix B for *Instrument E* with proposed revisions, where applicable)

1. **RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee recommends that *Standing Rules X.2.i* be revised to read:

   i. The Committee on Coordination shall consist of nine voting members, ministers and ruling elders. Three members shall be elected by the Committees on Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension, one from the membership of each committee; and six members shall be elected by the General Assembly, in three classes consisting of one minister and one ruling elder in each class, who shall be neither members nor employees of these three program committees. The General Secretaries of the three program committees shall be *ex officio* members of the Committee on Coordination without vote.

2. **RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee recommends that *Instrument E.4 d.* and *f* be revised to read:

   d. Obtain and review, yearly, the programs and budgets of the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the WWO programs separately from direct contributions to WWO programs.

   f. Implement a means of seeking annually from each session and/or congregation a statement of a goal for the support of the work of the program committees.

**Grounds:**

1. The removal of the “early in the year” provision gives the COC more flexibility in obtaining this data.
2. This will help the COC and the program committees to plan their promotion and solicitation efforts.

1. This is expected to engage ministers and sessions to promote the programs to their congregations.
2. The program committees are already making plans to engage presbytery promotion to some degree.
3. There will be greater visibility of the total Church effort.
4. This had been done with sessions about sixteen years ago, with a high 59% response rate.
3. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the parenthesis in Instrument E. 4.g. (1) be revised to read (including the costs of the operation of the Committee, the promotion, and solicitation activities of the Committee).

4. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the following be inserted as Instrument E. 4. g. (3) recommendations for combined promotion and solicitation plans for the Assembly’s approval.

5. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the following be inserted as Instrument E. 4. g. (4) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation activities of the past year of the program committees along with that of COC.

6. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the following be inserted as Instrument E. 4. g. (5) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation plans for the ensuing year of the program committees along with that of COC.

7. RECOMMENDATION: That the parenthesis in Instrument E. 3.a. be revised to read (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans).

8. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the parenthesis in Instrument E. 4.c. be revised to read (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans).

9. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E 4. h. be revised by adding the following paragraph [numbering the first paragraph (1)], as h. (2) so that this whole section would be revised to read:

   (1) Inform the churches of the programs (including budgets, promotion and solicitation plans) approved and commended by the General Assembly. (2) Provide the presbyteries and churches with quarterly updates reporting the progress in reaching the approved combined budget of the respective program committees directly to the presbytery clerks, sessions, and pastors via electronic mail (wherever possible).

   Grounds:
   (1) To reflect the recommendation noted above with reference to Instrument E. 4. g.
   (2) To inform the local churches more directly and concretely of the financial needs of the respective program committees.

10. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E 4. i. (1) be revised to read:

   i. (1) Contributions designated for the attainment of the overall approved budget of all the program committees shall be allocated first to the funding of the Committee on Coordination and New Horizons, and then to the program committees in the proportion which each program committee’s budget
bears to their combined budget; checks for this purpose shall be made payable to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” with the notation “Worldwide Outreach.”

11. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.i (4) be deleted, and that E. 4. i.(3) be replaced with the following:

(3) The Committee shall annually report and recommend to the General Assembly how to address any shortfalls in the most recent year’s planned revenues (e.g. designated giving, undesignated giving, and DMS) of any program committee.

*Grounds:*

(1) Maintains the unified and equitable effort that the CAP seeks, by making corrections in subsequent periods.

(2) The argument for the CAP (noted above), favored the CAP provision or “something like it”

(3) The CAP offers potential gaming for giving designated gifts.

(4) The CAP stifles promotion.

(5) Some have argued that the CAP is immoral.

(6) Offers greater visibility to the General Assembly of any shortfalls for each program committee annually.

12. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E.4.i. (5) be deleted and the section renumbered as (4) and be revised to read:

(4) Funds received by bequest or from sources outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees.

13. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E. 4. l. be revised to read:

See to it (1) that each program committee provides to the churches an annual report including finances, and to the General Assembly an annual financial report subjected to a review engagement or an audit engagement by certified public accountants; (2) that each committee provides to the General Assembly its past year’s activities and its current plans for promotion and solicitation of funds.

14. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that Instrument E. 4. o. (2) (a). be revised to read:

(a) A commitment for an initial period of not less than two years to provide the financial support (with at least 50% in any given year being funded by the special relationship and the remainder being provided for as part of Committee on Foreign Mission WWO annual approved budget) for the missionary from sources that are over and above the participant’s regular giving to the Worldwide Outreach combined budget.
Grounds:
(1) To prevent or mitigate significant shortfalls due to special relationships that are severely under-funded in the initial two-year commitment.
(2) Specifying 50% seems reasonable and corresponds to the provision that provides for “an intention for the missionary to concentrate his activities for up to one-half of each furlough period among those with whom the Committee on Foreign Missions has undertaken a special relationship(s) with respect to his work” [E. 4. o. (2) (c)].
(3) Requiring 50% places the mission on a stronger financial plan with less opportunity to jeopardize already existing missions.

15. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that if the previous recommendation is adopted, that the general assembly direct the CFM and COC to prepare a plan to bring all existing relationships into compliance with the revision to Instrument E.4.o.(2)(a), within three years.

Grounds:
(1) A transition period is necessary to avoid disruption of existing missions that may not be in compliance.
(2) Three years allows one year for the CFM and COC to derive a two year promotion and solicitation plan to bring existing relationships into compliance.

16. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the General Assembly direct the COC to present to the 74th General Assembly a specific set of goals for those things which the COC understands to be its assigned functions along with an evaluation of how these goals are to be, and are being, accomplished.

Grounds:
(1) Instrument E is so obscure that many in the church probably do not know it exits much less understand how to evaluate what COC does.
(2) This will lead the COC to study its mandate and do a self-evaluation of its performance.
(3) This will lead the COC to assess and determine what resources are, or may be, required to fulfill its mandate.

17. RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommends that the Special Committee for Financial Review be dissolved.

X. GENERAL ASSEMBLY REPRESENTATIVES

The Committee appointed the Rev. Robert L. Broline Jr., Chairman, and Mr. Bruce A. Stahl, Secretary, as their representatives to the 73rd GA.

* * * * *
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Worldwide Outreach—What, Why, and How
Donald M. Poundstone and Larry Wilson
The Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC) encourages each of its members and congregations to offer the Lord ongoing prayer for, and financial support of, Worldwide Outreach. Each November, the OPC encourages a denomination-wide special offering—the Thank Offering—to help support Worldwide Outreach. But what is Worldwide Outreach? Why do we support it?

What Is Worldwide Outreach?

Worldwide Outreach is part of our response—on the denominational level—to our Lord’s Great Commission: “And Jesus came and said to them, ‘All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age’” (Matt. 28:18–20). The heart of King Jesus’ marching orders to his church is that she makes disciples. The church corporately pursues her mandate by going, baptizing, and teaching. She goes by sending preachers (Rom. 10:13–17) and helpers. She baptizes converts into the church (Acts 2:41–42, 47; cf. 1 Cor. 12:13). This implies, by definition, that she must plant and build up churches. And since our Lord wants disciples (and not just “decisions”), an integral part of her mission program is providing resources in order to help train and nurture them.

The OPC is committed to fully pursuing our Savior’s mandate. One of the ways we do that is by means of our “combined budget,” which is set each year by our General Assembly. We have a full-orbed ministry that we call “Worldwide Outreach.” Worldwide Outreach is a three-dimensional ministry; it is spearheaded by three distinct program committees—Foreign Missions, Home Missions, and Christian Education. The General Assembly elects the members of each committee and holds each committee accountable. Each committee has a small staff to help implement its ministry. We join as fellow workers in participating in this full-orbed mission program by praying for and giving to Worldwide Outreach.

How Does This Work?

When your church sends money to the Worldwide Outreach ministry of the OPC, what happens to it? The Committee on Coordination (COC) divides it among the various program committees. The General Assembly established COC to support its Worldwide Outreach program. COC distributes contributions according to percentages that the General Assembly has previously set. Each year the General Assembly reevaluates and approves new percentages.

Let’s trace the path of a dollar donated to Worldwide Outreach according to this year’s percentages. The General Assembly mandates that both COC and New Horizons be funded “off the top.” That means that each month COC and New Horizons receive 1/12 of their annual approved budget. This assures both COC and New Horizons of adequate funding. The reason for this is that both are support ministries for the other ministries, and each has relatively fixed ongoing expenses. COC handles finances, does administration, and helps promote the Worldwide Outreach ministry of the church. Even though New Horizons is a ministry of the Committee on Christian Education, it also serves
the other committees. It exists to propagate the Reformed faith and to keep people informed of the OPC’s ministries and the needs of its program committees.

If giving matches the budget, COC would receive 11 cents of each dollar donated to Worldwide Outreach, and New Horizons would receive 8 cents. COC would then divide the remaining 81 cents of the dollar among the three program committees. It would dispense 36 cents to the Committee on Foreign Missions, which uses the money to serve the OPC in its ministry of sending missionaries around the world to preach the gospel of the kingdom. It would give 34 cents to the Committee on Home Missions, so that it can help OP presbyteries plant biblically Reformed churches throughout North America. And it would assign the Committee on Christian Education the final 11 cents, to use the money to provide biblically Reformed resources and training to help equip members, officers, ministers, and prospective ministers to serve the OPC in its mission of making disciples.

It sounds relatively simple. But what if giving to Worldwide Outreach falls short of the budget? (That happens all too often.) What if contributors designate their gifts just to one committee or just to a favorite cause? (That often happens, too.) Those contributions are of course received and their specific intentions are honored. But how do they affect the combined budget?

Suppose that enough churches and individuals designate gifts to Foreign Missions that it reaches its total annual budget by November. When COC divides the next undesignated dollar, Coordination and New Horizons will get their regular amounts. However, Foreign Missions will have to wait for additional funding out of undesignated giving until the other committees meet their budgets. COC will divide the remaining funds between Home Missions and Christian Education until they reach their budgets, too. The General Assembly has adopted rules or “instruments” for itself, and this procedure is prescribed in the General Assembly’s “Instrument E.” It is nicknamed “the cap.” “The cap” is designed to help all the committees advance together financially, so that the full-orbed mission program of the Church is not crippled. Once everyone has met their budget, any remaining giving to Worldwide Outreach is distributed to the three program committees according to the same percentages as before.

Why Do We Do This?

The OPC does this in order to submit to biblical principles. First, our Lord gives us a full-orbed Great Commission, which involves preaching the gospel, planting churches, and training disciples in the whole counsel of God. Second, our Lord calls us to do all things decently and in order (1 Cor. 14:40). Third, when the Holy Spirit, speaking through the apostle Paul, appealed to the Corinthians for gifts to relieve distressed believers in Jerusalem, he stressed a concern for all parts of the body of Christ: “I do not mean that others should be eased and you burdened, but that as a matter of fairness your abundance at the present time should supply their need, so that their abundance may supply your need, that there may be fairness” (2 Cor. 8:13–14). The combined budget, including “the cap,” is intended to sustain each of our ministries so they can reinforce each other as we pursue the entirety of our Lord’s Great Commission as a church.

The OPC always honors the wishes of donors to support particular missionaries or ministries that are close to their heart. Instrument E says that
designated contributions are to be “allocated to the causes designated by the donors.” At the same time—given the importance of the church, given the oneness of the body of Christ, given the responsibility and authority of the officers of the church, given the full scope of the Great Commission, and given the importance of doing things decently and in order—it is desirable that individuals give through their local churches. And it is desirable that local churches support the ministries of Worldwide Outreach as a whole.

What Is the Thank Offering?

In addition to this ongoing support of Worldwide Outreach by the churches, the OPC encourages a denomination-wide special offering each November—called the Thank Offering—to help support Foreign Missions, Home Missions, and Christian Education. The Thank Offering began years ago to give an added boost to our ministries (beyond the budget). But the Lord so prospered it, and it proved to be such a blessing to the church, that the General Assembly decided to make it an annual event. It really does help the committees to be able to make a strong start in their ministries as a new year begins. Local churches also find it to be a great opportunity for mission and outreach emphasis and education.

Each year, the churches in the OPC contribute to Worldwide Outreach. That is each congregation’s “regular giving.” The Thank Offering is intended to be “special giving,” voluntarily donated over and above that amount, to encourage and enable the expansion of ministries. Regrettably, however, regular giving has often lagged behind budget, turning the Thank Offering into a “catch-up” offering, but ideally this would not be so. When Thank Offering gifts are sent in, COC distributes them according to the same General Assembly–set formula described above.

Spiritual Fruit

We don’t usually think of money as spiritual “fruit.” But in Romans 15:28, the Holy Spirit uses that very word. Paul writes that he has collected money from Gentile converts to help their impoverished brethren in Jerusalem, and that after he has “made sure that they have received this fruit” (niv), he hopes to visit Rome. Jesus Christ rescued these Gentiles, these wild olive branches, and grafted them into his church, the good olive tree. Vitally united to Christ, they bore fruit by his grace—including the fruit of generous giving.

You see, when the Lord converts someone’s heart, he converts his wallet, too. The money Paul carried to Jerusalem was a fruit of Christ’s triumph by his Word and Spirit in the hearts of these Gentiles to whom Paul preached. It truly was a “thank offering.”

Paul was deeply concerned to make sure that he delivered the money safely and promptly. It was the Lord’s money; handling it was a grave spiritual responsibility. The apostle Paul took it very seriously. Similarly, faithful servants of God today will handle God’s money efficiently and responsibly, as the apostle did. Church treasurers really help the ministries of the church when they send in their congregation’s Worldwide Outreach support in a timely manner. They really help the ministries of the church when they send in the Thank Offering funds for the year by early December. This faithful service, too, is a “thank offering.”
God’s Word is going forth today—to our covenant children, to our own continent, and to all the nations. God is using Worldwide Outreach as a vital component of his work of gathering his elect and building his church. How can we be anything but generous for the sake of the One who has saved us?

The Rev. Donald M. Poundstone, regional home missionary for the Presbytery of Southern California, is a former member of the Committee on Coordination. The Rev. Larry E. Wilson, a church planter in Indianapolis, Ind., was until recently the general secretary of the Committee on Christian Education.

Reprinted with permission from New Horizons, April 2004. (Available on the OPC Webpage)

Appendix B
Instrument E – with Proposed Revisions

E. COORDINATING THE PROGRAMS OF WITNESS AND EDIFICATION

1. PURPOSE
There shall be a Committee on Coordination whose primary purpose shall be to recommend to the General Assembly a combined budget for the three program committees (Christian Education, Foreign Missions, and Home Missions and Church Extension) for the succeeding year so as to help the Church maximize the use of its resources for the fulfillment of its tasks, to support the ministry of the pastors and sessions in their responsibility to teach and encourage the practice of biblical stewardship in the church, and to help coordinate the promotion of the work of the three program committees in the development of support for their work.

2. STRUCTURE
The Committee shall consist of (a) one member each of the three worldwide outreach program committees above, elected by his representative committee; (b) six members at large, elected by the General Assembly (see Standing Rule X. 2); and (c) the General Secretaries of the three program committees as ex officio members without vote.

3. FUNCTIONS
The Committee shall seek to develop the financial support needed to achieve the short- and long-range goals set by the program committees.

To this end its functions shall include:
   a. reviewing the program (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans) desired by each program committee each year;
   b. recommending a combined budget for the program committees for submission annually to the General Assembly for its commendation and approval, and to the sessions and churches for their commendation and support;
   c. arranging for the orderly receiving and accounting of funds for the program committees;
   d. approving guidelines for promotion of the work and for development of support;
   e. developing and preparing programs to encourage the practices of good stewardship;
   f. acting as fiscal agent for the General Assembly in receiving, disbursing, and keeping account of receipts and disbursements of the General Assembly
Appendix

Operation Fund and making monthly reports to the Stated Clerk and the Trustees of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

4. OPERATION

The method of operation to carry out the functions of the Committee shall be these or similar activities:

a. Elect its officers annually.

b. Meet at least two times a year.

c. Review, early in each year, the programs (including budgets, promotion, and solicitation plans) desired by each program committee for the ensuing year.

d. Obtain and review, yearly, the programs and budgets of the congregations and presbyteries that have the effect of supplementing the WWO programs separately from direct contributions to WWO programs.

e. Recommend to the next General Assembly a combined budget for the succeeding year reflecting the committee’s judgment as to the most desirable apportionment of the anticipated resources of the church.

f. Implement a means of seeking annually from each session and/or congregation a statement of a goal for the support of the work of the program committees.

g. Report annually to the General Assembly. The report shall include (1) information concerning the Committee’s work (including the costs of the operation of the Committee, and the promotion and solicitation activities of the Committee); (2) recommendations for a combined budget for the program committees for the Assembly’s approval and commendation to the churches for their support; (3) recommendations for combined promotion and solicitation plans for the Assembly’s approval; (4) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation activities of the past year of the program committees along with that of COC; and, (5) a compilation of the promotion and solicitation plans for the ensuing year of the program committees along with that of COC.

h. (1) Inform the churches of the programs (including budgets, promotion and solicitation plans) approved and commended by the General Assembly; and (2) provide the churches with quarterly updates reporting the progress in reaching the approved combined budget of the respective program committees directly to the sessions and pastors via electronic mail (wherever possible).

i. (1) Contributions designated for the attainment of the approved budgets of all the program committees shall be allocated first to the funding of the Committee on Coordination and New Horizons, and then to each program committee in the proportion which each program committee’s budget bears to the total budget; checks for this purpose shall be made payable to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” with the notation “Worldwide Outreach.”

(2) Other designated contributions shall be allocated to the causes designated by the donors.

(3) The Committee shall annually report and recommend to the General Assembly how to address any shortfalls in the most recent year’s planned revenues (e.g. designated giving, undesignated giving, and direct missionary support) of any program committee.

(4) Funds received by bequest or from sources outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees.
j. Arrange for the receiving of a Thank Offering each year for the worldwide outreach of the program committees.

k. Establish guidelines for promotion of and development of support for the work of the program committees, unitedly and separately, keeping the Church informed with regard to the progress and opportunities of their work.

l. See to it (1) that each program committee provides to the churches an annual report, including finances, and to the General Assembly an annual financial report subjected to a review engagement or an audit engagement by certified public accountants; and (2) that each committee provides to the General Assembly its past year’s activities and its current plans for promotion and solicitation of funds.

m. Encourage the enlargement of the work of the program committees and the procurement of support from individuals through both current and deferred giving, and from churches outside the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

n. Provide counsel, assistance, and literature aimed at increasing the commitment of each member in the use of his means, time, and talents in the work of Christ’s kingdom.

o. The purpose of this paragraph is to provide flexibility in the funding of support for new missionaries being sent to new foreign missions works, to promote closer ties of such missionaries with existing congregations, and to foster greater interest in the pursuit of foreign missions within the church as a whole.

1. The Committee on Foreign Missions may, with the approval of the Committee on Coordination, undertake a special relationship with one or more session(s) or presbytery(s) (“the participant”) with respect to a missionary being sent to labor in a new foreign missions work.

2. The contemplated special relationship includes:

   a. A commitment for an initial period of not less than two years to provide the financial support (with at least 50% in any given year being funded by the special relationship and the remainder being provided for as part of Committee on Foreign Mission WWO annual approved budget) for the missionary from sources that are over and above the participant’s regular giving to the Worldwide Outreach combined budget;

   b. The establishment of a committee by the participant to actively promote the work (and the “over and above” support therefore) of the missionary, to serve as the liaison between the participant and the Committee on Foreign Missions, and to be available for consultation and encouragement as major decisions are taken regarding that work;

   c. An intention for the missionary to concentrate his activities for up to one-half of each furlough period among those with whom the Committee on Foreign Missions has undertaken a special relationship(s) with respect to his work; and

   d. A review of each special relationship every five years by the Committee on Coordination to ascertain whether it is then possible to include support for the missionary within the Worldwide Outreach combined budget (which is the desired objective).

3. The following rules shall apply:

   a. Prior to seeking the approval of the Committee on Coordination under (1) above, the Committee on Foreign Missions shall certify that its current financial position is such that additional funding (beyond its
portion of the Worldwide Outreach combined budget) must be developed in order to support the missionary through his first term of service;
  (b) The term, “new foreign missions work,” refers to a foreign mission field to which the Committee on Foreign Missions has been sending (without interruption) missionary evangelists for ten or fewer years;
  (c) Discussions regarding the undertaking of a special relationship may be initiated by either the Committee on Foreign Missions or by one or more sessions or presbyteries;
  (d) Funds received for the support of missionaries approved under (1) above shall not be reckoned as contributing to the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches for the approved budgets of the program committees;
  (e) After its approval by the Committee on Coordination, the special relationship shall commence at a mutually agreeable date; and
  (f) All special relationships under this paragraph shall be reported to the General Assembly annually.

p. Champion and coordinate the promotion and development work of the Committee on Coordination and the three program committees.

5. Staff
The Committee may employ a Director of Finance and Planned Giving and shall secure such clerical staff as needed to carry out its functions. The Committee may also engage the services of the necessary personnel for the purposes of promoting the work of and developing financial support for Worldwide Outreach. Costs shall be borne by the program committees in proportion to their General Assembly-approved budgets.

Appendix C: Promotional Guidelines for the [WWO Program] Committees

PROMOTIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMITTEES ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, FOREIGN MISSIONS, AND HOME MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION

1. Advertising
   a. Purposes. The purposes of advertising the program committees’ activities to the churches are to:
      (1) Enable them to praise the Lord for His specific faithfulness and goodness to us;
      (2) Enable them to pray intelligently and specifically for particular activities of the committees;
      (3) Encourage the churches in their own local works;
      (4) Inform the churches of ways in which they can participate (including financially) in the committee’s activities;
      (5) Instruct the churches in Biblical principles of stewardship; and
      (6) Discharge, in part, the committees’ responsibility to report their activities to the churches.
   b. Guidelines
      (1) All advertising shall be done in a manner designed to give the glory to God.
      (2) Every effort shall be made to ensure the truthfulness and completeness of all representations made.
(3) Efforts shall be made to achieve a balance in presenting the various aspects of the featured activities in each piece of advertising; the financial aspects shall not be unduly emphasized.

(4) Whenever possible, advertising shall present specific prayer requests for the needs of the activity being featured.

(5) Proper vehicles for advertising the activities of the program committees include (but are not limited to) New Horizons, bulletin inserts, visits to the presbyteries and congregations by members of the committees’ staff and missionaries, audio-visual presentations and recorded telephone messages.

(6) Each of the three program committees shall be encouraged to promote, both unitedly and separately, its own work, as part of Worldwide Outreach, to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

(7) The laying of specific financial needs before the churches shall be done in such a manner as to promote giving to the church as a whole rather than by designated giving to a particular committee or activity of such committee.

2. Solicitation Guidelines

a. As the bringing of tithes and offerings is a proper part of corporate worship, members and adherents of OPC congregations shall be encouraged to give towards the support of activities of the program committees through the budgetary processes of their local congregation.

b. Direct mail solicitation. Individual members and/or adherents of OPC congregations shall not be sent direct mail solicitations for funds to support the activities of the program committees.

(1) Exceptions

(a) Direct mail solicitations may be made for purposes specifically authorized by the General Assembly.

(b) Direct mail solicitations may be made in an emergency situation (as determined by the Committee on Coordination and reported to the next General Assembly).

(c) General and specific financial needs for the support of the activities of the program committees may be described in New Horizons (which is mailed directly to the residences of members and adherents), and in bulletin inserts and similar materials mailed to local congregations at their church address.

(d) A return envelope may be included in the same mailing which contains a receipt issued in response to a designated gift.

(2) Return envelope inscription: any return envelope included in a mailing described in (l)(c) or (d) above shall bear the inscription, “If you are currently worshipping with an OPC congregation, please place this envelope in the local offering; otherwise please mail” and be addressed to “The Orthodox Presbyterian Church” or “Worldwide Outreach.”

(3) Definition. For purpose of these guidelines, a ‘direct mail solicitation’ is defined to mean a communication sent through the mail to the residences of the members and/or adherents of OPC congregations which either:

(a) specifically requests funds to support an activity or activities of a program committee; or

(b) includes a return envelope.

(Minutes of the 53rd [1986] General Assembly, Articles 84–85, pages 19–20 and 149–150. The Promotional Guidelines were later amended by inserting a new paragraph 1.b.(6) and renumbering the succeeding paragraphs accordingly, see Minutes of the 71st [2004] General Assembly, Articles 62 [rec. 3] and 64, pages 17–19 and 179–180.)
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I THE COMMITTEE

A. Meetings

The Committee met three times during the past year, once in conjunction with the meeting of the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel (PRJC) and twice by telephone conference call. The regular was held 23 February
2006 at the Crowne Plaza Atlanta Airport in Atlanta, Georgia. Mr. Robert M. Coie (class of 2008), Mr. Richard M. Dickerson (class of 2006) and Mr. Robert B. Needham (class of 2007) were present in Atlanta. Mr. Gordon E. Kauffman (class of 2008) was absent. The telephone meetings were held on 29 June 2005 with all members present, and 16 March 2006 with all members present except Mr. Dickinson. Mr. Coie, Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Needham were elected to serve as commissioners to the PRJC. In the absence of Mr. Kauffman from the PRJC meeting, Mr. Dickinson, who had originally come as an observer, served in Mr. Kauffman’s place.

B. Officers

Mr. Needham served as chairman for the entire year. From 29 June 2005 until the 23 February 2006 meeting, Mr. Coie served as vice chairman and Mr. Kauffman as secretary. Beginning 23 February 2006, Mr. Kauffman served as vice chairman and Mr. Coie as secretary.

II ROLL OF CHAPLAINS

As of 23 February 2006, the PRJC endorses thirteen Orthodox Presbyterian chaplains serving on active duty, four serving in the Reserves or National Guard, and six serving as chaplains outside the Department of Defense along with two military chaplain candidates.

A. Endorsed Chaplains Serving on Active Duty and their Presbyteries:

CH (CPT) Paul T. Berghaus, USA Midwest
CH (CPT) David A. Bottoms, USAR Philadelphia
LT John A. Carter, CHC, USN Southern California
CH (LTC) Jonathan C. Gibbs III, USA Philadelphia
CH (1st. Lt.) C. Phillip Hollstein III, USAF Southern California
CH (Capt.) Cornelius Johnson, USAF New Jersey
CH (LTC-P) Chester H. Lanius, USA Central US
LCDR Timothy J. Power, CHC, USN Southern California
CH (CPT) David J. Stevenson, USAR Philadelphia
CH (MAJ) Earl W. Vanderhoff, USAR Northwest
CAPT Bryan J. Weaver, CHC, USN Ohio
CH (LTC) Christopher H. Wisdom, USA Southwest

B. Endorsed Chaplains Serving with Reserve Status on Active Duty and his Presbytery:

CH (Lt. Col.) Richard M. Dickinson, MaineAirNG NY and New England

C. Endorsed Chaplains Serving in Active Reserves or National Guard and their Presbyteries:

The Rev. William B. Acker, CAPT, CHC, USN Midwest
The Rev. Graham Harbman, MAJ, NJARNG Philadelphia
The Rev. Douglas M. Withington, CDR, CHC, USN Southeast
The Rev. James A. Zozzaro, CPT, NJARNG New Jersey
D. Endorsed Chaplains Serving Outside the Department of Defense:

The Rev. Gordon H. Cook, Jr., MidCoast Hospital, Brunswick ME
The Rev. Martin L. Dawson, Sr., Police Department, Stratford NJ
The Rev. Edward S. S. Huntington, Civil Air Patrol, Mandan ND
The Rev. Robert B. Needham, Sheriff’s Department, Kings County CA
The Rev. Richard A. Shaw, Spring House Estates Retirement Community, Lower Gwynedd PA
The Rev. Jack K. Unangst, Chaplain Coordinator, Veterans Administration Medical Center, Prescott AZ

E. Unendorsed Civilian Chaplains

The Rev. Steven L. Phillips, Quarryville Presbyterian Home, Quarryville PA
The Rev. Ralph A. Rebandt II, Farmington Hills Police Dept., Farmington MI

F. Retired Chaplains

The Rev. Robert B. Needham, CDR, CHC, USN Ret.
The Rev. Stephen L. Parker, LCDR, CHC, USNR Ret.

G. Candidates for Endorsement as Military Chaplains:

1LT Kenneth W. Honken, USAR Michigan and Ontario
2nd. Lt. Benjamin W. Johnson, USAFR Michigan and Ontario

Note: Any teaching elder currently serving as a chaplain but not included in the Roll of Chaplains above is requested to contact the Secretary of Standing Committee on Chaplains and Military Personnel.

III FINANCES

A. Contributions and Budget


B. PRJC Rates Assessed

The PRJC assesses endorsed paid chaplains at the following rates:

1. Military active duty chaplains pay $25 per month, ranks 0-3 and below; $30 per month, ranks 0-4 and above
2. Active Reserve and National Guard chaplains pay $15 per month
3. Inactive Reserve chaplains pay $5 per month
4. Hospital chaplains pay $25 per month
5. Full-time Veterans Administration and Prison chaplains pay $25 per month
6. Part-time chaplains pay $15 per month
IV. MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS AND ISSUES

A. PRJC Elections

The following members were elected or re-elected to one-year terms on the PRJC:
1. Mr. James C. Pakala (PCA), Chairman
2. Mr. Jerry O’Neill (RPCNA), Vice-Chairman
3. Mr. Gordon E. Kauffman (OPC), Secretary
4. Mr. Robert B. Needham (OPC), member of the Issues and Concerns Committee
5. Mr. Robert M. Coie (OPC) served as Secretary pro tem

B. Response to the Air Force Revised Interim Guidelines

The PRJC responded to the U. S. Air Force Interim Guidelines to Chaplains and Military Personnel in November 2005, and also to the new Revised Interim Guidelines Concerning Free Exercise of Religion in the Air Force (dated 9 February 2006) at the annual meeting. The later effort is set forth below in the context of the Air Force document:

[Original document without Air Force logo, spacing slightly modified, italics in original]

REVISED INTERIM GUIDELINES
CONCERNING FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION IN THE AIR FORCE

WE ARE SWORN TO SUPPORT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. IN TAKING OUR OATH WE PLEDGE OUR PERSONAL COMMITMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION’S PROTECTIONS FOR FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION AND ITS PROHIBITION AGAINST GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION.

WE WILL REMAIN OFFICIALLY NEUTRAL REGARDING RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, NEITHER OFFICIALLY ENDORSING NOR DISAPPROVING ANY FAITH BELIEF OR ABSENCE OF BELIEF. WE WILL ACCOMMODATE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION AND OTHER PERSONAL BELIEFS, AS WELL AS FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION, EXCEPT AS MUST BE LIMITED BY COMPPELLING MILITARY NECESSITY (WITH SUCH LIMITATIONS BEING IMPOSED IN THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MANNER FEASIBLE). COMMANDERS SHOULD ENSURE THAT REQUESTS FOR RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION ARE WELCOMED AND DEALT WITH AS FAIRLY AND CONSISTENTLY AS PRACTICABLE THROUGHOUT THEIR COMMANDS. THEY SHOULD BE APPROVED UNLESS APPROVAL WOULD HAVE A REAL, NOT HYPOTHETICAL, ADVERSE IMPACT ON MILITARY READINESS, UNIT COHESION, STANDARDS, OR DISCIPLINE. AVOIDANCE OF SCHEDULE CONFLICTS BETWEEN OFFICIAL ACTIVITIES AND RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES CAN ENHANCE UNIT EFFECTIVENESS AND DEMONSTRATE MUTUAL RESPECT.
CHAPLAIN SERVICE PROGRAMS ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF COMMANDERS. CHAPLAINS IMPARTIALLY ADVISE COMMANDERS IN REGARD TO FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION, AND IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS OF RELIGIOUS SUPPORT AND PASTORAL CARE TO HELP COMMANDERS CARE FOR ALL THEIR PEOPLE, INCLUDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR FREE EXERCISE OF INDIVIDUAL BELIEFS. WE WILL RESPECT THE RIGHTS OF CHAPLAINS TO ADHERE TO THE TENETS OF THEIR RELIGIOUS FAITHS AND THEY WILL NOT BE REQUIRED TO PARTICIPATE IN RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING PUBLIC PRAYER, INCONSISTENT WITH THEIR FAITHS.

LEADERS AT EVERY LEVEL BEAR A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY TO ENSURE THEIR WORDS AND ACTIONS CANNOT REASONABLY BE CONSTRUED TO BE OFFICIALLY ENDORSING NOR DISAPPROVING ANY FAITH BELIEF OR ABSENCE OF BELIEF. IN OFFICIAL CIRCUMSTANCES OR WHEN SUPERIOR/SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIPS ARE INVOLVED, SUPERIORS NEED TO BE SENSITIVE TO THE POTENTIAL THAT PERSONAL EXPRESSIONS MAY APPEAR TO BE OFFICIAL, OR HAVE UNDUE INFLUENCE ON THEIR SUBORDINATES. SUBJECT TO THESE SENSITIVITIES, SUPERIORS ENJOY THE SAME FREE EXERCISE RIGHTS AS ALL OTHER AIRMEN.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION IN WORSHIP, PRAYER, STUDY, AND DISCUSSION IS INTEGRAL TO THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION. NOTHING IN THIS GUIDANCE SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD TO LIMIT THE SUBSTANCE OF VOLUNTARY DISCUSSIONS OF RELIGION, OR THE EXERCISE OF FREE SPEECH, WHERE IT IS REASONABLY CLEAR THAT THE DISCUSSIONS ARE PERSONAL, NOT OFFICIAL, AND THEY CAN BE REASONABLY FREE OF THE POTENTIAL FOR, OR APPEARANCE OF, COERCION.

PUBLIC PRAYER SHOULD NOT IMPLY GOVERNMENT ENDORSEMENT OF RELIGION AND SHOULD NOT USUALLY BE A PART OF ROUTINE OFFICIAL BUSINESS. MUTUAL RESPECT AND COMMON SENSE SHOULD ALWAYS BE APPLIED, INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND THE NEEDS OF THE COMMAND. FURTHER, NON-DENOMINATIONAL, INCLUSIVE PRAYER OR A MOMENT OF SILENCE MAY BE APPROPRIATE FOR MILITARY CEREMONIES OR EVENTS OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE WHEN ITS PRIMARY PURPOSE IS NOT THE ADVANCEMENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS. MILITARY CHAPLAINS ARE TRAINED IN THESE MATTERS.

GENERAL RULES REGARDING USE OF GOVERNMENT COMPUTERS APPLY TO PERSONAL RELIGIOUS MATTERS AS THEY DO FOR OTHER PERSONAL MATTERS. CHAPLAIN PROGRAMS WILL RECEIVE COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT AS WOULD COMPARABLE STAFF ACTIVITIES.
THESE GUIDELINES ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY OF COMMANDERS TO MAINTAIN GOOD ORDER AND DISCIPLINE, AND ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE CORE VALUES OF THE AIR FORCE: INTEGRITY FIRST; SERVICE BEFORE SELF; AND EXCELLENCE IN ALL WE DO.

Recommendations from the PRJC
To the Air Force Revised Interim Guidelines

I. Recommended change to paragraph 2, first sentence
“...neither officially endorsing nor disapproving any system of belief.”

Justification: If religion can be defined as “Any system of belief to which one or more individual gives his or her first adherence”, then an atheist is properly understood as “religious”. In other words, the term “non-religious” is an oxymoron.

II. Recommended change to paragraph 3, last sentence
“...we will respect the rights of a chaplain to adhere to the tenets of his religious faith, and without any personal or professional adverse consequences, he will not be required to participate in any religious activities inconsistent with his faith, including public prayer.”

Justification: In this situation, explicit prohibition of negative or punitive personal or professional consequences is so important that it ought not to be assumed as recognized.

III. Recommended change to paragraph 4, first sentence
“Leaders at every level bear a special responsibility to make every reasonable effort to avoid language or actions which could be construed as officially endorsing, or disapproving of any belief system.”

Justification: No leader ever has the actual power to “ensure” what others will “construe” in their thinking.

IV. Recommended change to paragraph 4, last sentence
“Subject to these constraints, superiors and chaplains enjoy the same free exercise rights as all other enlisted and commissioned personnel.”

Justification: The obvious exclusion of chaplains from the wording of this critical protection is unwarranted, and otherwise could be construed as excluding them from that general constitutional protection.

V. Recommended change to paragraph 6, first sentence
“Public prayer should not be offered in a manner implying government endorsement of any belief system, and while not being a required part of routine
official business, should neither be forbidden, but left to the discretion of the presiding senior officer.

   Justification: The way the sentence is presently worded could be argued as prohibiting prayer at a public meeting except in the most extreme or unusual circumstances.

VI. Recommended change to paragraph 6, second sentence

   “Reasonable sensitivity and mutual respect are expected of leaders in considering unusual circumstances and needs of the command”

   Justification: “Common sense” is an elusive concept, difficult to define, and even more difficult to enforce, thus constituting an unrealistic obligation.

VII. Recommended change to paragraph 6, sentence three

   “While non-denominational, inclusive prayer or a moment of silence may be regarded by some as appropriate for military ceremonies, or events of special importance not undertaken for the advancement of religious beliefs, this expectation may not be construed as forbidding any phrasing of a prayer by a chaplain who believes that such phrasing is necessary in order to be faithful to his ordination vows.”

   Justification: This third sentence, as it is presently worded, is the most ominous with respect to free exercise because of what it does NOT say. This proposed revision protects the right of every chaplain to conduct the ministry of requested public prayer in accordance with these ordination vows.

C. PRJC Code of Ethics

   The PRJC adopted the following Code of Ethics:

   **CODE OF ETHICS FOR PRJC-ENDORSED CHAPLAINS**

   Whereas Jesus Christ, the Head of His Church, has ordained His body to be His primary instrument through which He carries out His messianic, saving and sanctifying ministry to people,

   **PURPOSE**

   We, the Presbyterian and Reformed Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel (PRJC), representing the churches of our respective member denominations (the PCA, the OPC, and the RPCNA) are committed to endorsing only well-qualified chaplains for military, police, hospital, Veterans Administration, prison, industrial and other institutional chaplaincy ministries. Therefore, we are unequivocally committed to maintaining, by relying on God’s sanctifying grace, only the highest standards of chaplain selection, oversight and endorsing accountabilities.
In seeking energetically to maintain a demonstrable and credible commitment to a realistic code of ethics, in support of the above stated purpose, we, the members of the Commission, subscribe to the following specific obligations, and further will require any chaplain we endorse to subscribe, confessing our conscious reliance on God’s enabling grace to do so.

**OBLIGATIONS**

1. To uphold carefully and ethically, without mental reservation, the biblical truths, doctrinal and confessional distinctives, policies and practices of our ordaining and endorsing denominations as represented through the PRJC.

2. To abide by all the requirements for ministry of the institution(s) seeking the ministry services of a PRJC-endorsed chaplain, unless one or more of those requirements is plainly in contradiction to the word of God and the confessional standards of the chaplain’s endorsing church. In that unlikely but possible eventuality, we commit to a wholehearted effort to resolve the difference(s) through the process of humble, respectful and biblical discussion.

3. To require our endorsed Chaplains to provide ministry to all those whom they are called to serve, which is in accord with biblical standards of kindness, confidentiality, humility, and ethical regard for those recipients.

4. To respect and uphold the ethical and constitutional right of other endorsers and their respective chaplains, to maintain and express their doctrinal distinctives and ecclesiological practices. At the same time we thereby do not agree or imply any willingness, overtly or covertly, to deny or otherwise suppress the free and appropriate expression of our own distinctives, of which offering prayer in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is a case in point.

5. To encourage our own (and other non-PRJC endorsed chaplains) to provide the maximum of cooperative ministry without any covert or overt pressure on our own, or other chaplains, to compromise their conscience. At the same time, we are committed to respecting those distinctives which make a cooperative ministry possible.

6. To seek actively the grace of God, in order to engage in all relevant aspects of endorsement, approval, and oversight of PRJC chaplains in their pastoral ministry, in accordance with recognized standards for a genuinely godly personal conduct in all matters public and private.

**D. PRJC Paper, Praying in Jesus’ Name**

The PRJC adopted the following paper, *Praying in Jesus’ Name* and sent it to all the service Chiefs of Chaplains with accompanying petitions:

**PRAYING IN JESUS’ NAME**

1. Current Situation
Today, as never before in our nation’s history, there are contentious issues related to the free exercise of religion and the protection of individual civil liberties that challenge United States military chaplains in the conduct of their ministry to members of the Armed Forces.

One high profile issue is the liberty to pray in Jesus’ name, in public, non-sectarian settings, and without illegitimate pressures to refrain from doing so, both from within and without the uniformed services. The most common source of those unconstitutional pressures has been some senior chaplains and senior commanders who are fearful of offending others.

The secular settings in which these pressures are growing are settings of religious and cultural diversity commonly referred to as pluralism.

It should be noted that in the context of worship services, conducted in any military setting, the use of Jesus’ name in prayers is seldom an issue.

II. Historical Background

Congress established the military chaplaincy to protect the rights of uniformed Americans in the free exercise of their religion in environments where that exercise would otherwise be impossible or extremely difficult. It is no accident that the first amendment to our Constitution addresses the principle that the government may not establish any religion.

From the beginning of the military chaplaincy it was understood that the chaplaincy services necessarily included chaplains endorsed by different ecclesiastical bodies. Further, the providential circumstances of remote and/or combat environments required chaplains to provide ministry to those from religious traditions and communities other than their own. It was understood that such ministry was to be offered graciously, respecting the right of recipients to believe differently than the chaplain himself.

Well before the war of independence, the practice of offering public prayer in non-sectarian environments was a well-established practice. Prayer was commonly offered in local governmental meetings, school classrooms, civic memorial services, and even in Congress itself. For nearly two centuries, few saw this strong tradition of public prayer as a problem, so it was seldom addressed or challenged. In recent decades, that relatively benign situation has changed. Multiple lawsuits and court challenges became a major strategy for those who objected to public prayer at non-sectarian events.

III. Discussion

This development generated a growing debate and conflict when a chaplain was invited to offer public prayer, and did so “in the name of Jesus Christ.” The reason this is so contentious is that many non-Christians, and even some churchgoers, rightly regard this phrase as implying that all religions which do not specifically highlight the exclusivity of Jesus Christ as the only way of salvation, are therefore, “wrong.” In this, they are eminently correct, from the
perspective of those who hold to the Bible as God’s inspired Word, and as revealing salvation in Jesus Christ alone. Admittedly, that truth, however circumspectly avoided in direct statement by a discerning chaplain in the wording of his public prayer, in today’s politically correct climate, is to invite attack, and, for chaplains, possibly cause damage to their careers.

Where the debate becomes murkier is in the widespread notion that chaplains, offering prayer at public events, should suppress the specific mention of Jesus’ name and use generic nomenclature to refer to God. That the specific understanding and intent of a rabbi or imam who would so use their respective traditional names for their god is of no offense to those of anti-Christian bias is scarcely surprising, even though adherents of those faiths also believe theirs is the only true way to Heaven. In the name of “pluralism” chaplains are often pressured by supervisors to restrict the expression of their Christocentric focus and commitment.

Yet, from a constitutional perspective, no governmental entity has the legal authority to tell a chaplain offering prayer, in a public ceremony, what the content of his prayers will be. To do so violates the stringent restrictions on our government to establish a religion of any sort. Governmental attempts at any level to restrict the content of any chaplains’ prayer constitute an effort to establish a generic religion, supposedly devoid of theological offense.

In sum, many Christians believe their entire faith and system of belief center in the person, and finished work, of Jesus Christ, of which one of many expressions is offering prayer in His name. Further, for some Christians, refraining from that obedience in such a circumstance constitutes betrayal of their Savior. Nevertheless, recognizing the diversity of an audience in a public setting, we counsel thoughtful language in the use of Jesus’ name (e.g., “I pray in Jesus’ name” versus “we pray ...” and prefacing public prayer with a statement such as: “I am a Christian Chaplain, and am praying in accordance with my Christian faith”). Thus, chaplains and their endorsing bodies, have a spiritual and constitutional duty, to insist that they not be censored for the use of the name of Jesus Christ in public prayer.

IV. Recommendations

1. That the PRJC petition the service Chiefs of Chaplains to cease any censorship of a military chaplain, or support of those who would so suppress a chaplain, who, by reason of ordination integrity and theological commitment, believe that he is required to pray in Jesus’ name, in all prayer offered to God.

2. That the PRJC petition the service Chiefs of Chaplains to train all chaplains in the duty of all chaplains to represent their traditions faithfully, without prejudice being exercised against those who seek to be faithful to their ordination vows, even in practice(s) not necessarily appreciated by the majority.

E. Membership in PRJC Limited to NAPARC Churches
The PRJC determined to “only invite denominations who are members of North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) to apply for membership” in the PRJC in response to a request for approval of an individual chaplain candidate from a classis of the United Reformed Churches in North America and an additional inquiry from another denomination outside NAPARC.

F. Chaplains Needed

The PRJC noted that with the current high tempo of military operations, there is a need to recruit chaplains, especially for our armed forces.

G. Presbytery Care of Chaplains

Pastors from two churches were mobilized during part of the past year, and the PRJC acted to send a letter to “PRJC presbyteries, to be sent through the respective PRJC denominational representatives for the OPC, PCA and RPCNA, to educate our presbyteries on the ministry needs of our country’s military reserves with the intent that those presbyteries

1. more intentionally support presbytery churches of deployed chaplains, and
2. seek to mitigate session reluctance to allow teaching elders to participate in the reserve chaplaincy, and
3. invite representatives of the PRJC to speak to presbyteries about their chaplaincy ministry.”

H. Women in Combat Questionnaire

Approximately one-third of the PRJC Chaplains returned the questionnaire taken during this past year regarding the Women in Combat issue and a PRJC paper on that subject and found that a majority found it useful to their ministry.

I. PRJC Associate Directors

The PRJC re-elected Mr. Stan J. Beach and Mr. Beryl T. Hubbard to one-year terms as Associate Directors for military chaplaincy and Mr. Gary L. Hitzfeld to a one-year term as Associate Director for non-military chaplaincies. Executive Director David Peterson continues to serve the Commission.

J. Next PRJC Meeting

The next regular meeting of the PRJC is scheduled for February 20-22, 2007 in Atlanta, Georgia.

K. Operation Follow Me

It was noted with rejoicing and praise to God that 26 of our churches as well as others supported Operation Follow Me, a Committee sponsored ministry of mercy to our warriors from the 2nd Marine Division and distributed through Division Chaplain Captain Bryan J. Weaver, CHC, USN. Some 161 boxes weighing about 4000 pounds were shipped with the hope that it might bear eternal fruit as it encouraged his ministry in the gospel. Chaplain Weaver has expressed his thanks and appreciation to all those who have participated. The Committee also notes that Chaplain Weaver became the first division chaplain in OPC history in July 2005.
L. Sponsoring Congregations

The Committee is thankful for the churches that have supported military chaplains. We strongly urge other congregations to join in this ministry. We expect that chaplains will provide at least quarterly communication with sponsoring OPC congregations. Each chaplain is requested to inform the Committee’s Secretary of additions or deletions to the list of his sponsoring congregations. The following chaplains have reported their sponsoring congregations to the Executive Director of the PRJC:

Active duty and mobilized Reserves and National Guard:

CPT Paul T. Berghaus, USAR
Grace OPC, Hanover Park IL
CPT David A. Bottoms, USAR
Bethel Presbyterian Church, Wheaton IL
LT John A. Carter, USN
Harvest OPC, Vista CA; Roswell OPC, Roswell NM
CPT Tom Faichney, USAR (PCA)
Geneva OPC, Marietta GA
MAJ Michael Frazier, USAR (PCA)
Pineville OPC, Pineville LA
LTC Jonathan C. Gibbs USA
Grace OPC, Hanover IL
LTC-P Chester H. Lanious, USA
Trinity OPC, Bothell WA;
                               Westminster OPC, Westminster CA
LCDR Timothy J. Power, USN
Bethany OPC, Oxford PA; First PC, Enterprise AL; Rocky Mountain PC,
                               Westminster CO; Spencer Mills, Gowen MI;
CPT David J. Stevenson, USAR
Trinity OPC, Bothell WA
                              Washington OPC, Westminster CO;
MAJ Earl W. Vanderhoff, USAR
First PC, Enterprise AL; Rocky Mountain
                               PC, Westminster CO; Trinity OPC, Bothell WA
CAPT Bryan J. Weaver, USN
Covenant OPC, Mansfield OH; Redeemer
                               OPC, Dayton OH; Westminster OPC,
                               Hollidaysburg PA
LTC Christopher Wisdom, USA
Covenant of Grace OPC, Plainview TX;
                               Emmaus OPC, Ft. Collins CO; Grace OPC,
                               San Antonio TX; Pineville OPC, Pineville
                               LA; Redeemer OPC, Toms River NJ; Sharon
                               OPC, Hialeah FL

Reserves and National Guard (not mobilized as of February 23, 2006):

CAPT William B. Acker, USNR
Apple Valley OPC, Appleton WI
MAJ Graham C. Harbman, NJANG
Covenant OPC, Easton PA
LCDR Douglas M. Withington, USNR
Pilgrim OPC, Raleigh NC
CPT James A. Zozzaro, NJANG
Calvary OPC, Wildwood NJ

V BUDGET

A. Standing Committee Budget

The Committee requests a 2007 budget of $5,000.00 for travel and lodging to enable the four members of the Committee (three of whom may vote on the PRJC) to
attend the annual meeting of the PRJC in Atlanta in February 2007, and the meeting of the Committee to be held at the same time.

B. Active Duty Chaplain Support

The Committee requests that the OPC financial support for the PRJC in 2007 be provided at the annual rate of $500.00 per active duty chaplain, a total of $6,000.00 for the twelve chaplains we expect to have on active duty in 2007.

C. Mobilized Reserve and National Guard

The Committee requests that the OPC also provide additional 2007 financial support for the PRJC at the annual rate of $500.00 for any Reserve or National Guard chaplain who has been mobilized under presidential recall authority as of 01 January 2006. This category includes one chaplain, Lt. Col. Richard M. Dickinson, who was mobilized with Maine Air National Guard. Total additional PRJC support requested for 2007 in this category is $500.00.

D. Civilian Chaplain Support

The Committee requests the 73rd General Assembly of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church to maintain the financial support of the PRJC at the annual rate of $500.00 per full-time paid civilian chaplain, $250.00 per part-time paid civilian chaplain and $100.00 per volunteer chaplain, a total of $1,800.00 for three full-time paid chaplains and three volunteer chaplains in the 2007 budget.

VI RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that the 73rd General Assembly respectfully encourage the presbyteries

1. be prepared to aid churches where the pastor is mobilized,
2. encourage their positive involvement in processing calls presented to those either currently serving as chaplains or intending to serve as chaplains in the military reserves,
3. request that their churches without pastors consider utilizing approved chaplain candidates either as pulpit supplies or be utilized to assist the pastor in a manner that such candidates are enabled to fulfill their chaplain candidate ministry requirement of up to two years of ministry before endorsement.

Grounds:

(1) Pastors who serve in the reserves and National Guard are increasing being mobilized in a time of war and the churches that they serve are in need of the care of their presbyteries.
(2) Being called up to serve their country in time of war should not jeopardize the pastoral relationship with the chaplain’s local church.
(3) Chaplain candidates are increasingly being required to have two years of pastoral service before they can be endorsed for the Military Chaplaincy. Pulpit supply service and internships can provide for this requirement.

VII ELECTION

The term of Mr. Dickinson expires at this Assembly. One member is to be elected to the Standing Committee on Chaplains and Military Personnel, class of 2009.
The primary responsibility of the Committee on Pensions is to provide a retirement plan for the ministers of The Orthodox Presbyterian Church. The Committee also provides health insurance and group life insurance plans for the ministers, officers and full-time employees of the Church and their families. Finally, the Committee makes supplemental payments to certain ministers with inadequate pensions. The Committee on Pensions endeavors to assist the churches in providing for the health, welfare and retirement needs of ordained officers and full-time employees of the Orthodox Presbyterian churches and committees through these programs. The Committee earnestly covets the prayers of the Church as it labors in its task, sensing all too clearly “Unless the Lord builds the house, its builders labor in vain”.

I PENSIONS AND INSURANCE
A. Investment Policies
1. The investments of the Retirement Equity Fund are managed by two investment managers: Oppenheimer & Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Beacon Trust Co., Madison, New Jersey. Both managers function under guidelines established by the Committee. Those guidelines state in part that the managers should select investments with the optimal combination of quality and future growth prospects. Equity investments under the guidelines are restricted to a maximum of 70% of the total funds under their management.

2. At the end of 2005 the investments of the fund were allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money Market Funds</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Funds</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Governments and Agencies</td>
<td>27.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Stock</td>
<td>63.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Investment Results

1. The investment results for the year 2005 were less than had been originally anticipated, but the results did maintain the positive growth mode of earlier years.

2. The net assets of the Fund at the end of the year amounted to $17,283,882. There was a net gain of 2.39% ($403,738) for the year 2005. The growth of the Fund over the years is shown in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1965</td>
<td>$14,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1975</td>
<td>577,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1985</td>
<td>2,575,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 1995</td>
<td>9,039,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 2005</td>
<td>17,283,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. At the end of 2005, each participant’s account was credited with 1.61% income and with 2.60% in increased market value, resulting in a total credit of 4.21%. The investment results over specific periods is shown in the following:

- Average annual percentage of gain - the last 5 years - 2.282%
- Average annual percentage of gain - the last 10 years - 7.808%
- Average annual percentage of gain - the last 15 years - 9.204%
- Average annual percentage of gain - the last 20 years - 10.245%

C. Term Life Insurance

Included as part of the pension plan is $20,000 of term life insurance, which remains in force until a participant retires and begins to receive pension payments. The annual premium for this coverage per individual for 2005 was $130. This coverage is underwritten by Union Central Life Insurance Company.

D. Eligibility and Participation

1. All ministers and permanent full-time employees of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church or its congregations and organizations, including those serving in any capacity and beyond the borders of the United States of America, shall be eligible for coverage under this plan. A minister shall be eligible upon his ordination or reception by
the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. A non-ministerial employee shall be eligible upon being declared a “permanent employee” by his employer.

2. At the end of 2005, the participants in the plan consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants Making Contributions</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants Not Making Contributions</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired - Drawing Pension</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving Spouses - Drawing Pension</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired - Receiving Annuity</td>
<td>2/260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Benefits

1. During the year 2005, the following retirement payments were made:

   - Annuity payments - insurance companies $3,167
   - Pension payments - Committee 477,380

   The average pension payment by the Committee was $812 per month.

2. The Committee has designated for the calendar year 2006 that $1,100 per month of pension distributions to an ordained member shall constitute a housing allowance, provided, however, that such housing allowance is not to exceed the actual expenditures for housing, utilities, maintenance, repairs, and other expenses related to providing a house.

II PENSION SUPPLEMENT FUND

A. Eligibility and Participation

   Benefits from this fund are available to ministers (and their surviving spouses, unless they remarry) who have at least 20 years of service in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, were at least 65 years of age prior to January 1, 1988, and are receiving regular pension payments from the Retirement Equity Fund. At the end of 2005, there were 5 ministers and 14 surviving spouses receiving supplementary payments.

B. Contributions From Churches

   For a period of five years (1989-1994) the Committee had not requested contributions from the churches for this fund. However, as a result of a decrease in earnings in the fund, combined with the projected cost-of-living increases, the Committee had requested contributions for the years 1995-2000. The Committee is not requesting any contributions for the year 2007.

C. Benefits

1. During the year 2005, payments made to eligible participants were $200 per month. Those participants whose regular pension accounts have been exhausted or who are receiving commercial annuity payments purchased with their pension account monies received $265 per month since they no longer benefit from the investment results of the Retirement Equity Fund.

2. The pension supplement payments made to retired ministers were designated as housing or rental allowances paid in recognition of, and as compensation for, their past services. These payments were not subject to federal income tax.
D. Summary Financial Report

1. Income and expense

The summary financial report of the Pension Supplement Fund for the year 2005 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance - January 1, 2005</td>
<td>$181,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$12,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>$7,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,101</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disbursements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension supplements</td>
<td>$49,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance - December 31, 2005</strong></td>
<td><strong>$151,665</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Investments

The assets of this Fund are invested primarily in money market funds, fixed income mutual funds, and government securities. The Fund also holds some equities which were received as gifts to the Fund.

III VOLUNTARY TERM LIFE INSURANCE

A. Premiums and Eligibility

This plan, separate from the pension and hospitalization plans, is open to all full-time church employees and ordained officers and their families. The monthly premium for individual and spouse is based on their ages, but is a fixed cost of $1.50 per month for all children in a family under age 19, or age 25 if a full-time student.

B. Coverage

The maximum individual coverage available is as follows:

- Participant: $300,000
- Spouse: $50,000
- Children: $5,000

C. Enrollment

The enrollment in the plan continues to decrease, and at the end of 2005 had 40 participants. Total insurance in force at year end was as follows:

- Participants: $2,243,400
- Spouses: $720,000

D. Insurance Carrier

Since January 1, 2002, the coverage has been through Boston Mutual Life Insurance Company.
IV HOSPITALIZATION

A. Description of the Plan

1. The plan is designed to provide medical benefits to participants and their families, including hospitalization and prescription drug costs. As of April 1, 1997, the Committee added to the plan a network of medical providers. This change was made to keep the costs of medical care to Plan participants as competitive as possible while improving the benefits at the same time. In summary, if participants use the providers in the network, the deductible is decreased, the co-pay is increased to 90%, and the maximum out-of-pocket costs will be less. Participants are still able to choose non-network providers, and the benefits remain as before. The revised plan design as of January 1, 2003 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Non-Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual / Family</td>
<td>Individual / Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDUCTIBLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Primary</td>
<td>$250 / $750</td>
<td>$250 / $750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$500 / $1,500</td>
<td>$1,000 / $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-INSURANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Primary</td>
<td>80% of $2,000 / $4,000</td>
<td>80% of $2,000 / $4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>90% of $5,000 / $10,000</td>
<td>80% of $5,000 / $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM OUT OF POCKET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Primary</td>
<td>$650 / $1,550</td>
<td>$650 / $1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,000 / $2,500</td>
<td>$2,000 / $5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic / Name Brand</td>
<td>$5 / $25</td>
<td>$5 / $25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The plan is structured as a self-funded plan with stop-loss insurance policies carried with an insurance company. The plan is similar to what might be considered a medical diaconal fund. All of the participants contribute their quarterly payments, and from these funds the Committee pays a third-party administrator to process, evaluate, and pay the claims submitted. In addition, premiums were paid to an insurance company to insure the fund for individual claims that exceeded $50,000, and for total claims in a year that exceeded $1,189,971 and $1,132,136 in 2005 and 2004, respectively. The remaining funds are used to pay claims. In effect, the experience of the participants’ claims and increases in medical costs determine the level of premiums that need to be charged to the individuals in the plan.

B. Eligibility and Participation

1. Those eligible for inclusion in the plan are ministers, ruling elders, deacons, licentiates of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, and full-time (an average of 30 hours per week) employees of the churches and denominational agencies. Also eligible are full-time teachers in Christian schools that are associated with the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

2. Participants and their dependents who enroll within 30 days after becoming eligible will be entitled to immediate coverage. Those who do not enroll within the 30-day eligibility period will be required to wait for an open enrollment date that is designated by the Committee. The 30-day eligibility period begins from the date of employment, licensure,
ordination, or installation in a position or office which would entitle a person to participate in the plan. The open enrollment dates designated by the Committee are January 1 and July 1 of each year.

3. At the end of 2005, the enrollment in the plan was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Deacons</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Individuals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Group</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband/Wife</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surviving Spouses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Financial Summary

1. During the year 2005 there were five large claims incurred, two of which exceeded $50,000. These five claims totaled $311,715 (30% of total claims paid). In spite of these claims, the year 2005 continued the positive income results of the prior three years and ended with a year-end reserve in the amount of $715,326. This reserve is the result of the contributions of the churches to eliminate the prior deficit and accumulate a reserve, together with the efforts to bring the premiums to a level to cover the claims and expenses. The Committee did not request any contributions from the churches for the year 2006, but is making a request for the year 2007 (See Recommendation).

2. At its March 2005 meeting the Committee added another category to its rate structure, namely Husband and Wife, at a rate 15% less than the Family rate.

3. A regional rate structure is used for the plan in order to reflect costs and competitive rates in the various parts of the country. The regions were those set up by one of the major insurance companies. The regions established were as follows:

   Region 1: AK, CA, CT, FL, HI, IL, KS, MA, NV, NJ, NY, PA, RI, TN
   Region 2: AL, AR, AZ, CO, DE, GA, IN, MI, MO, MT, NB, ND, OH, OK, SD, TX, VA, WV, WY
   Region 3: IA, ID, KY, LA, MD, ME, MN, MS, NH, NM, NC, OR, SC, UT, VT, WA, WI

The monthly rates by category and region are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Individual</td>
<td>$403</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td>$324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and Wife</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Group</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special 65 - Single</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special 65 - Husband and Wife</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single(65) &amp; Dependent(under 65)</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above rates are those in effect as of May 1, 2005.

D. Benefits of Participation in the Plan

The Committee regularly receives requests for information about the plan from those seeking medical coverage. In most cases, the decision about participation is made
largely on the current cost factor. There are, however, important benefits to be considered other than cost.

1. Mobility of Ministers. A very important and beneficial feature of our plan is that ministers in the plan, unlike those in a local or regional plan, can move from one part of the country to another without having to change their coverage. If an individual leaves the plan and obtains coverage under a local or regional plan, he must, when he moves to another area, start anew with another insurer, subject to premiums which are available in that area.

2. Many policies, particularly those issued on an individual basis, are cost-rated based on age of the participant. The denominational plan maintains the same premium cost regardless of the age of the participant.

3. As more individuals enroll in the plan, particularly younger men, the rates and the benefits in the plan will show more stability because of the nature of the plan itself.

4. As participants in the plan reach retirement, they are able to continue the same benefits they have enjoyed, with a reduced rate, under Special-65 coverage, including the prescription drug card. This is not available to anyone who has not been covered by the Plan prior to retirement.

5. The plan is more reliable than diaconal pools designed as contributions for the payment of eligible expenses incurred by other members (or subscribers). Such diaconal pools normally need to increase contributions as their census matures, or delay the payment of “benefits” for several months. Furthermore, except to the extent the benefits are covered by an insurance program, they are not guaranteed.

V  ADMINISTRATION

A. Committee Members
   Class of 2008:
      Minister: Douglas L. Watson
      Ruling Elders: Garret A. Hoogerhyde, Stephen R. Leavitt
   Class of 2007:
      Minister: Darren S. Thole
      Ruling Elders: Robert M. Meeker, William C. Redington
   Class of 2006:
      Minister: Robert L. Broline, Jr.
      Ruling Elders: Roger W. Huibregtse, Bruce A. Stahl

B. Officers
   President: Roger W. Huibregtse
   Vice President: William C. Redington
   Secretary: Robert M. Meeker
   Treasurer: Garret A. Hoogerhyde

C. Executive Committee: Garret A. Hoogerhyde, Roger W. Huibregtse (Chairman), Robert M. Meeker, and William C. Redington

D. Staff: Administrative Assistant - Kathleen Kline
VI RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that the 73rd General Assembly request the congregations to contribute $10 per communicant member to the Hospitalization Reserve Fund in 2007.

VII ELECTIONS

The terms of the class of 2006 expire with this Assembly. The Standing Rules of the Assembly provide that each class of the Committee shall include at least one minister and at least one ruling elder.

VIII AUDIT REPORTS

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S REPORT

Committee on Pensions
Orthodox Presbyterian Church
Pension Fund

We have audited the accompanying statement of net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Pension Fund (the “Plan”) as of December 31, 2005 and 2004, and the related statements of changes in net assets available for plan benefits for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Plan’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Pension Fund at December 31, 2005 and 2004, and the changes in net assets available for plan benefits for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Our audit was made for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. Schedule I, Assets Held for Investment as of December 31, 2005, is presented for purposes of additional information and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

North Haledon, NJ
March 24, 2006
ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PENSION FUND
STATEMENT OF NET ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PLAN BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments at fair value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money market funds</td>
<td>$488,185</td>
<td>$527,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual fund</td>
<td>40,059</td>
<td>39,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>983,307</td>
<td>888,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stocks</td>
<td>10,831,156</td>
<td>11,157,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government securities</td>
<td>4,764,985</td>
<td>4,085,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investments</td>
<td>17,107,692</td>
<td>16,697,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest and dividends receivable</td>
<td>55,735</td>
<td>47,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment - net of accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in interest-bearing accounts</td>
<td>123,499</td>
<td>139,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>17,288,050</td>
<td>16,884,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities and Net Assets Available for Benefits</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued expenses</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>3,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>4,168</td>
<td>4,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assets in Excess of Liabilities available for plan benefits | $17,283,882 | $16,880,144 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PENSION FUND
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PLAN BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net unrealized appreciation in fair value of investments</td>
<td>$414,724</td>
<td>$941,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gain (loss) on sale of investments</td>
<td>&lt;105,427&gt;</td>
<td>70,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment income</td>
<td>263,519</td>
<td>280,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>218,638</td>
<td>221,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment income</strong></td>
<td>791,454</td>
<td>1,505,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Investment expenses | 42,354 | 40,323 |
|                     | 749,100 | 1,465,125 |

| Contributions:      |          |            |
| Employer            | 586,530  | 532,845    |
| Employee            | 40,510   | 31,406     |
| **Total Contributions** | 627,040 | 564,251 |

| Other additions:    |          |            |
| Transfer from supplemental fund | 49,870 | 52,455 |
| **Total Additions** | 1,426,010 | 2,081,831 |
### Deductions from assets attributable to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premiums on life insurance</td>
<td>23,993</td>
<td>24,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension distributions</td>
<td>477,380</td>
<td>457,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental pension</td>
<td>49,870</td>
<td>52,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lump sum withdrawals</td>
<td>419,828</td>
<td>437,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>51,201</td>
<td>50,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Deductions</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,022,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,023,475</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net increase in net assets available for plan benefits  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>403,738</td>
<td>1,058,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assets in excess of Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>available for plan benefits, beginning</td>
<td>16,880,144</td>
<td>15,821,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available for plan benefits, ending</td>
<td>$ 17,283,882</td>
<td>$ 16,880,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ORTHOODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH  
PENSION FUND  
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**Note 1 - Description of the Plan**

The following is a brief description of the Pension Fund. Participants should refer to the Plan agreement for a more complete discussion.

The Pension Fund is a defined contribution plan which was created to provide term life insurance during the period of eligibility and retirement benefits at age sixty-five (65) for the Church’s ordained ministers, its permanent, full-time employees, and the permanent, full-time employees of the congregations or organizations thereof. The normal retirement benefit is based on participant’s equity in the Pension Fund at the time of retirement and on income option selected. The Pension Fund also provides death benefits. Participants’ contributions are limited to a percentage of their annual compensation, which is determined by the individual congregations. The current recommended percentage is 6%. The participating churches generally make contributions, and allowances are given to individuals to make voluntary contributions on their own.

Key provisions of the Plan are:

### Eligibility for coverage

All ordained ministers and all permanent, full-time employees of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church or of any congregation or organization of the Church are eligible to participate. Ministers are eligible to participate upon ordination. Non-ministerial employees are eligible to participate upon being declared a “permanent employee” by their employers.

### Normal retirement date

The normal retirement date is the first day of the month following the participant’s 65th birthday. The retirement date is not mandatory.

### Vesting

The vested interest of participants who leave the Plan shall receive his vested interest in the Retirement Equity Fund determined as follows:

A. His vested interest in his share of the Retirement Equity Fund shall be the sum of:
1. A percentage of the portion of his share of the Retirement Equity Fund which is not attributable to any voluntary contributions he has made equal to the following percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anniversary</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plus:

2. The portion of his share which is attributable to any voluntary contributions he has made.

B. The interest of a totally and permanent disabled participant shall be fully vested.

Normal form of pension
The normal form of retirement benefits is a lifetime annuity which is guaranteed for at least ten years.

Optional forms of pension available
Participants may elect any option acceptable to the Plan Committee.

Note 2 - Significant Accounting Policies
The financial statements of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Pension Fund (the “Pension Fund” or the “Plan”) are maintained on the accrual basis of accounting.

 Marketable securities are stated at current fair value, as determined by the quoted market prices on the last business day of the year. The change in the difference between current fair market value and the cost of such securities is reflected in the statement of changes in net assets available for Plan benefits as unrealized appreciation or depreciation in the current fair market value of marketable securities.

 Securities transactions are recorded on a trade-date basis. Interest income is accrued as earned and dividends are recorded on the ex-dividend date.

 Benefit payments to participants are recorded upon distribution.

 The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Note 3 - Investments
Investment securities consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12/31/2005</th>
<th></th>
<th>12/31/2004</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money market funds</td>
<td>$488,185</td>
<td>$488,185</td>
<td>$527,013</td>
<td>$527,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marketable securities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual fund</td>
<td>42,168</td>
<td>40,059</td>
<td>40,930</td>
<td>39,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>1,007,484</td>
<td>983,307</td>
<td>878,426</td>
<td>888,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stocks</td>
<td>6,707,483</td>
<td>10,831,156</td>
<td>7,185,196</td>
<td>11,157,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Gov’t securities</td>
<td>4,805,390</td>
<td>4,764,985</td>
<td>3,990,534</td>
<td>4,085,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total marketable securities 12,562,525 16,619,507 12,095,086 16,170,557

Total Investments $13,050,710 $17,107,692 $12,622,099 $16,697,570

The unrealized appreciation or (depreciation) of the Plan’s investment securities is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual funds</td>
<td>$ (606)</td>
<td>$ &lt;986&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate bonds</td>
<td>&lt;29,865&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;29,710&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stock</td>
<td>557,988</td>
<td>1,070,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Government securities</td>
<td>&lt;112,793&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;98,383&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 414,724 $ 941,605

Note 4 - Income Tax Status

The Plan has qualified under the applicable sections of the Internal Revenue Code and, therefore, is not subject to tax under present income tax laws.

Note 5 - Party in Interest

The accounting firm of Baker & Hoogerhyde LLC, CPA’s received fees of $40,800 and $40,800 respectively for the accounting and administration of the Plan for each of the years ended December 31, 2005 and 2004.

Note 6 - Plan Termination

Although it has not expressed any interest to do so, the Trust has the right under the Plan to terminate the Plan. In the event of Plan termination, participants will become 100% vested in their accounts.

Note 7 - Concentration of Risk

The Plan’s investments include a mutual fund, corporate bonds, common stocks and U.S. Government securities. Such investments are subject to market risk.

ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
PENSION FUND
SCHEDULES OF ASSETS HELD FOR INVESTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. GOVERNMENT SECURITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Note, 4.75%, due 11/15/08</td>
<td>$ 30,262</td>
<td>$ 30,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Note, 3.25%</td>
<td>08/15/08</td>
<td>44,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>FHLB, 4.375%, due 03/17/10</td>
<td>50,364</td>
<td>49,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Note, 6.50%, due 02/15/10</td>
<td>64,398</td>
<td>67,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 4.25%, due 07/15/09</td>
<td>69,462</td>
<td>66,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 5.00%, due 11/15/14</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>73,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Note, 3.25%, due 08/15/07</td>
<td>86,499</td>
<td>83,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>GNMA Number 214712</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 3.125%, due 11/26/07</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 3.50%, due 09/15/07</td>
<td>101,490</td>
<td>98,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FNLM, 4.00%, due 12/15/09</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLB, 3.857%, due 11/21/08</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 4.15%, due 11/15/10</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>96,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FNMA, 4.50%, due 11/19/10</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FNMA, 4.50%, due 06/17/11</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Freddie Mac, 5.00%, due 12/15/11</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>99,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FNMA, 4.50%, due 08/20/12</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>96,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FNMA, 5.625%, due 02/28/12</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>100,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Freddie Mac, 4.35%, due 06/03/13</td>
<td>99,750</td>
<td>96,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLB, 5.08%, due 03/15/13</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>98,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 4.696, due 05/06/13</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>96,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 4.75%, due 07/22/13</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 5.00%, due 12/15/13</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>98,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FNMA, 5.00%, due 11/19/13</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Freddie Mac, 5.125%, due 03/10/14</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>98,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 4.645%, due 04/07/14</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>96,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Fannie Mae, 5.25%, due 11/03/14</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>98,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Freddie Mac, 5.25%, due 12/01/14</td>
<td>99,500</td>
<td>98,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FNMA, 5.3782%, due 02/25/15</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>98,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLB, 5.25%, due 06/29/15</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>98,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>FHLB, 5.6%, due 08/24/15</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>99,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 5.75%, due 03/15/09</td>
<td>118,376</td>
<td>119,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224,000</td>
<td>FHLM, 4.00%, due 12/15/09</td>
<td>220,911</td>
<td>218,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Note, 2.00%, due 01/31/06</td>
<td>133,166</td>
<td>132,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Strip, due 08/15/06</td>
<td>191,776</td>
<td>194,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Strip, due 11/15/06</td>
<td>189,753</td>
<td>192,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Strip, due 02/15/07</td>
<td>186,067</td>
<td>190,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Strip, due 05/15/07</td>
<td>183,203</td>
<td>188,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Strip, due 02/15/08</td>
<td>176,464</td>
<td>182,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury, 2.50%, due 05/31/06</td>
<td>300,328</td>
<td>297,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385,000</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury, 4.0%, due 06/15/09</td>
<td>384,259</td>
<td>380,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Securities** | **4,805,390** | **4,764,985**
### CORPORATE BONDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>SBC Communications, 5.75%, due 05/02/06</td>
<td>$46,757</td>
<td>$45,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Citicorp, 7.125%, due 05/15/06</td>
<td>88,493</td>
<td>85,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>Citigroup Inc., 4.625%, due 08/03/10</td>
<td>89,744</td>
<td>88,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>Clorox Company</td>
<td>107,904</td>
<td>105,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>General Electric Capital Credit, 4.25%, due 06/15/12</td>
<td>123,332</td>
<td>119,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Household Finance Corp., 7.875%, due 03/01/07</td>
<td>86,192</td>
<td>87,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>IBM Corp., 5.375%, due 02/01/09</td>
<td>129,760</td>
<td>127,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Proctor and Gamble, 4.75%, due 06/15/07</td>
<td>129,720</td>
<td>125,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Wal-mart Stores, 4.375%, due 07/12/07</td>
<td>130,600</td>
<td>124,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Wells Fargo &amp; Co., 4.625%, due 08/09/10</td>
<td>25,153</td>
<td>24,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>WM Wrigley Jr Co, 4.30%, due 07/15/10</td>
<td>49,829</td>
<td>49,073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Corporate Bonds 1,007,484 983,307

### COMMON STOCKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Shares</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Alcon Inc.</td>
<td>$36,767</td>
<td>$110,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>American Electric Power</td>
<td>14,310</td>
<td>40,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>American Int'l Group</td>
<td>20,715</td>
<td>170,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Amgen Inc.</td>
<td>108,726</td>
<td>149,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Anadarko Petroleum</td>
<td>179,614</td>
<td>379,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Aqua America Inc.</td>
<td>95,853</td>
<td>181,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Bed Bath &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>119,614</td>
<td>108,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Borg Warner Inc</td>
<td>103,248</td>
<td>109,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,498</td>
<td>B.P. Amoco</td>
<td>86,014</td>
<td>288,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>Cendant Corp.</td>
<td>108,395</td>
<td>86,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Chubb Corp.</td>
<td>145,631</td>
<td>195,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Cincinnati Financial Group</td>
<td>124,141</td>
<td>147,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>Cisco Systems Inc.</td>
<td>240,088</td>
<td>176,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Coca Cola Co</td>
<td>84,515</td>
<td>80,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Colgate Palmolive</td>
<td>130,688</td>
<td>142,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Comcast Corp.</td>
<td>79,097</td>
<td>77,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>75,236</td>
<td>74,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>Duff &amp; Phelps Util. Inc.</td>
<td>155,966</td>
<td>145,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Enesco International</td>
<td>101,637</td>
<td>133,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>Exxon Mobil</td>
<td>100,147</td>
<td>478,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>First Data Corp.</td>
<td>110,643</td>
<td>116,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Company</td>
<td>Shares</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiserv Inc</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>91,244</td>
<td>86,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannett Co. Inc.</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>93,986</td>
<td>72,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Dynamics Corp.</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>89,477</td>
<td>125,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electric</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>75,233</td>
<td>315,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman Sachs</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>130,933</td>
<td>159,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business Machines Corp.</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>46,118</td>
<td>205,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuit</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>105,294</td>
<td>133,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM Smucker Co.</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>97,916</td>
<td>101,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>163,236</td>
<td>474,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Clark Corp.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>117,603</td>
<td>119,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauder Estee Cos, Inc.</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>119,380</td>
<td>97,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowes Corporation</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>89,501</td>
<td>133,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall &amp; Ilsley Corp.</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>83,324</td>
<td>107,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masco Corp.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>107,430</td>
<td>90,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGraw Hill</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>158,193</td>
<td>268,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medtronic</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>126,454</td>
<td>143,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merck &amp; Co., Inc.</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>54,890</td>
<td>111,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury General Corp.</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>83,375</td>
<td>104,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Corp.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>95,114</td>
<td>104,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Corp.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>202,796</td>
<td>182,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan (J.P.) &amp; Company Inc.</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>47,691</td>
<td>254,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola Inc.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>54,923</td>
<td>135,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestles Sponsored ADR</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>75,349</td>
<td>298,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Corp</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>112,959</td>
<td>107,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk &amp; Southern</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>86,323</td>
<td>188,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PepsiCo, Inc.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>126,857</td>
<td>177,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfizer, Inc.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>149,395</td>
<td>93,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Financial Group</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>92,693</td>
<td>147,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor &amp; Gamble</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>93,252</td>
<td>115,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNC Bank Corp.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>60,856</td>
<td>185,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Dutch Petroleum</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>61,721</td>
<td>338,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlumberger Ltd.</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>201,843</td>
<td>359,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sysco Corp.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>185,230</td>
<td>186,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXU Corp.</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>48,631</td>
<td>175,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermo-Electron Corp.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>103,509</td>
<td>123,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M Co.</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>218,816</td>
<td>232,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Technologies Corp.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>96,591</td>
<td>167,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon Communications</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>87,308</td>
<td>168,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walgreen Co.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>111,190</td>
<td>132,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellpoint Inc.</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>63,822</td>
<td>159,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington Trust Corp.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>94,440</td>
<td>116,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyeth</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>153,535</td>
<td>368,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmer Holdings, Inc.</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>28,007</td>
<td>67,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Common Stocks**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,707,483</td>
<td>10,831,156</td>
<td>42,168</td>
<td>40,059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix**
### Money Market Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dreyfus Liquid Assets</td>
<td>85,675</td>
<td>85,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt Cash Series</td>
<td>209,856</td>
<td>209,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Invest Fund</td>
<td>192,654</td>
<td>192,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Money Market Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>488,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>488,185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Investments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,050,710</td>
<td>17,107,692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Auditors’ Report

Committee on Pensions  
Orthodox Presbyterian Church  
Hospitalization Trust

We have audited the accompanying statement of net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Hospitalization Trust as of December 31, 2005 and 2004, and the related statement of changes in net assets available for plan benefits for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Trust’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the net assets available for plan benefits of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church Hospitalization Trust as of December 31, 2005 and 2004, and the changes in net assets available for the years then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

North Haledon, New Jersey  
March 24, 2006

### Orthodox Presbyterian Church Hospitalization Trust

#### Statement of Net Assets Available for Plan Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 450,463</td>
<td>$ 525,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest receivable</td>
<td>5,801</td>
<td>3,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>57,624</td>
<td>19,908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
HOSPITALIZATION TRUST
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS AVAILABLE FOR PLAN BENEFITS

2005  2004

Revenue:
Premiums - members $1,224,204 $1,242,619
Service charges 500 542
Investment income 35,584 11,899
Reserve contributions 90,823 130,845
Unrealized loss - investments <11,504> -
Premium subsidy 14,965 -
Total revenue 1,354,572 1,385,905

Expenses:
Claims paid and incurred 1,040,793 858,423
Premiums - insurance companies 215,827 224,583
Trust administration fees 64,887 61,354
General and administrative expenses 2,781 2,281
Total expenses 1,324,288 1,146,641

Excess of revenue over expenses 30,284 239,264

Assets in excess of liabilities available for plan benefits, beginning 685,042 445,778

Assets in excess of liabilities available for plan benefits, ending $ 715,326 $ 685,042

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
HOSPITALIZATION TRUST
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Note 1 - Description of the Plan
The Hospitalization Trust, which is administered by Trustees elected by the General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, was established as a funding vehicle for designated welfare benefit plans maintained by the Church for its employees.

All employees of the Church who meet the eligibility requirements of the Health and Welfare Benefit Plans may participate in the Plan.

Note 2 - Nature of Operations and Significant Accounting Policies
The Welfare Benefits Funding Plan for Employees of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Inc. (the “Hospitalization Trust” or “Trust”) was established on July 1, 1984 when the Church’s prior hospitalization plan was terminated.

The Trust uses the accrual method of accounting.

The Trust considers money market accounts to be cash equivalents.

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Note 3 - Party in Interest
The accounting firm of Baker & Hoogerhyde LLC, CPA’s received management fees of $13,200 and $13,200 respectively for the accounting and administration of the Hospitalization Plan during each of the years ended December 31, 2005 and 2004.

Garret Hoogerhyde, who manages the account for Baker & Hoogerhyde, is a participant in the Hospitalization program. It is his secondary source of health insurance. Total claims paid to Garry in 2005 were $316.

Note 4 - Tax Status
The Trust is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(9) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code as a voluntary employees’ beneficiary association.
Moreover, brethren, we make known to you the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia: that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded in the riches of their liberality. For I bear witness that according to their ability, yes, and beyond their ability, they were freely willing, imploring us with much urgency that we would receive the gift and the fellowship of the ministering to the saints.

2 Corinthians 8:1-4

How do we respond in diaconal emergencies? It certainly seems that in 2005 we responded very well. Over half of the giving to this Committee was designated for diaconal emergencies. About $145,796.00 was given toward relief of tsunami victims and about $200,900.00 was given for relieving victims of hurricane Katrina. Our total receipts were about $666,745.00, and nearly all of this came from OPC sources. Furthermore, it is remarkable that unlike past special offerings, these offerings did not reduce the amount normally given to this Committee.

What Paul says here about the churches of Macedonia seems to apply to the church of Christ known as the OPC. We, too, have received a special grace or blessing from the Lord. Although it was not “a great trial of affliction” and “[out] of deep poverty” that we acted, yet the church has given out of “the riches of liberality.”

One woman wrote that her brother teaches at a Christian school on the foreign mission field, and he and his family had planned to go to the beach the day the tsunami hit. By God’s grace they were providentially unable to do so and were saved from the tsunami. In thanks to God, the family sent a gift for tsunami relief.

Several other communications contained notes about how the donations were collected. One communication told how children in a stateside Christian school had a penny drive and collected $617.30. This was sent for tsunami relief together with a sizeable gift collected by a special church offering. A gentleman learned that his company was willing to triple a donation for tsunami relief. He gave $3000.00 and they gave an additional $6000.00.

The young children in a pastor’s family worked many hours to make refrigerator magnets made of brightly colored beads (they sent us one) which they sold for 50 cents apiece. The $24.00 they earned was sent to the Committee and forwarded to needy recipients somewhere in Iran to help them recover from the earthquake there.
Several letters explained how the money for hurricane relief was gathered. One of the women of the OPC requested that her award for 10 years of service to her employer be replaced by a donation to this Committee for hurricane relief.

We did not hear the details of all the sacrificial and loving gifts, but we are certain that there was a great deal of sacrificial and lovingly expended funds to help in both tsunami and hurricane relief. Thus, we “bear witness that according to their ability, yes, and beyond their ability, they were freely willing,” that we should “receive the gift for the ministering to the saints.”

In one of our communications thanking donors, we included hand written notes of thanks from some of those who received help in the midst of the tragedy they suffered at the hands of the Iranian earthquake. We heard oral reports through Mr. Haney about the thankful gratitude of those the disaster teams helped.

Above all, Christians do not give to receive credit or the thanks of men, but they give to the glory of our God and Father and to the praise of our Lord Jesus Christ. We do what we do in gratitude for what God has done and is doing for us.

II OVERVIEW

The chart below provides a comparison and overview of the ministry of this Committee for the years 2004 and 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 Actual</th>
<th>2005 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$15,486 (7%)</td>
<td>$20,356 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Foreign</td>
<td>45,950 (21%)</td>
<td>235,417 (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry USA</td>
<td>155,807 (72%)</td>
<td>353,628 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdirected Check</td>
<td>3,294 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$217,243</td>
<td>$612,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart shows that we disbursed about $612,695 during 2005. Thus, in 2005 our disbursements increased by $395,452.00 from 2004. Most of this increase was due to special emergency relief disbursed to help victims of the tsunami and hurricane Katrina. We spent a little more on administration costs in 2005 due primarily to increased costs of travel to and from our meetings. Other than this, the actual cost of administration stayed about the same. The percentages of foreign expenditures to home expenditures varied somewhat with the foreign ministries receiving a slightly lower percentage.

The 2005 financial statement shows that the Committee’s receipts totaled about $666,745.00 and our disbursements were about $612,695.00. The increase in disbursements will be explained below.

III ADMINISTRATION

The Committee’s composition did change in 2005, but still consists of seven members, three ministers: two ruling elders and two deacons. The ministers are the Revs. Leonard Coppes (Secretary-Treasurer), David King (President), and Ronald Pearce (elected to be president at our Oct. meeting). The ruling elders are Messrs. Frode Jensen and David Haney. The deacons are Messrs. Roy Ingelse (Vice-President) and Robert Wright.

As in 2004, the Committee met twice during 2005; both meetings were held in Thornton, CO. These meetings are presided over by the President. Our Vice-president is responsible to take charge of the meetings in the absence of the President. As before, the Secretary-Treasurer is responsible to maintain much of the correspondence and minutes of
meetings for the Committee and to keep the financial records (including making disbursements and keeping a record of the monthly financial status of the Committee). He is responsible to make a full and detailed report of his activities to the entire Committee when it meets. He also sends each member a detailed monthly financial statement to keep them abreast of Committee activities and status, as well as whatever other communications may be felicitous for Committee information and business.

The executive committee consisting of the three officers makes most decisions between the Committee meetings. Budgeted items and providing insurance premium payments for ministers who are unable otherwise to have such coverage do not require any action of the executive Committee, but the Secretary-Treasurer is authorized to take care of these matters. If there are questions about an item, he consults the executive committee for help in making a decision or for advice. Other decisions are made by the executive committee or by the entire Committee.

We remind the church again that requests for aid may come to the Committee through any member of the Committee. A local session or diaconal board should normally examine requests before sending them to their Presbytery. If they find themselves unable to meet the need financially, they may appeal to their Presbytery diaconal committee for help and advice. If that committee is unable to provide the needed help, they may appeal to this General Assembly Committee. This Committee expects the request to come before it with the needed financial statements from the needy party and the recommendations of the nearer court(s) of jurisdiction. Only in the most rare instances does the Committee on Diaconal Ministries provide help apart from the help and advice of a closer court of jurisdiction. This is for at least three reasons. First, the General Assembly has specifically directed us to follow such a policy. Second, often needy parties need personal ministry, and it is usually much more practicable that this be done by someone more local than we are. Third, nearly always there is the need for financial or medical counsel and help in preparing the needed documentation to appeal to the Presbytery and, perhaps, this Committee.

Again, as in past years, the Committee sought to stimulate presbyteries and sessions (or deacons) to supervise actively and oversee the disbursement of the church’s funds. To that end, we sent letters to every presbytery requesting that they contact those members receiving insurance premium aid with a view to providing possible pastoral help and renewing the request for financial aid from this Committee.

The Committee sent letters to every session in the month of November. In this letter, we reported how much, if anything, we had received from their church. Our intentions are to remind churches of the date on which our books are closed so their donation is recorded for the year they wish, to provide an objective statement to allow them to check their records with a view to checking for possible donations lost in the mail, and to encourage churches to contribute to this important work of God’s church. The Secretary-Treasurer’s office seeks to respond to every donor with a thank you note and a receipt.

IV FOREIGN MINISTRIES

The disbursements in 2005 included support for eight mission fields (this does not include the areas aided with tsunami relief). This support was initiated upon the requests of the Committee on Foreign Missions (CFM) and the Rev. Victor Atallah (coming through and with the approval of his Presbytery). Also, upon the request of CFM, the Suriname field received no funds for 2005. The work in Uganda received $20,000.00 as per the request of CFM; $14,000.00 of this money was earmarked to help defray the costs of running the hospital, and $6,000 was sent to help needy members of the Presbyterian Church of Uganda. The Committee sent $4,600.00 for diaconal work in Eritrea (part of this was what
remained from the 2004 budget), $4,800.00 for Ethiopia, $4,800.00 for Haiti, and $9,600.00 to help in China. The disbursements just listed were not included in the 2005 budget previously reported to the General Assembly, but the revisions to the budget by your Committee were in response to a request from CFM.

In 2005 we sent $3,000.00 for aid to Kenya, $20,000.00 for relief in Iraq, and $10,000.00 to Sudan through Rev. Atallah (as communicated through and concurred to by the Presbytery of the Midwest).

The largest disbursement in this category was about $146,795.00 sent to aid victims of the tsunami. This disbursement made foreign ministries the largest recipient from the Committee in 2005. These funds were distributed through the Rev. Victor Atallah to and through indigenous reformed churches in the stricken areas.

We have included in this report the changes to the 2006 budget as shown in the attached proposed 2007 budget.

V HOME MINISTRIES

The largest item in this sphere of this Committee’s ministry was relief given to victims of Hurricane Katrina. We disbursed $200,900.00 in 2005. We continue to hold a sizeable amount of funds budgeted for Disaster Relief. We have found this amount sufficient to defray the immediate expenses in case of disaster while we seek additional funds from the churches—if needed. The work was done through: (1) the Presbytery of the South (Rev. Jeff Boer, the Presbytery chairman), (2) in Pineville, LA, through Rev. Jack Sawyer, (3) in Longview, TX, through Mr. Phillip D. Hodson, and (4) in LA and MS through relief teams organized by and headed by elder David Haney. As outlined in our policy guidelines listed below, we work initially through the Presbytery within whose bounds the bulk of the destruction occurred, i.e., the Presbytery of the South. The only other direct appeal for support was from the Committee on Home Missions that worked with elder David Haney in organizing and funding an emergency response team(s), and we also supported these efforts.

In 2005, the Committee helped several individual members of the OPC in their time of critical emergency. These included a church member in a critical situation due to circumstances in his life which were beyond his control, and a pastor with an emergency medical need that was not covered by his insurance and required immediate attention. In all of these cases, the request was processed according to the guidelines given below.

Disbursements for pastors’ hospitalization premiums decreased from $115,057.00 in 2004 to $107,188.00 in 2005. This was due to the improved financial situation of some of those we were helping. We thank the churches for their sincere attempts to cover the insurance needs of their pastors.

For many years, the Committee has seen a decrease in the amount we needed to dispense for the needs of retired ministers, their wives and children. This year, however, we added a new recipient of these funds. We are glad to report that the local church and Presbytery in this case, picked up and continues to pick up the majority of this need. Therefore, we were asked for a small supplement payment, and we granted it.

Disbursements of $28,000.00 from the Pension Fund showed no significant change over 2004. Yet, we anticipate increased needs in this item in the future. The Committee has received a grant designated to help needy OPC ministerial retirees, and we solicit help in finding them. In addition, we are working to see if there are any ministerial retirees whose income is insufficient to afford them a reasonable living. Currently, we are working through
the Committee on Pensions and the Committee on Foreign Missions in our attempt to find those who are in need.

We continue to support Emmanuel Chapel and their ministry to inner city families. Our annual $12,700 goes to help in paying Christian School tuition for the children. The families help in the church in return for this aid. We continue to commend the Chapel for the care they take in administering these funds and the careful records they keep (and report to us) concerning each recipient.

VI POLICIES

In response to the request from the 69th GA, we submit the following statement of policies and procedures. We include the statement in the report again in the interests of making it generally available to the church.

1. In the case of discretionary budget items, funds are dispersed first to the church and then to the non-churched.
2. We work first through the OPC and then through churches with whom we have fraternal relations.
3. Other working procedures and policies.
   a. With reference to the total budget approved by the GA, monies are disbursed routinely by the treasurer to designated recipients.
   b. The approved budget may be adjusted upon advice from the CFM with regard to the missions they supervise.
   c. The budget for non GA mission works not directly under the OPC GA are disbursed upon the direction of CDM but only in conjunction with a request of the overseeing OPC judicatory.
   d. The budget for USA disbursements:
      (1) Special relief, emergency medical aid and disaster relief funds are disbursed normally upon the request and co-operation of the Presbytery diaconal committees. If a decision must be made in an emergency situation, the executive committee is contacted to make the decision.
      Procedure:
      (a) Upon receiving the request from an individual, normally he or she is advised to contact his session or Presbytery.
      (b) If the request comes from a Presbytery (perhaps via its diaconal committee),
      (i) The secretary seeks to make certain the request is in the correct form (that we have written documentation of the Presbytery’s or committee’s actions or decision),
      (ii) That the Presbytery has done what it can to raise the needed funds (sometimes advice is proffered as to steps to be taken toward raising the funds or reducing the need by negotiation, etc.), and
      (iii) That the proper documentation is available to help this Committee in its determination (e.g., budget statements from the person making the initial request, etc.).
      (2) Hospitalization premiums – the secretary-treasurer is authorized to disburse needed hospitalization funds upon his discretion under the specifications and limitations of the approved budget. In unusual circumstances, the executive committee is contacted to make the decision.
      (3) Pension aid payments. These funds are disbursed according to the budgeted items approved by the Committee. Consultation has been sought with the Committee on Pensions.
(4) Payments to the Committee on Pensions. These funds are disbursed according to approved budget and in consultation with the Committee on Pensions.

(5) Philadelphia scholarship funds are designated by the General Assembly and in consultation with the Emmanuel OPC. Emmanuel submits yearly reports detailing the recipients, the amount given to each one, and the services rendered to the church in return.

(6) Other scholarships are disbursed upon the approval of the Committee. Applicants are asked to be open to the Committee’s financial counsel, to submit a detailed financial report (if the applicant is a pastor, a report on the church’s financial status is to be submitted), and to consult with their Presbytery.

(7) Infirm minister fund. Normally the person in question has been working with his Presbytery. If he has not been doing this, he is advised to contact his Presbytery. Applicants are requested to submit a financial statement, to seek alternative sources of financial aid before pursuing the church’s aid (Medicare, Medicaid, etc.), to seek to negotiate a reduction of debt with creditors, to submit to the Committee’s financial advice, to continue to work with and through their Presbytery. Under unusual circumstances emergency aid may be granted at the direction of the Committee.

4. Emergencies and special circumstances may require the Committee to deviate from the procedures outlined above.

VII ELECTIONS

Currently the Committee consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Minister</th>
<th>Elder</th>
<th>Deacon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008:</td>
<td>David W. King</td>
<td>David Haney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007:</td>
<td>Ronald Pearce (President)</td>
<td>Frode M. Jensen</td>
<td>Roy W. Ingelse (Vice-president)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006:</td>
<td>Leonard J. Coppes (Secretary-Treasurer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert J. Wright, Jr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms expiring at this Assembly: Leonard J. Coppes, Roy W. Ingelse, Robert J. Wright

Requirements for membership on this Committee: this Committee shall consist of seven members with one minister in each class, twodeacons in one class, and one elder in each remaining class.

VIII RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the General Assembly request the congregations to give at least half of their contributions by the end of May.

2. That the General Assembly remind the Presbyteries not to approve a call containing “free from worldly care” if they consider the call under consideration to be inadequate to provide for the minister’s livelihood, and to make certain that the call includes a provision for adequate retirement and for payment of hospitalization, surgical, and major medical insurance.
3. That the General Assembly request the Presbyteries to investigate whether all their ministers have adequate medical insurance coverage and retirement provision including looking into the sufficiency of co-pay and other alternatives.

4. That for the year 2007 the General Assembly request the churches of the OPC to support the work of this Committee at the suggested rate of $25.00 per communicant member.

**PROPOSED BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>AMENDED</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Administration</td>
<td>1,557.66</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Secretary</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee travel</td>
<td>7,423.87</td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdirected Check</td>
<td>3,294.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1,374.40</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

| 23,649.93 | 19,000.00 | 19,000.00 | 21,000.00 | 21,000.00 |

**Diaconal Ministries - Foreign:**

| Palestine | 1,500.00 |
| Kenya | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 |
| Iraq | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Haiti | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 |
| Eritrea | 4,600.00 | 2,500.00 | 2,500.00 | 2,880.00 | 2,880.00 |
| Uganda | 1,374.40 | 1,500.00 | 1,500.00 | 1,500.00 | 1,500.00 |
| Mission Stations | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 6,000.00 | 12,000.00 | 12,000.00 |
| Clinic | 14,000.00 | 14,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 20,000.00 |
| Sudan | 10,000.00 | 4,000.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Suriname | 2,500.00 | 2,500.00 |
| Ethiopia | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 | 4,800.00 | 7,600.00 | 7,600.00 |
| China | 9,600.00 | 9,600.00 | 9,600.00 | 9,600.00 | 9,600.00 |
| Disas. Emerg. | 146,795.59 | 12,000.00 | 14,000.00 | 14,000.00 | 14,000.00 |
| Emerg. Relief | 11,821.00 | 8,000.00 | 29,000.00 | 29,000.00 | 29,000.00 |
| Total | 235,416.59 | 88,700.00 | 70,700.00 | 163,880.00 | 102,380.00 |

**Diaconal Ministries - USA:**

| Spec. Relief | 4,250.00 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 |
| Emerg. Med. | 107,188.18 | 150,000.00 | 150,000.00 | 150,000.00 | 150,000.00 |
| Hosp. Prem. | 28,000.00 | 44,000.00 | 44,000.00 | 44,000.00 | 44,000.00 |
| Student Scholarships | 590.00 | 49,000.00 | 49,000.00 | 49,000.00 | 49,000.00 |
| Philadelphia | 12,700.00 | 12,700.00 | 12,700.00 | 12,700.00 | 12,700.00 |
| Other | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 |
| Disas. Relief | 200,900.06 | 50,000.00 | 50,000.00 | 50,000.00 | 50,000.00 |
| Pens. Aid Fd | 28,000.00 | 44,000.00 | 44,000.00 | 44,000.00 | 44,000.00 |
| Infirm Minister | 590.00 | 49,000.00 | 49,000.00 | 49,000.00 | 49,000.00 |
| Total | 353,628.24 | 353,700.00 | 353,700.00 | 353,700.00 | 353,700.00 |
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HEIDER, TANNER, & DIRKS, INC.
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT’S

The Committee on Diaconal Ministries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church
Thornton, Colorado

We have reviewed the accompanying statement of assets, liabilities and net assets—cash basis of the Committee on Diaconal Ministries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as of December 31, 2005, and the related statements of receipts, disbursements and changes in net assets - cash basis and cash flows - cash basis for the year then ended, in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. All information included in these financial statements is the representation of the Committee’s management.

A review consists principally of inquiries of Committee personnel and analytical procedures applied to financial data. It is substantially less in scope than an audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion regarding the financial statements taken as a whole. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

Based on our review, we are not aware of any material modifications that should be made to the accompanying financial statements in order for them to be in conformity with the cash basis of accounting, as described in Note 2.

Our review was made for the purpose of expressing limited assurance that there are no material modifications that should be made to the financial statements in order for them to be in conformity with the cash basis of accounting, as described in Note 2. The information in the accompanying Schedules is presented only for supplementary analysis purposes. Such information has been subjected to the inquiry and analytical procedures applied in the review of the basic financial statements. This information is presented on the cash basis of accounting, and we are not aware of any material modifications that should be made thereto.

HEIDER, TANNER, & DIRKS, INC.
March 2, 2006

COMMITTEE ON DIACONAL MINISTRIES
of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church
STATEMENT OF ASSETS, LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS -  
CASH BASIS  
December 31, 2005  

ASSETS  
Cash in bank  
checking $ 18,499  
share account 246,556  
Total Cash 265,055  
Money Market account 299,404  
Total assets $ 564,459  

LIABILITIES  
0  

NET ASSETS  
Unrestricted 564,459  
Temporarily restricted 0  
Total net assets 564,459  
Total liabilities and net assets $ 564,459  

See accompanying notes and accountant’s report.  

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS  
CASH BASIS  
Year ended December 31, 2005  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporarily</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECEIPTS  
Contributions -  
General - Orth. Pres. churches $ 272,521 $ 252,432 $ 524,953  
General - Orth. Pres. other 11,746 90,139 101,885  
General – Non-Orth. Pres. Sources 146 38,929 39,075  
Total contributions 284,413 381,500 665,913  
Interest and dividend income 8,893 0 8,893  
Total receipts 293,306 381,500 674,806  

DISBURSEMENTS  
Administrative 22,798 852 23,650  
Foreign ministries 88,081 147,336 235,417  
Domestic (USA) ministries 120,316 233,312 353,628  
Total disbursements 231,195 381,500 612,695  

EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OR  
(DISBURSEMENTS) 62,111 0 62,111  

NET ASSETS, 12-31-04 502,348 0 502,348  

NET ASSETS, 12-31-05 $ 564,459 0 $ 564,459  

See accompanying notes and accountant’s report.
STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS – CASH BASIS

CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES:
   Excess of receipts or (disbursements)  62,111
   Cash provided (used) by operations   62,111

CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES:
   Cash invested in money market account  (8,068)
   Cash provided [used] by investing activities (8,068)

CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES:
   Loans made -
   Collections on loans -
   Cash provided (used) by financing activities -

NET INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH 54,043
CASH, December 31, 2004  211,012
CASH, December 31, 2005 $ 265,055

See accompanying notes and accountant’s report.

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

December 31, 2005

NOTE 1 ORGANIZATION AND PURPOSE
   The Committee on Diaconal Ministries of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (the
   “Committee”) receives funds primarily from Orthodox Presbyterian Churches and church
   members to support various domestic and foreign ministries and various retired ministers
   as directed by the Committee members.

NOTE 2 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES
   Accounting Method: The Committee’s policy is to prepare its financial statements on
   the cash basis of accounting, which is a comprehensive basis of accounting other than
   generally accepted accounting principles. Accordingly, income is recorded when received,
   rather than when pledged or earned, and expenses are recorded when paid rather than when
   the obligation is incurred.
   Cash and Cash Equivalents: Cash is deposited in two accounts, checking and “share”
   or savings, maintained at the Space Age Federal Credit Union, Aurora, Colorado. There
   are no cash equivalents.

NOTE 3 RESTRICTED AND UNRESTRICTED RECEIPTS AND NET ASSETS
   Contributions received are recorded as increases in unrestricted or temporarily
   restricted net assets, depending on the nature of any donor restrictions. There are no
   permanently restricted net assets.
NOTE 4 LOANS RECEIVABLE

The Committee makes loans to recipients in cases where the recipient requests a loan instead of a grant or donation. Loans are non-interest bearing, and any unrepaid balances are forgiven after seven years. At December 31, 2005, there were no loans outstanding.

NOTE 5 CONCENTRATION OF CREDIT RISK

The Committee maintains its bank account at a single financial institution. The balance of these accounts frequently exceeds the $100,000 per depositor insured limit set by the FDIC. Cash accounts therefore may not be completely insured.

NOTE 6 INVESTMENTS

The Committee invests excess cash in a money market account. The Committee records the value of this account at cost, which approximates fair market value. The carrying value (and fair market value) of the account was $299,404 at December 31, 2005. Dividend income on this account totaled $8,068 during 2005, which is included in interest and dividend income as reported on the statement of receipts, disbursements and changes in net assets – cash basis.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
Year ended December 31, 2005

Schedule 1 - Administrative Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office expense</td>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and meals</td>
<td>7,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting fees</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Disbursement</td>
<td>3,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total administrative disbursements</td>
<td>$23,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule 2 - Foreign Ministries Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea 04</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea 05</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Relief</td>
<td>11,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster relief</td>
<td>146,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total foreign ministry disbursements</td>
<td>$235,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule 3 - Domestic (USA) Ministries Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Pensions</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships - Philadelphia</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special relief</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization premiums Family 1</td>
<td>$3,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 2</td>
<td>6,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 3</td>
<td>2,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 4</td>
<td>7,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 5</td>
<td>11,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 6</td>
<td>6,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 10</td>
<td>11,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 11</td>
<td>10,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 12</td>
<td>9,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 13</td>
<td>4,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 16</td>
<td>11,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 17</td>
<td>11,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 18</td>
<td>7,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 19</td>
<td>1,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hospitalization premiums</td>
<td>107,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster relief</td>
<td>200,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension aid -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 1</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 2</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 3</td>
<td>16,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total pension aid</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infirm minister</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total domestic (USA) ministry disbursements</td>
<td>$353,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I  THE COMMITTEE

A. Meetings
The Committee has held two full meetings since the previous General Assembly. The first was October 5-6, 2005 and the second was March 22-24, 2006 both at the Administration Building at 607 N. Easton Road, Bldg. E, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

B. Officers
The officers of the Committee are Thomas E. Tyson, Chairman and Peter J. Wallace, Secretary.

C. Liaisons/subcommittees
The Committee has assigned individual members as “liaisons” whose duty it is to represent the Committee as contact persons with specific churches or organizations to keep the Committee informed about the life of that church or churches and, in turn, to inform the whole Church when it believes that significant information is available or appropriate action needed. In addition to the liaisons there are continuing subcommittees and subcommittees for specific tasks. The liaisons and subcommittees at present are:

1. Liaisons
   a. ARPC  Jack W. Sawyer
   b. BPC  Robert B. Needham
   c. CanRC  Wallace
   d. EPCEW - George W. Knight III
   e. ERQ - Mark T. Bube
   f. FRCNA  G. I. Williamson
   g. KAPC  Bube
   h. PCA  Knight
   i. RPCNA  L. Anthony Curto
   j. RCUS  Tyson
   k. URCNA  Williamson
   l. ICRC - Jack J. Peterson

2. Subcommittees
   a. Fraternal delegates - Bube
   b. Asia/Pacific  Bube, Tyson
   c. Africa [except South Africa]  Bube, Peterson
   d. Europe  Knight, Needham
   e. South Africa  Curto, Peterson
   f. South and Central America/Mexico - Needham, Williamson
   g. International Ecumenical Organizations  Sawyer

D. Part-time Administrator
The Committee is also served by a part-time staff Administrator, Mr. Peterson, whose work is reviewed annually at the Committee’s regular spring meeting.

II  FELLOWSHIP WITH OTHER CHURCHES

A. Fraternal Delegates/observers
1. Since the last General Assembly fraternal delegates were sent to the major assemblies of the Reformed Churches of South Africa (Knight), the Reformed Churches of New Zealand (Bube), the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of England and Wales (Needham and William Shishko), the Free Church of Scotland (Bube and Peterson), the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) (Bube and Peterson), the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland (Peterson), the Presbyterian Church in America (Wallace), the Reformed Church in
Japan (Stewart E. Lauer), and the Reformed Church in the United States (Benjamin K. Hopp). Written greetings are sent to those churches to which a fraternal delegate was not sent.

2. Since the last General Assembly a fraternal observer was sent to the to the major assembly of the Bible Presbyterian Church (Needham).

3. This year the Committee plans to send fraternal delegates to the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Free Reformed Churches in North America (FRCNA), the Korean American Presbyterian Church, the Presbyterian Church in America, the Reformed Church in Japan, the Reformed Church in the United States, the Reformed Church of Quebec (l’Église Réformée du Québec (ERQ)), and the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America.

4. This year the Committee plans to send observers to the Bible Presbyterian Church.

5. Our 72nd (2005) General Assembly received fraternal delegates and observers from the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (Ray B. Lanning), the Bible Presbyterian Church, General Synod (Kevin M. Backus), the Canadian Reformed Churches (Richard E. Pot and Riemer Faber), l’Église Réformée du Québec (ERQ) (the Reformed Church of Quebec) (Bernard Westerveld), the Free Church of Scotland (Alex J. MacDonald) the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) (Sherman Isbell), the Presbyterian Church in America (William S. Barker), the Reformed Church in Japan (Takayuki Ashida), the Reformed Church in the US (Tracy Gruggett and Kyle Sorenson), and the United Reformed Churches in North America (Harry Zekveld and Casey D. Freswick),

B. Churches in “Ecclesiastical Fellowship”.

1. The document that defines the position of the OPC in its ecumenical service is “Biblical Principles of the Unity of the Church”. That document has been adopted by 63rd (1996) G.A., and it is also found on the OPC website.

2. At present we are in Ecclesiastical Fellowship with 13 churches which are:
   a. the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church [www.arpsynod.org/]
   b. the Canadian Reformed Churches [www.canrc.org]
   c. the Christian Reformed Churches in the Netherlands [http://users.erols.com/mfaber/cgkinfen.htm]
   d. the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of England and Wales [www.epeew.org.uk/]
   e. the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland [http://web.ukonline.co.uk/epc/]
   f. the Free Church of Scotland [www.freechurch.org/]
   g. the Presbyterian Church in America [www.pcanet.org/]
   h. the Presbyterian Church in Korea (Kosin) [http://upc.or.kr]
   i. the Reformed Church in Japan [www.rcj.net.org/index.htmlq]
   j. the Reformed Church in the United States [www.rcus.org]
   k. the Reformed Churches of New Zealand [http://reformedchurches.org.nz/]
   l. the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland [www.rpc.org/]
   m. the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America [www.reformedpresbyterian.org]

C. Churches in “Corresponding Relationship”

   At present we are in “Corresponding Relationship” with seven churches which are:

1. the Africa Evangelical Presbyterian Church [AEPC]
2. the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Liberated) (de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland (Vrijgemaakt)) [GKNV] [www.gkv.nl]
3. the United Reformed Churches in North America
4. the Presbyterian Church in Japan (PCJ) [http://www2s.biglobe.ne.jp/~ploion/ncc.htm]
5. the Reformed Church of Quebec (l’Église Réformée du Québec (ERQ)). [http://www.erg.qc.ca/]
6. The Bible Presbyterian Church
7. the Reformed Churches of South Africa

D. The committee has established a special committee to propose guidelines for determining the number and nature of our relations to worldwide churches. Several churches approached the OPC requesting a relationship including churches in Australia, Peru, Indonesia and Belize. See recommendation 1.

E. The Committee has adopted a program to better discharge our mutually covenanted responsibilities to other churches in our relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship (EF) and to strive for the unity of the church contemplated in Biblical Principles of the Unity of the Church. The goal is to meet annually with representatives of the interchurch relations committee of churches in North America with which the OPC has Ecclesiastical Fellowship on a rotating schedule, and invite them to meet with us; on the years when the ICRC meets, the delegates to the ICRC meeting will meet with member churches of the ICRC with whom the OPC has Ecclesiastical Fellowship. The agenda of items to be discussed with respect to both churches during such a meeting will include: Are there specific occasions where you believe we have failed to live up to our commitments to you or have caused you grief? Speaking the truth in love, where do you perceive our testimony or practice to be weak? What, if any, significant changes in polity, doctrine, or practice are pending in your church(es)? What are the significant issues presently under study in the various assemblies of your church(s)? Are there ministries in which we can more closely cooperate? What are the impediments, real or perceived, to the two churches achieving organic unity? We desire to do this also with churches outside of North America where possible.

This will implement the relationship of ecclesiastical Fellowship set forth in the Minutes of the 64th [1997] General Assembly, Article 178, pages 53 and 283–284, such as Joint action in areas of common responsibility, Consultation on issues of joint concern, particularly before instituting changes in polity, doctrine, or practice that might alter the basis of the fellowship and The exercise of mutual concern and admonition with a view to promoting Christian unity. Also in view is the document Biblical Principles of the Unity of the Church, specifically part IV of which is entitled, Towards Perfecting Biblical Unity, and concludes: H. In seeking unity with faithful presbyterian and Reformed churches: I. There is also responsibility to call all churches, including our own, to faithfulness in order to seek the unity of the whole church. It is difficult to see how the OPC’s responsibilities under either of the above can be faithfully discharged without periodic substantive face-to-face meetings with our brothers. This year the delegates to the ICRC met with the Reformed Churches of New Zealand at the ICRC meeting, the Committee met with the URCNA in the spring and is scheduled to meet with the RCUS. F. The Committee also urges the presbyteries to continue improving fraternal relations with churches of like faith and practice in their regions and to communicate regularly with the CEIR to inform it of their progress.
Appendix

III FELLOWSHIP WITH CHURCHES IN NORTH AMERICA

Fellowship with several churches in North America is maintained largely by our membership in NAPARC, and we seek to meet with their delegations individually as well as through the plenary meetings of the Council. Our church also maintains fellowship with churches that are not members of NAPARC.

A. Churches in Ecclesiastical Fellowship in North America

1. **Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (ARPC)**. Several of the reports of the churches here and below are taken from their annual report to NAPARC.

   a. The ARPC and the OPC is in the relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship

   b. The report of the ARPC to NAPARC included the following:

      (1) The 201st Meeting of the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church was held at Bonclarken Conference Center (Flat Rock, NC) on June 7-9, 2005. The moderator of Synod is Dr. William B. Evans, Younts Professor of Bible and Religion at Erskine College. His emphasis for the Synod this year is “Nurturing and Equipping the People of God.” Mr. Paul Bell of Due West, SC is the Vice Moderator.

      (2) The Pre synod lectures and services were on the theme of Culture and the Church. Speakers were Ken Myers, Robert Glick, David Brisben, Frank van Dalen and Ali Mitchell with Bill Evans moderating.

      (3) The reported membership for 2004 was 35,418 communicant members and 5,379 non-communicant members for a total of 40,797 members. The number of our congregations increased from 264 to 268.

      (4) Concerning Inter Church Relations, the Synod received the report of the NAPARC meeting as well as the ongoing discussions with the RPCNA and our desire to know and work alongside them better. The Synod approved membership of the URCNA into NAPARC. The Synod’s Committee of Theological and Social Concerns declined to give recommendation regarding the matter of Women in the Military. The Synod received greetings from Rev. Ian Wise (RPCNA), Dr. Donald Fortson (EPC), Dr. L. Roy Taylor (PCA) and a written greeting from Rev. Calvin L. Tuininga (URCNA).

      (5) The Special Committee on Worship is on schedule to have a draft of the new Book of Worship for the 2006 Synod. Much of the work of the Special Committee on Organization was presented and adopted, but the committee will continue its work for at least another year. The memorial and paper concerning Women in the Church, originally presented in 2003, was adopted.

      (6) Rev. Frank van Dalen has become the director of World Witness, replacing John Mariner. Dr. John Carson stepped down from the presidency of Erskine College and Seminary, and there is a search to find his replacement. President Carson challenged the Synod to find the “friction point” be effective in engaging the culture’s swing away from the Lordship of Christ. Following his address, a committee was formed to help us be more proactive in impacting society with the gospel.

      (7) Mr. Thomas Patterson, a ruling elder in our oldest Congregation (Coddle Creek, 1753) and the director of Church Extension of our First Presbytery, is the Moderator elect for the 2006 Synod and Dr. John E. Hill is the Vice Moderator elect. The 2006 Synod is scheduled to meet June 6-8 at Bonclarken in Flat Rock, NC.

2. **Presbyterian Church in America (PCA)**

   a. The Committee, in response to the communication to the OPC 70th GA from the 30th (2003) General Assembly of the PCA (through its Interchurch Relations
Committee), is engaging in discussions with the PCA interchurch committee whose goal would be the union of the two churches.

b. Mr. Wallace was the Fraternal Delegate to the 33rd GA (2005) of the PCA.

c. The report of the PCA to NAPARC included the following:

1) **Year of the Ruling Elder & 50th Anniversary of Covenant College**

   (a) The 33rd General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America met June 13-17 at the Chattanooga Convention Center in Chattanooga, Tennessee, an attractive and accommodating venue. The theme of the Assembly, “The Year of the Ruling Elder,” was fitting for the PCA, which was begun in 1973, to a large degree, through the efforts of faithful Ruling Elders. In the first years of the PCA, Ruling Elders (RE) outnumbered Teaching Elders (TE, ministers) at the annual General Assembly. Soon, however, Teaching Elders outnumbered Ruling Elders in ratios from 2-1 to 3-1. Final registration this year indicated 1,049 Teaching Elders (66%) and 531 Ruling Elders (34%) present for a total of 1,580 commissioners, representing 841 churches and 63 Presbyteries. The ratio last year was 72% TEs to 28% REs.

   (b) The format of the Assembly was arranged with “The Year of the Ruling Elder” in mind. Over sixty seminars held on Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday and Thursday mornings covered a broad range of subjects designed to be of interest to Ruling Elders, not just to Teaching Elders. Preachers for the three evening services were Dr. J. Ligon Duncan, III, retiring Moderator, Dr. Sinclair B. Ferguson, Professor of Theology at Westminster Theological Seminary-Dallas, and Dr. John S. Piper, pastor of Bethlehem Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Dr. Duncan spoke on “Why God Invented Elders” based on Titus 1:5-9. Dr. Ferguson using Romans 8:31-39, focused on “The Heart of the Gospel” especially in verse 32. Dr. Piper spoke on “Obedience, Orthodoxy, and Joy: Leadership for a Greater Consensus.” Over 4,000 people attended the services each night,

   (c) Covenant College celebrated its Fiftieth Anniversary during the week. Dr. Niel Nielson, president of the college, coordinated the Assembly seminars and a festive dinner was held at the college for the commissioners on Wednesday night.

   (d) Jane Patete, PCA Women’s Coordinator (CE&P) and Sandy Hartley, Commissioners Families Sub-Committee (TN Valley Presbytery, Local Arrangements Committee) along with a host of volunteers organized activities and events for women, youth, and children to make the assembly family friendly. Over 450 women attended the Women’s events. Programs and activities for children and youth were well appreciated.

2) **RE Howard Q. Davis Elected Moderator of 33rd PCA General Assembly**

   Traditionally Ruling Elders and Teaching Elders are elected as Moderators of the Assembly in alternating years. The 33rd General Assembly elected RE Howard Q. Davis, Jr. as Moderator. Mr. Davis, a ruling elder in the First Presbyterian Church in Indianola, Mississippi, and a native of Indianola, graduated from the University of Mississippi (Ole Miss) with both his undergraduate and law degrees. He served in the army for three years, attaining the rank of Captain and served a stint in Vietnam where he was awarded the Bronze Star. A third generation lawyer in Indianola, Mr. Davis began his legal practice after completing his military service. From 1988 to 1994, he was a circuit court judge with the Fourth Circuit Court District of Mississippi. He also served in a number of other judgesthips including being appointed as a Special Circuit Judge by the Mississippi Supreme Court. He has served as moderator of Covenant Presbytery several times. On the General Assembly level, he has served on the Mission to North America Committee, the
Administrative Committee, and the Board of Directors of the PCA. Mr. Davis and his wife Fran, who have been married for 36 years, have three grown children and four grandchildren. One son, Howard Q. Davis, is the pastor of Grace PCA in Shreveport, LA.

(3) **Growth of the PCA**

For the statistical year of 2004 the PCA had a reported total membership of 330,182, a net increase of 9,782 over the previous year. The PCA ended 2004 with 1,553 churches, a net decrease of 22 churches. Though our church planting activities continued apace in areas of population stability or growth, several Presbyteries dissolved a number of struggling churches in areas of population decline. There were 10,978 professions of faith in PCA churches in 2004, an increase of 479. Total reported local church disbursements were $546,317,651, an increase of $15,815,849. The General Assembly approved overtures from Pacific Northwest Presbytery, Northern Illinois Presbytery, and Philadelphia Presbyteries to form a total of five new Presbyteries (Western Canada, Wisconsin, Chicago Metro, Eastern Pennsylvania, and Philadelphia Metro West Presbyteries). With the formation of the new Presbyteries, the total number of PCA Presbyteries will reach seventy-three.

(4) **Value of Human Life Study Committee Appointed**

Ohio Valley Presbytery overtured the General Assembly to erect an *ad interim* committee to study the issue of the value of human life. The 16th General Assembly in 1988 adopted the “Report of Heroic Measures Committee.” Since that time technological advances and changing medical ethics have called for decisions unforeseen in 1988. The Assembly adopted the overture of Ohio Valley. The Moderator will appoint a committee of seven to study the issue and report to the 35th Assembly in 2007. The committee is to be funded by designated gifts to the Administrative Committee/Office of the Stated Clerk.

(5) **Christian Education and Public Education**

A minister of Westminster Presbytery, TE Steven Warhurst, along with several other ministers and ruling elders presented a personal resolution (that was not adopted by Westminster Presbytery) calling on the General Assembly to encourage “all her officers and members to remove their children from the public schools and see to it that they receive a thoroughly Christian education, for the glory of God and the good of Christ’s Church.” Some who favored the resolution argued that public schools do not teach children to think biblically about all of life and, that the parents’ vows taken at the baptism of their children (*BCO* 56-5) require them to remove their children from public schools. Some who opposed the resolution argued that PCA members (on the bases of principle and financial considerations) utilize various means of educating their children (via church-based Christian schools, parent-led Christian schools, home schooling, secular private schools, and public schools) and that teaching children to think biblically about all of life is essentially the responsibility of the family and the church. The Assembly did *not* adopt the resolution.

(6) **Other Overtures**

The Assembly took the following actions on other overtures:

(a) Answered in the negative Overture 1 from Iowa Presbytery to define the term “papists” in *Westminster Confession of Faith* XXIV.3 by adding a footnote.

(b) Answered in the negative Overture 3 from Central Carolina Presbytery to revise *BCO* 19-12 to change interns’ filing frequent progress reports.

(c) Answered in the negative Overture 7 from Chesapeake Presbytery to amend BCO 21-5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and footnotes to revise the role of assistant pastors.

(d) Answered in the negative Overture 9 from Presbytery of the Ascension to amend *BCO* 21-4 to specify a procedure of teaching and preaching allowable
doctrinal differences. On the same issue, procedures for Presbyteries determining what are allowable doctrinal differences were proposed by the Review of Presbytery Records Committee (proposed revision to the “Rules of Assembly Operations” 14-3 e. 5) and consideration was postponed until the Wednesday morning session of the 2006 General Assembly.

(e) Answered in the affirmative Overture 10 from Ascension Presbytery to amend BCO 24-1 to require an examination in Bible content for the ordination of Ruling Elders and Deacons.

(f) Answered in the negative Overture 11 from Illiana Presbytery to establish a PCA Adoption Assistance Fund.

(g) Answered in the negative without prejudice to its content Overture 14 from Mississippi Valley Presbytery (MVP) to distribute to all Presbyteries the MVP “Report on the New Perspectives on Paul, the Theology of N. T. Wright, the Theology of Norman Shepherd, and the Theology of the so-called ‘Federal Vision’ in the PCA.”

(h) Answered in the affirmative a personal resolution from TE Peter Lillback of Philadelphia Presbytery that the 2006 General Assembly commemorate the 300th anniversary of the first Presbytery meeting in America (Philadelphia, 1706), if at all possible and that individual Presbyteries do the same where possible and appropriate.

(7) Amendments to the Book of Church Order

(a) BCO 26-2 requires an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Presbyteries as part of the amendment process. Two BCO proposed amendments were sent down by the 32nd General Assembly to Presbyteries for their vote:

1. to Amend BCO 24-3 Regarding Election of Ruling Elders and Deacons, substituting parenthetical reference to BCO 24-3 instead of BCO 24-2; and

2. to Amend BCO 24-9 to remove a specific age requirement for emeritus Elders and Deacons. Both items received the required majority vote of two-thirds of the Presbyteries and, the 33rd General Assembly approved both BCO amendments.

(b) Three BCO amendments were given initial approval by Assembly-2005 and will be sent to Presbyteries for a vote:

1. to amend BCO 15-4 to broaden the work of the Standing Judicial Commission,

2. to amend BCO 40-5 to simplify the language of that section, and

3. to amend BCO 24-1 to require an examination in Bible content for the ordination of Ruling Elders and Deacons.

The affirmative vote of forty-nine of the seventy-three Presbyteries will be needed for the 2006 Assembly to take final action.

(8) Strategic Planning

The Assembly heard the report of the Strategic Planning Committee, that for five years has operated as a sub-committee of the Administrative Committee. The committee reported that it divided itself into various task forces to expedite its work: Survey (Opinions and Perceptions in the PCA), Statistics (statistical analysis of the PCA), Ruling Elder Engagement, Reaching the Rising Generation, Inter-Agency Collaboration and Funding, General Assembly Structure and Procedures, and External Benchmarking (how other denominations gauge progress). The SPC recommended two BCO changes, which will be sent to Presbyteries for a vote, 1) to amend BCO 15-4 to broaden the work of the Standing Judicial Commission, 2) to amend BCO 40-5 to simplify the language of that section. The SPC was constituted an ad interim committee to report its
final recommendations directly to the Assembly in 2006. Among its recommendations will be: 1) the expansion of the Bills and Overtures Committee to include two representatives from each Presbytery to increase deliberation and debate on vital issues and 2) the formation of a Cooperative Ministries Committee to improve inter-Agency collaborative ministry and funding. The Assembly will hold discussions in Presbyteries in the coming year prior to a vote on the SPC recommendations in 2006. See the Website, www.pcaac.org/strategicplan.htm, for details.

(9) **General Assembly Ministries Annual Reports**

(a) **The Administrative Committee and Office of the Stated Clerk (AC/SC)** reported that *byFaith* magazine began publication in January. The Strategic Planning Committee has nears completion of its work and will present its final report in 2006. The AC/SC worked with the Local Arrangements Committee of TN Valley Presbytery to make “The Year of the Ruling Elder” a successful assembly in 2005. In 2006 North Georgia Presbytery will host the assembly in Atlanta. In 2007 Covenant Presbytery will host the Assembly in Memphis.

(b) **Committee on Christian Education and Publications (CE&P)** provides Christian Education resources, teacher training, youth leader training, and Women in the Church (WIC) training regionally. CE&P provides national and regional conferences on children’s ministry, mercy ministry (in cooperation with MNA), Christian schools, racial reconciliation, and women’s ministry, as well as Equip conferences.

(c) **Covenant College (CC)** reported that enrollment for 2003-2004 in all programs was 1,260 students, the highest in the history of the college. Students come from 46 states and 26 countries. In 2005 CC celebrated its 50th anniversary. A five-year $31 million capital campaign has been launched for building construction, building renovation, endowment, and expansion of library services.

(d) **Covenant Theological Seminary (CTS)** reported that the end of 2004 had placed all M.Div graduates. The seminary had the 16th consecutive year of increased enrollment. The Center for Ministry Leadership was inaugurated in cooperation with Westminster and Reformed theological Seminaries devoted to the mission of “Sustaining Pastoral Excellence,” through several initiatives such as the Pastor’s Summit, The Intersect Forum, and a Pastor in Residence program. In continuing pastoral education CTS offers a number of courses and conferences and vital issues such as evangelism, missions, Reformed worship, preaching, and community ministry, as well as a D.Min. Program.

(e) **Mission to North America (MNA)** has as its first priority the recruiting and development of church planters. MNA credentials assessment centers of several PCA networks of churches, and conducts MNA-led church planter assessment centers as well. MNA cooperates with Global Church Advancement, Inc. (Dr. Steve Childers) to provide three, one-week, intensive seminars for Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced training for Church Planters. MNA cooperates with the *Embers to Flame* ministry of Briarwood PCA (Dr. Harry Reeder) as a fourth unit of training. MNA cooperates with American University of Biblical Studies (Atlanta) to provide ministerial training through the MNA Leadership and Ministry Preparation Program (LAMP) led by TE Brian Kelso to prepare men, in keeping with the PCA Uniform Theological Curriculum Guidelines, to serve in the PCA ministry in all segments of society in North America. MNA staff member, TE Tim McKeown is leading the English as a Second Language Ministry (ESL). Two ESL Convocations have been held thus far.

(f) **Mission to the World (MTW)** reported 569 long-term missionaries (an increase of 11), 176 two-year missionaries, 293 missionary interns, 7,500 two-week mission trip participants, and 381 national church-planting partners. Sixty-three percent of MTW missionaries are involved in church planting. Fifty-four churches were
planted abroad. MTW worked with RUM to develop campus ministry at the University of Mexico, in Mexico City, the world’s largest university. The Street Child Ministry is being conducted in six major international cities. Asia Tsunami Relief has been distributed in Sri Lanka and India. Over $1.6 million has been received for that effort. The AIDS Coordinator for World Relief is MTW missionary, Debbie Dortzbach. Partnerships of local churches, MTW missionaries, and national partners are working in East Asia, Scotland, West Africa, and the Middle East to plant churches, do evangelism, mercy ministry and theological education. Total contributions to MTW for 2004 were about $43.1 million.

(g) PCA Foundation (PCAF) reported total assets in 2004 of $34.3 million, a new milestone. $4,303,000 was disbursed for Kingdom work. Almost $2 million was channeled to PCA local churches. $689,000 was channeled to General Assembly ministries.

(h) PCA Retirement & Benefits (PCA-RBI) reported that the PCA Health Plan was terminated due to the adverse selection situation of participants and inadequate claims-to-premiums ratios. A last-ditch effort to save the plan was ineffectual. Participation in the Retirement Plan increased 7.5%. Total assets under management grew to $241.5 million, a 16.1% increase. The Christmas Ministerial Relief Offering totaled of $427,000.

(i) Ridge Haven Conference Center (RH) reported prayer goals of 1,200 summer campers, 180 conversions, 8,500 guests served annually, Partnership Shares participation of 35% of PCA churches, $75,000 for Dining Hall renovations and septic field expansion. Ministry Director, Lt. Col. Mack Griffith, has been deployed as an army chaplain. A Ministry Assistant Director will cover his duties for 12-24 months.

(j) Reformed University Ministries (RUM) began ministry on eleven new campuses since the last assembly. Ministry is expected on 98 campuses by the end of 2005. New campus ministries include, Birmingham Southern/University of Alabama-Birmingham, Coastal Carolina U., Duke University, Northwestern University, University of Alberta, Edmonton, University of Northern Colorado, and the Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City (the world’s largest university). The project in Mexico is the first joint ministry with MTW. Students from over forty countries are involved in Reformed University Fellowship International in the USA. Local campus ministries (Reformed University Fellowships) are led by ordained PCA ministers. Students are instructed in Evangelism, Missions, Growth in Grace, Fellowship and Service, and a Biblical World-and-Life View, while setting forth an appreciative view of the Visible Church and the ordinary means of grace (preaching of the Bible, participation in the sacraments, and engagement in prayer).

(10) byFaith Magazine

The Editor RE Dick Doster, reported on the progress of byFaith. The 30th General Assembly (2002) authorized the Administrative Committee/Office of the Stated Clerk to proceed with plans to publish a news magazine to report on the ministries of PCA churches, PCA members, Presbyteries and PCA Committees and Agencies, as well as to deal with matters of interest to the members and friends of the PCA. Most of the ten General Assembly Committees and Agencies have periodic publications regarding their respective ministries. The new magazine, byFaith, is intended to cover the entire PCA. Start-up funds were sought before bi-monthly publication was begun in January, 2005. Initial response from readers, advertisers, and supporters has been overwhelmingly positive. A subscription effort is underway to increase circulation. Individual annual subscriptions are $19.95 Sessions may take advantage of an every-family subscription plan for $14, if all families in a local church are enrolled. See Website, www.byfaithonline.com, for details.
(11) **Special Days, Offerings and Events Recommended for PCA Churches**


(12) The 33rd General Assembly will convene June 20-23, 2006, in Atlanta, Georgia.

(13) **A Word of Thanks and Request.**

The Administrative Committee/Office of the Stated Clerk provides the administrative services and legal structure for the PCA to minister cooperatively as a denomination. All churches, presbyteries, and denominational ministries benefit from the ministry of the AC/SC. Therefore, we request that all PCA churches consider supporting the AC/SC through the *per capita* giving of Partnership Shares or *proportional* giving (for example, one-half of one percent of local church offerings). We appreciate your support for this needful ministry.

3. **Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS)**

   a. The RCUS and the OPC is in the relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship. The Committee is scheduled to meet with the RCUS in the deepening of ecclesiastical program.

   b. The report of the RCUS to NAPARC included the following:

   The 259th Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States was convened after evening worship on May 16th, 2005 in the Ebenezer Reformed Church in Shafter, California. On Wednesday, May 18th the venue was moved to Grace Reformed Church in Bakersfield, CA, where the remainder of the Synod was held. Some of the highlights of Synod are as follows:

   1. The Reformed Church in the United States now consists of thirty nine churches and nine home mission works, with 4,256 baptized members, of which 3,213 are communicants.

   2. Four new ministers were officially received by Synod this year, Rev. Dan Rogers, of Sutton, NE, Rev. Matthew Power, of Limon, CO, Rev. Lee Johnson, of Herried, SD, and Rev. Eric Bristerly, of Grass Valley, CA. We are grateful to God for providing ministers for the churches of the RCUS.

   3. A five year Sunday School curriculum based on S. G. DeGraaf's Promise and Deliverance has been completed for use in the churches. As these materials have been implemented in many of the churches, there are also avenues for feedback, so that the materials may be improved upon if necessary.

   4. The Special Committee to Study the Procedures for the establishment of an RCUS Seminary's Report stirred a very lively debate. There has been concern to maintain orthodoxy into the future, and thus, the proposal that the RCUS establish
a seminary that would be under the authority and oversight of the Synod. The main thrust of the report was how to accomplish and proceed with such an establishment. The report was recommitted and the committee continued.

(5) The special Committee to Study Justification had a mandate to examine the New Perspective on Paul with an emphasis on critiquing N.T. Wright's teaching on Justification, and to report to this Synod its conclusion. The doctrine of justification by grace through faith, and therefore the Gospel itself, has been undermined in recent years and certainly necessitated the work of this committee. The recommendations of the report were adopted and on motion the report is being sent to all churches in fraternal relations, and to member churches of NAPARC and the ICRC. The committee was continued with a mandate to study the theology of “Federal Vision” and report to the 260th Synod.

(6) Fraternal delegates received by Synod this year were Rev. K. M. Kabongo of the Reformed Confessing Church of the Congo, Rev. Klaas Jonker of the Canadian Reformed Churches, and Mr. Tyson of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. Observers from the United Reformed Churches in North America were Rev. Gary Findley and Rev. Johginda Gangar.

Synod rejoiced to hear the report of Rev. K. M. Kabongo that the Reformed Confessing Church in the Congo, which the RCUS sponsored at its inception in 1984, now numbers 250 churches served by twenty two ministers. The RCUS financially supports the churches in the Congo (in conjunction with the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands/Liberated), as well as the Free Reformed Church in Kenya. There is a program in place for training indigenous pastors and evangelists by RCUS ministers sent by Synod. Two men were to visit Kenya for this purpose by the end of 2005.

(7) The RCUS supports, with other Reformed churches, the French language Reformed Faith and Life radio broadcast produced by Rev. Eric Kayayan in Pretoria, South Africa. Rev. Paul Treick reported on that work. Rev. Gil Baloy advocated exploration of the feasibility of working with churches near Manila, in the Philippines. Middle East Reformed Fellowship, Rev. Victor Atallah, director, an outreach by various means to the Arabic speaking world, was added by Synod to the list of ministries worthy of support.

(8) Mission work among the deaf is also progressing in several areas of the country. Two RCUS churches named Deaf Reformed Church, one in Danville, Kentucky, and the other in Columbia, Maryland, are pursuing mission work among the deaf with vigor. A work has begun in the Chicago area, and Rev. Jari Saavalainen has been called to labor for the establishment of a church there, with the assistance of Elder Mike Brabo.

(9) Synod was adjourned on Thursday, May 19th, at 9:45pm. The work of the Lord’s church was done with seriousness, with joy, and with a view to his honor and glory. We ask you, brothers, to pray for the Reformed Church in the United States, as we seek to be faithful in the proclamation of God’s Holy Word, that we may be useful in the church gathering work of our Lord Jesus Christ.

4. **Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America (RPCNA)**
   a. The RPCNA and the OPC is in the relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship
   b. The report of the RPCNA to NAPARC included the following:
      (1) The 174th Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America met at Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania, June 27-30, 2005. This was a much shorter Synod than usual; rather than the normal schedule of Saturday evening until Friday afternoon, it started on Monday evening and ran until Thursday afternoon. One
reason for the change was that it eliminated the need for pastors to be away over a weekend. The Business of Synod Committee reached the conclusion that the time was too short, and proposed that the 2006 Synod meet from Monday evening to Friday afternoon; this was adopted by Synod. Rev. Dr. Jonathan Watt, a Bible Professor at Geneva College was elected Moderator. Dr. Wayne Spear, retiring Professor of Systematic Theology at the RP Seminary led the morning devotional messages on The Offices of Christ”.

(2) Our Synod adopted the following three recommendations of the Interchurch Relations Committee:

(a) We recommended that Synod approve membership in NAPARC of the United Reformed Churches in North America.

(b) We recommended to the Synod that since last year’s Synod responded to a request from the United Reformed Churches in North America (URC) to enter into Corresponding Relationship with them, and that since our Committee had a positive meeting with their Interchurch Committee, that we enter into full fraternal relations with the URC.

(c) On the basis of a meeting with members of the Interchurch Committee of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (ARP), we recommended, to Synod that in order to develop closer relationships with the ARP; the Business of Synod Committee invite an ARP minister to speak at one of the devotional periods at the Synod of 2006, and that they plan a time when representatives of the ARP may share with the Synod the work of the ARP including foreign missions.

We are still open to the invitations of the OPC and the PCA to enter into church union talks with each of them at a later time.

(3) A proposed change in our Directory for Church Government was sent down to the Sessions in overture and failed by one vote to get a two-thirds majority. The current practice is for the congregation to elect congregational officers (chairman, vice-chairman and secretary) at the annual congregational meeting to be in charge at business meetings (usually just once a year) of the congregation. The proposed change was to restrict the election of church officers to “teaching and ruling elders and deacons.”

(4) The Foreign Mission Board reported on the growth and strengthening of our six congregations in Kobe, Japan. In addition to the new church building at Kasumigaoka, funds have been raised to construct a new church building at Higashishima. A new Japanese Pastor, Katsunori Endo, was installed Pastor of the Kata-Suzurandai congregation. Rev. James Pennington, who has also served as a pastor, has completed his missionary service, and the Foreign Mission Board is calling for missionaries to go to Japan to work with the Presbytery. Kobe Theological Hall had 21 students this past year, four of whom are under care of Presbytery. The Board is exercising considerable time and effort in the development of a new mission field in the Sudan. It is also considering work in a Middle Eastern country where a family is already serving on the field.

(5) The Home Mission Board reported that 14 new congregations and continuing mission churches have been planted since 1988, as well as 5 developing church plants and several more in early planning stages. It unveiled a goal which envisions the planting of 17 new congregations by the year 2020, a goal entitled “2020 Vision”. It issued the following statement of its priority: “To work toward our goal of establishing healthy, growing multiplying congregations, that the Synod make evangelism and church planting a renewed priority as expressed in the 20/20 Vision.”

(6) Two of the professors of the Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary retired in 2005: Drs. Wayne R. Spear and Edward Robson. In a careful process in which credentials were presented, candidates for the position of Professor of Old Testament Studies were publicly interviewed and observed by the Synod in a class-room setting. C. J.
Williams, currently a pastor and candidate for doctoral degree at Baltimore Hebrew University, was elected as Professor of Old Testament. In a like process, candidates for the position of Professor of Systematic Theology were interviews and observed by the Synod. Dr. Richard Gamble, Professor of Systematic Theology at RTS, Orlando, was elected. Both men will begin serving this Fall and will be inaugurated on Friday, September 30, 2005. 100 students are enrolled this Fall with an F.T.E. of 58. The Seminary is planning for a program of celebration in 2010 commemorating, its 200th Anniversary.

(7) Geneva College completed its 157th year and installed its 19th President, Dr. Kenneth A. Smith, on October 30, 2004. Enrollment continues to increase and major campus improvements are scheduled for 2006.

(8) The Reformed Presbyterian Home in Pittsburgh is proceeding with plans for the construction of 36 new apartments (The Upper Rooms) on the hill above the Home. About half of the current residents’ rooms have been remodeled.

(9) Synod is called to meet June 26-30, 2006 at Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA.

5. **Canadian Reformed Churches (CANREF) [//www.canrc.org]**
   a. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Canadian Reformed Churches are in Ecclesiastical Fellowship. The Committee is working with the Committee for Contact with Churches in the Americas of the Canadian Reformed Churches to implement the new relationship.
   b. The report of the CANREF to NAPARC included the following:
      1. On behalf of the Canadian and American Reformed Churches I bring you greetings.
      2. Our churches take ecumenical relationships seriously and we are therefore careful about the relationships we establish.
      3. About four years ago we as Canadian and American Reformed Churches offered relationships to a number of churches besides the ones which have traditionally been our sister churches. As a result, we started to have pulpit exchanges with churches such as the OPC, URC, and the RCUS. These are new developments that take getting used to. But we experience them as positive changes. A couple of weeks ago, we could read on the Canadian Reformed website that our churches are now even calling ministers from such denominations, i.e.: from the RCUS and the Free Church of Scotland.
      4. As members of the Canadian Reformed Committee for Contact with Churches in the Americas, we are observing your meetings to see if membership in NAPARC will be useful next to the ICRC, since there are similarities between these organizations. The OPC, ERQ, and the RCUS churches who are part of your membership, have encouraged us to participate in NAPARC as they see a growing need for this.
      5. The next General Synod of our churches will be dealing with a response from our committee to questions concerning the need to join another organisation besides the ICRC. This Synod to be, is scheduled for May 2007 in Smithers BC.
      6. Last year two question were brought by our delegates, and you were asked to respond. The questions were: 1. What is the need for NAPARC beside ICRC? 2. Is NAPARC open to exploring the possibility of integration into the ICRC?

So far, we realize that NAPARC was there before the ICRC and also that several members of NAPARC are not members of ICRC.
We also understand that membership in NAPARC could benefit us. The activities of each organization can complement each other. Membership in NAPARC could assist us in our biblical calling to foster unity with other faithful Reformed churches who are not members of ICRC.

The ICRC does not have annual meetings to facilitate contacts between Reformed and Presbyterian. To leave such contacts to every four years may not be as useful in our international discussions on issues that are maybe of common interest and concern with all Churches that are present here.

We would appreciate any further input in response to our thoughts on these matters.

(7) As we see it, one area where further cooperation could benefit all NAPARC member churches is more communication among each other regarding Church planting. Our churches are concerned about the choice of target areas for church planting (i.e: Is there already an existing true church of Jesus Christ in that area?)

We started a discussion on this with the CEIR of the OPC at a meeting which we had with them in April of this year. They agreed that there should be more consultation with existing churches in the areas of church planting.

We believe that we have the duty to join a church where it can be seen that it is a faithful Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our witness to the community should be one. (John 17:20-26 Eph.4: 1-6 and Belgic Confession Article 27-29). Our forces against all evil should be a united force, and if we recognise each other we should not be in separate battle fields. The world around us should not be looking at us and saying that if the Reformed or the Presbyterians cannot get along, they just start up yet another church.

(8) Another issue to discuss and I think is linked to this one is church hoppers or church shoppers. And I add: Should discipline stop at our church borders? Can we carry on discipline among churches that are not related denominationally?

(9) These are maybe some of the issues that we feel could benefit us, and which also is possible when reading the Basis of your Council, as published on your website.

(10) Finally, it would be nice if the NAPARC web site could be updated with more information as to what it offers. We are just looking for as much information as we can get. The last report of meetings was 2002.

(11) Last year there were four members of our committee here. We had planned to have more delegates here this year but due to other commitments and circumstances this was not possible, So I alone will have to report this years events.

The Lord willing next year we may be present with 4 observers in order to make up a final proposal to our next Synod, for membership in NAPARC. Hopefully meeting with you during your sessions and speaking with the delegates here this year and again next year we may see the needs of this organization for our churches to be members.

(12) May the blessings of the Lord be upon you and may your labours be for the ongoing gathering of the Catholic Christian Church which is spread and dispersed throughout the entire world.

May the present hidden Glory of God completely shine through the whole of the Church and may we be joined and united with heart and will, in one and the same Spirit, by the power of faith. (Belgic Confession, Art.27)

B. Other Churches

1. **Bible Presbyterian Church (BPC)** [http://bpc.org/]
   a. The BPC and the OPC are in Corresponding Relationship
b. We continue to send observers to their annual Synod each year. They afford our observer with full privileges.

2. United Reformed Churches of North America (URCNA)
   a. Our 64th (1997) General Assembly invited the URCNA to enter into corresponding relations with the OPC.
   b. The URCNA is a member church of the ICRC and of NAPARC.
   c. The URCNA “Guidelines for Ecumenicity and Church Unity” were included in our report to the 70th General Assembly (2003).
   d. The OPC - URC Statements of Agreement were printed in the Minutes of the 2004 GA. Your Committee continues to review these and proposes changes to them.
   e. The Committee met with the interchurch relations committee (CERCU) of the United Reformed Churches in North America (URCNA) March 22-23, 2006.

What follows is an agreed on press release.

(1) Meeting of the CEIR of the OPC with the CERCU of the URCNA
(2) On March 22-23, 2006 the committees for ecumenicity of both the OPC and the URCNA met in Willow Grove, PA to further their ecumenical dialogue.
(3) Present from the URCNA: John Bouwers, Chuck Dykstra, Gary Findlay, Casey Freswick, Dan Hoaglander, Todd Joling, Ralph Pontier, William Vanderwoerd, Harry Zekveld.
(5) The meeting was chaired by the Rev. Thomas Tyson.
(6) The OPC has invited the URCNA to enter a relationship of “ecclesiastical fellowship” (equivalent to the URCNA’s “phase two” of ecclesiastical relations). The committees have been meeting annually to discuss these matters since 2002. The two committees are involved in producing a series of “Statements of Agreement,” in order to provide a clear picture to the General Synod of the URCNA in 2007.
(7) The two committees have agreed on the wording of statements on 1) The Holy Scriptures, 2) The Confessions, 3) Subscription to the Confessions, 4) Church History (especially regarding the formation of the OPC and the URCNA), 5) Church Designations and Distinctions, and 6) Church Offices and Authority. The purpose of this meeting was to finalize the first six statements, and to begin working on further statements on worship, preaching, sacraments, ministerial training and discipline.
(8) The committees’ statements of agreement are as follows (it should be noted that these statements are simply the statements of the committees and are not the official positions of either the URCNA or the OPC. They are intended to promote mutual understanding and should not be construed in any other way):

OPC - URCNA STATEMENTS OF AGREEMENT
Drafted by the Church Relations Committees

1. The Holy Scriptures
The Bible is God’s Word received by His people for the foundation, regulation, and confirmation of their faith. We agree that the Scriptures are inspired by the Holy Spirit, that they are infallible and inerrant, and that no one may add to or detract from the Word of God. We further agree that in the Bible the LORD reveals the whole counsel of God for His glory, our salvation, and a life of service for believers that comprises both preservation and propagation of the truth.
2. **The Confessions**
The confessions and catechisms of the OPC and the URCNA are their approved and adopted formulations of the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. The Three Forms of Unity (Belgic Confession, Heidelberg Catechism, and Canons of Dort) display a broad, reflective, and pastoral quality. The Westminster Standards (Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger Catechism, and Shorter Catechism) depict a careful and more detailed articulation of the same Reformed faith. We agree that while each confession reflects its own era, the Westminster Standards and the Three Forms of Unity both express a faithful summary of God’s Word, and are compatible and in harmony with each other.

3. **Subscription to the Confessions**
In order to preserve their unity and purity both the OPC and the URCNA require their office bearers to record their vows of subscription to the confessional standards, and do not allow private exceptions by office bearers. Should these vows be breached, we agree that biblical discipline must be exercised.

4. **Church History**
God’s gathering of His holy catholic Church from, and in the midst of a sinful humanity also entails reformations. We agree that the secessions of the 1930s and the 1990s in producing the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the United Reformed Churches were reformations used by the Lord of the Church to retain for Himself a faithful people. We confess that while both secessions were imperfect and marred by sin, the resultant communions give evidence of being true and faithful to the Lord in striving for the pure preaching of His Word, the pure administration of the sacraments, and the faithful application of discipline.

5. **Church Designations and Distinctions**
Since God’s Word employs the designation “church” in a variety of ways, the OPC and the URCNA agree that Scripture envisions local, regional, and universal manifestations with the same word “church.” We further agree that it is mandatory for churches to heed the Lord’s call to enter into mutual relationships such as denominations or federations. We also agree that the nature or structure of these relationships includes both Biblically prescribed and voluntary aspects. Both of these features are intended to serve the well-being of the local churches in their congregational life and broader ministry.

6. **Church Offices and Authority**
Both communions practice three ordinations, including three different sets of vows, for three distinct callings in Christ’s church (ministers, ruling elders, and deacons). As Head of the Church, Christ confers His authority to shepherd and govern His flock on the body of presbyters (ministers and ruling elders), who are mandated to exercise their office in His Name. We agree that Christ has appointed ministers whose primary task it is to preach and teach, as well ruling elders whose primary task it is to govern. We also agree that the exercise of such authority by presbyters (ministers and ruling elders) is not limited to the local congregation, but remains vested in officers or office bearers when they are delegated or commissioned to broader assemblies for the edification of the church. We further agree that decisions of such assemblies, when in agreement with God’s Word and the confessional standards, have Christ’s authority and are therefore to be received with reverence and submission. Both communions recognize the right of a dissenting minority to appeal to a broader assembly.

(9) Each committee presented a written statement on worship, preaching, sacraments, ministerial training and discipline, followed by discussion of the
areas of agreement and disagreement between our two communions an amicable and profitable discussion which demonstrated that there is much foundational agreement in all of these areas. Each communion is concerned to govern its worship practices by Scripture, to preach the whole counsel of God, to administer the sacraments properly, and to exercise Christian discipline faithfully. While neither the OPC nor the URCNA have denomination-run seminaries, both are committed to a thorough theological education for the ministry. While the age for receiving members by baptism to the Lord’s Table by a profession of faith may generally be lower in the OPC than in the URCNA, paedocommunion is not permitted in either the OPC or the URCNA.

(10) While the resulting statements will focus on the agreement between us, we recognized that there are details of our church order and practice where there are we have significant differences between us, such as:

a) The URC does not generally lay hands on ruling elders at their ordination, while the OPC does.

b) The URC generally uses the word “church” to refer only to the local church and the holy, catholic Church, while the OPC also speaks of the “regional church” under the oversight of the presbytery and the “whole church” under the General Assembly as further manifestations of the church.

c) The URC requires ministers to preach catechetical sermons, while the OPC does not. Some OP ministers would be uncomfortable with such a requirement since they are committed to preaching through books of the Bible. While the method of catechetical preaching produced considerable discussion there was general agreement that the whole counsel of God must be preached.

d) The URC encourages special attention to Christmas and Easter in its church order, while the OPC does not have such a provision.

e) The URC requires the use of particular forms for sacraments, ordination, marriage, etc., while the OPC allows for greater liturgical freedom.

f) The URC Church Order prescribes two worship services per Lord’s Day, while this is not the practice in some OPC congregations.

(11) The meeting was characterized by great cordiality and frankness as well as warm fraternal fellowship.

f. The report of the URCNA to NAPARC included the following:

(1) We greet you in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ with the humble hope of being welcomed as a member church of NAPARC. We pray and trust that we may be of great blessing to one another, even, the Lord willing growing closer and closer to one another in our common witness to the world from out of our precious Reformed heritage.

(2) Given that our synodical assembly is only required to meet once every three years, there are technically no significant synodical actions that we can report to you beyond what was reported already last year from the 5th Synod of the United Reformed Churches in North America that was hosted in Calgary, AB, June 15-18, 2004. Neither have there been any significant developments affecting the entire federation.

(3) For the benefit of the member churches, however we will repeat a brief summary of the important synodical actions of Synod 2004, as well as provide a summary of the ecumenical relations our federation is currently engaged in.

(4) Creation. On the teaching of the Bible regarding creation, the synod had been overtured (asked) by the churches to add to the affirmations made at Synod Escondido 2001. The decision of this body was that no expanded statement was necessary. The 2001 decision reads as follows: Synod affirms that the Bible teaches that God created all things good in six days defined as evenings and mornings (Genesis 1,2, Exodus 20: 11).
This means that we reject any evolutionary teaching, including theistic evolution, concerning the origin of the earth and of all creatures.

(5) Ethical Issues. One of the classes had overtured synod to make statements regarding the sins of homosexuality and abortion. The synod decided that we were not shown any compelling reason to make such statements, because no one in our midst denies that such actions are sinful. In the grounds for both of these decisions it was affirmed that Scriptures are already clear, and the confessions clearly imply that these actions are sinful.

(6) Justification through Faith Alone. Occasioned by an appeal that originated as a charge against a minister’s sermon, Synod Calgary 2004 made the following statement: Synod affirms that the Scriptures and confessions (Heidelberg Q/A 59-62; Belgic Confession Articles 20-23) teach the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone, based upon the active and passive obedience of Christ alone.

(7) Paedocommunion. The synod rejected this practice with the following statement: The confessions to which the URCNA subscribe (the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession, the Canons of Dort) accurately summarize the teaching of Scripture (1 Corinthians 11:24-25;28). Thus our confessions, in harmony with the Scripture, require that the Lord's Supper be administered only to those who have publicly professed their faith, in the presence of God and His holy church.

(8) Ecumenical Relations Abroad. Ecumenical work among the United Reformed Churches has initially been focused more prominently on relations in North America. Work of the Committee for Contact with Churches Abroad (CECCA) is beginning to progress as well, however. Synod Calgary 2004 received greetings from representatives of the GKN (vrijgemaakt) of the Netherlands, the RCNZ of New Zealand, and the GKZA (“Doppers”) of South Africa. The synod also drafted a letter of concern over the fact that the above listed church in South Africa has recently decided to open the office of deacons to women.

(9) Ecumenical Relations in North America. The Committee for Ecumenical Relations and Church Unity (CERCU) has been working actively as our churches strive to live up to the name United Reformed. Here follows a summary of the background and present state of ecumenical relations in the URCNA.

At Synod St. Catharines (1997) the churches assigned to CERCU the responsibility of pursuing ecumenical relations with a list of ten North American ecclesiastical bodies. With the removal of the Protestant Reformed Churches there presently are nine remaining.

At Synod Hudsonville (1999) the churches specified that the work should be conducted with a view toward complete church unity. CERCU makes recommendations in order that by synodical decision the UR churches may move along together in relation to these bodies in three phases of development. Phase 1 is Corresponding Relations, Phase 2 is Ecclesiastical Fellowship and Phase 3 is the highest form of unity, Church Union where two federations become one.

(10) Our present level of involvement with each of the assigned bodies is as follows:

**Ecumenical Dialogue** (Our churches have instructed the Committee to dialogue with these groups but have not yet progressed to Phase I, Corresponding Relations).

1. Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (ARP)
2. Presbyterian Church of America (PCA)

Phase 1 - **Corresponding Relations**

1. Eglise Reformee du Quebec (ERQ)
2. Free Reformed Churches in North America (FRC)
3. Orthodox Christian Reformed Churches (OCRC)
4. Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC)
5. Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America (RPCNA)

Phase 2 - Ecclesiastical Fellowship
1. Canadian Reformed Churches (CanRC)
2. Reformed Church of the United States (RCUS) - this was ratified by the consistories, on May 1, 2005 with a vote of 70%. A simple majority was required. We understand that the RCUS from its side has postponed action on this decision and will take up the matter at their next synod.

With regard to the relationship with the Canadian Reformed there are joint committees that are looking into each of the following matters of a Joint Church Order, Theological Education and a Common Song Book.

3. Free Reformed Churches in North America (FRCNA) [www.frcna.org]
   a. The Committee hopes to have an observer at the meeting of their synod this year.
   b. The report of the FRCNA to NAPARC included the following
      (1) The Free Reformed Churches of North America now consist of 4273 members, spread over 20 congregations and 1 church plant.
      (2) Our roots lie in the Secession of 1834 in the Netherlands. At the time the Dutch state church was largely liberal and corrupt. Rev. Hendrick DeKok was converted by reading the Canons of Dort (1618-19), and led out a small group of members to form a new church. When others followed, a new denomination was formed called the Christelijk Gereformeerde Kerken (Christian Reformed Churches). When Abraham Kuyper led another large group out of the state church in 1892, he sought to unify with the Secession churches. Our forefathers however refused because they were suspicious of his doctrine of presumed regeneration. When a number of them emigrated to Canada immediately after the Second World War, they started a new group of churches with the name Free Reformed, since Christian Reformed was used by another denomination. To this day, our concern about the doctrine of presumed regeneration, as well as insisting on the antithesis between the church and the world, is the primary reason for our continued existence separate from other confessional reformed bodies. We also love the experiential heritage bequeathed to us by the English and Dutch Puritans.
      (3) As far as missions are concerned, we are involved in a number of efforts. We have sent out a missionary professor, Rev. Ken Herfst, to the Evangelical Presbyterian Seminary of Guatemala. When hurricane Stan hit recently, the government made him coordinator for local relief efforts, even at one point putting a helicopter at his disposal. We also have 3 missionary families in the mountains of Guatemala, working with the Achi Indians in literacy work, bible translation, medical work, and church planting. One of the local men broadcasts Spanish language messages over the radio. We also broadcast the Banner of Truth radio program weekly all over the world, concentrating especially on Africa. One of our pastors is doing some exploratory work in India, with a view to getting involved in training young men for the ministry. Our publications include: The Messenger, the Youth Messenger, and the Free Reformed Theological Journal.
      (4) There are a number of concerns about which we covet your prayers. 5 of our pulpits are vacant, and at this point we only have one man studying for the ministry. At our last Synod, when the individual churches gave their reports, most of our consistories are involved in admonishing someone under their charge with regard to sexual
sins. We are also concerned that our young people maintain a confessional reformed outlook on life, particularly our university students. Chiefly we desire and need the second coming of our Lord on the clouds of heaven.

(5) We have close ties with the HRC denomination, and operate the Puritan Reformed Theological Seminary together in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The instructors include Dr. Joel Beeke, and Dr. Gerald Bilkes. We are also involved in talks with the United Reformed Churches, the Canadian Reformed Churches, and the OPC.

4. L’Église Réformée du Québec (ERQ)
   a. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the Reformed Church of Quebec (l’Église Réformée du Québec (ERQ)) are in a Corresponding Relationship.
   b. The report of the ERQ to NAPARC included the following:
      (1) Greetings, brothers, in the name of Christ who is the way, the truth and the life.
      (2) We apologize that we will not extend greetings to you in person this year. The resources of the ERQ, both human and financial, are limited. Consequently, no ordained officer was able to avail himself to attend the 2005 NAPARC meeting as the ERQ delegate. Lord willing, we shall be present in 2006.
      (3) Concerning the significant activities of the ERQ, we thank the Lord for Mr. Meine Veldman who was called and ordained in January 2005 as the pastor of the Église réformée de Laval. This new church plant, just north of the city of Montreal, is located on the same premises as Farel, Reformed Theological Seminary. The ERQ now consists of a total of seven mission and established churches.
      (4) The congregation of the Église réformée St-Paul, which has been without a pastor for four years, has recently called Mr. Jason Zuidema. Lord willing, he shall be ordained on October 15, 2005.
      (5) In addition to these new pastors, two new elders were installed in the Église réformée St.-Marc (Quebec City). Give thanks to the Lord with us for these men whom he has called to serve and lead his people in the province of Quebec.
      (6) With respect to the work of the ERQ synod, we cancelled the regularly scheduled November meeting in 2004 and replaced it with an evening dinner and mini-conference for the pastors and elders, along with their wives. All appreciated this evening of fellowship and mutual edification.
      (7) The Administrative Committee will make a bigger effort to make known the work and needs of the reformed mission in the province of Quebec via the ERQ Newsletter. (Anyone interested in receiving this quarterly newsletter may forward his mailing address to Ben Westerveld.)
      (8) The Interchurch Committee is pursuing its dialogue with the Canadian Reformed Churches, Presbyterian Church in America, the Orthodox Presbyterian Church and the United Reformed Churches. No official ecclesiastical relationships have yet been established.
      (9) The Ministerial Committee continues to study questions concerning the administration of the Lord’s Supper. The synod has instructed the committee to consult with the four denominations with which the ERQ has undertaken interchurch dialogue, as well as with the member churches of NAPARC in order to receive their advice.
      (10) An ad hoc Liturgy Committee presented a draft profession of faith liturgy to the April ERQ synod in order to receive commentary and suggestions. The synod also permitted the Liturgy Committee to consult representatives of the CanRC, PCA, OPC and URC in order to receive their counsel and advice on the proposed liturgy.
(11) With respect to NAPARC, the April 2005 ERQ synod did accept the proposal to attend the 500th anniversary celebrations of the birth of John Calvin. Unfortunately, due to a lack of time, the vote to receive the United Reformed Churches as a member of NAPARC had to be post-posted to the November 2005 ERQ synod.

(12) For your information, the following ERQ synod meetings are scheduled:

- November 18-19, 2005 in Montreal, Quebec.
- March 17-18, 2006 in Laval, Quebec.
- June 16-17, 2006 (location to be determined).

(13) May the Lord bless your discussions and deliberations, and may he respond favorably and mightily to our prayers for his church in North America.

6. Korean American Presbyterian Church [KAPC]

The report of the ERQ to NAPARC included the following:

a. The 29th meeting of the KAPC was held in at the Renaissance Philadelphia Hotel Airport, with 293 ministers and elders in attendance. Reverend Yong Kol Yi of Young Sang Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia was elected as moderator. The 30th General Assembly will be held in Boston on May 23-26, 2006.

b. Statistics. Reports brought to the Korean American Presbyterian Church General Assembly indicate that we had a slight increase in membership. The total number of communicant members was 45,350 and non communicant members were 9,930. We had a total of 950 ministers and missionaries serving in 23 presbyteries. The total number of churches increased to 463. On average, we have been growing at a rate of approximately 5% per year.

c. Dual membership. As the result of the growing number of English speaking ministers in the KAPC, a nation wide presbytery was formed at the end of 2002 called the North America Presbytery. A unique aspect of the new presbytery was that its members were allowed to be in two separate presbyteries, their original Korean language presbytery and this new English language presbytery. This was a temporary solution (three years) to aid in the initial development of a presbytery filled with younger ministers. With the expiration date nearing, the members of the North America presbytery requested an extension of this unusual situation. It was unanimously approved by the 2005 G.A.

d. Missions. The most significant action that the General Assembly took in its last meeting was to approve the formation of a distinct missions organization under the oversight of the denomination. This organization will have its own elected leadership and governing policies. The reasons for this action were twofold: consistency and progress. As a committee of the G. A. the missions board was plagued by Inconsistency. Because of the yearly change in leadership and short duration of membership (3 years) in the committee, it was not able to sustain a consistent effort and direction. It is hoped that this action will lead to a more effective, focused, and strategic missions effort by our denomination.

e. URCNA Vote. As requested by NAPARC, the KAPC General Assembly considered and approved, by unanimous vote, the membership of the United Reformed Churches in North America (URCNA) in NAPARC.

7. Others

The Committee is seeking to have contact with other North American churches by means of our liaisons.
IV FELLOWSHIP WITH CHURCHES ABROAD

The Churches. The Committee seeks to maintain an active fellowship with churches abroad especially through our membership in the ICRC, though not limited to that.

A. **Presbyterian Church in Korea/Kosin (PCKK)**
   The OPC is in Ecclesiastical Fellowship with the PCKK. We have had a very close relationship dating back almost to the start of our church.

B. **Reformed Church in Japan (RCJ)**
   The OPC is in Ecclesiastical Fellowship with the RCJ. We have had a very close relationship dating back almost to the start of our church. This year the RCJ celebrated their 60th anniversary.

C. **Presbyterian Church of Japan. (PCJ)**
   The OPC and the PCJ are in Corresponding Relations.

D. **The Free Church of Scotland (FCS) and The Free Church of Scotland/Continuing (FCS/C)**
   1. The split
      a. On January 20, 2000, 22 ministers (15 serving, 3 suspended and 4 retired) walked out of the meeting of the Commission of the Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland which served libels on them for defiance of the church court and suspended them on full pay pending mediation and trial. This culminated unrest and division in the church which began in the middle 1980s. The documentation, the media releases and email are extensive. The seceders are organized into the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing).
      b. The official statements of the two groups have been included in our reports to recent General Assemblies and may be found on their websites: The statement of the Free Church of Scotland, “The Free Church Division of January 2000 A Free Church Perspective”, may be found on their website www.freechurch.org.; and The declaration of the Free Church of Scotland Continuing, “Declaration of Reconstitution of the Historic Free Church of Scotland”, may be found on their website www.freechurchcontinuing.co.uk.
   2. Subsequently a subcommittee visited the Free Church of Scotland (FCS) and the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) (FCSC).
   3. Communications were sent to both groups and responses received from both groups. The Committee has responded to the responses.
   4. At their request and on recommendation of your Committee the GA recommend to the International Conference of Reformed Churches (ICRC) that the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) be received into the membership of the ICRC.
   5. Messrs. Bube and Peterson were a fraternal delegation to both GAs in May 2005.
   6. You committee continues to pursue the situation existing in the fatherland of Presbyterianism with the goal of reconciliation between the churches.
   7. The FCSC took the FCS to court, claiming that they were the Free Church of Scotland. The judge ruled in favor of the FCS. Her opinion is found at http://www.scotcourts.gov.uk/opinions/2005CSOH46.html
   8. The ICRC rejected the request for membership of the FCSC. See below under ICRC.
E. Evangelical Presbyterian Church of England and Wales (EPCEW)
   1. The OPC has a relationship of Ecclesiastical fellowship with the EPCEW.
   2. That church is a member of the International Conference of Reformed Churches [ICRC].

F. Reformed Churches of New Zealand (RCNZ)
   1. The OPC and the RCNZ are in Ecclesiastic Fellowship.
   2. The OP delegation met with the RCNZ delegation at ICRC 2005.

G. Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Liberated) (de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland (Vrijgemaakt)) (GKNV)
   1. The OPC has a Corresponding Relationship with the GKNV.
   2. They are a member of the International Conference of Reformed Churches [ICRC].
   3. The Committee sent a three man subcommittee of Messrs. Bube, Tyson and Williamson to Holland to meet with the GKNV regarding some concerns that have arisen.
   4. The GKNV has invited us into a closer relationship with them. Our GA last year adopted this recommendation of CEIR. That, with respect to the invitation of the GKNV to enter into sister church relations, the general assembly—having received from the Deputies on Relations with Churches Abroad a copy of the English-language translation of the report of the Deputies on Marriage and Divorce, and having sent a delegation to the Netherlands to meet with GKNV delegates and to discuss with them our concerns regarding that report, especially those pertaining to the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture that appear to be expressed therein, and having been informed that a revision to the report of the Deputies is being prepared, which might address at least some of our concerns—determine to continue the relationship of Corresponding Relations with the GKNV, with a view towards taking up the matter of entering into full Ecclesiastical Fellowship with the GKNV at a future assembly.

H. Reformed Churches in South Africa (GKSA).
   1. The GKSA has requested that they and the OPC enter ecclesiastical fellowship. Our GA last year responded to the invitation by entering into a corresponding relationship with the GKSA.
   2. The OPC delegation to the ICRC meeting (Bube, Knight, Peterson and Tyson) met with the delegation of the GKSA and discussed a variety of things. They urged us to send a delegate to their synod meeting in January, especially because the subject of women in office of minister and elder in the church was on the agenda. As a result, Dr. Knight attended that synod as a fraternal delegate. He had many opportunities to address individuals, the advisory committees and the synod. The Synod adopted a complaint against the last Synod’s action of opening the office of deacons to women and nullified that action. By a separate action this Synod placed the whole matter of women in all the offices back on the table for the next Synod meeting.

I. Other churches
   There is intense persecution of Christians in many areas of this world. It is urged that these persecuted brothers and sisters be included in our prayers.

V. INTERCHURCH BODIES

A. International Conference of Reformed Churches (ICRC)
1. ICRC 2005, its sixth Assembly, was held in Pretoria, South Africa with the Free Reformed Churches of South Africa as hosts. The venue was the Dutch Reformed Church building in Rietfontein, Pretoria with accommodation in the Jakaranda Lodge (about 20 minutes walk away). This had options of single, double rooms or self catering units. Those who wanted a single room had to pay a supplement. The main meal was at the FRCSA church (10 minutes walk). 85 delegates were expected.

2. The theme for the conference was: “The Lordship of Christ” 1) in the life of the believer; 2) in the church; and proclaimed in the world. Speakers will be 1) Dr. A. J. de Visser (South Africa), 2) Dr. J. W. Maris (CGKN) and 3) Rev. D. A. Robertson (Scotland) and Rev. Y Dethan (Indonesia).

3. The Opening address was an address in connection with the theme, based on Revelation 1:5,6 (20 minutes).

4. The website (www.icrconline.com) has been improved and made more attractive.

5. Your Committee sought to meet with the Reformed Churches of New Zealand (RCNZ) and Christian Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (CGKN) representatives while in South Africa for the meeting.

6. The four-man OPC delegation to ICRC 2005 in Pretoria, South Africa were Messrs. Bube, Knight (voting), Peterson and Tyson (non-voting), with Messrs. Curto and Williamson, as alternates (in that order).

7. The Press Release adopted by ICRC follows:
   a. The sixth quadrennial meeting of the International Conference of Reformed Churches was held in Pretoria, South Africa, from October 13 to 19, 2005. A prayer service preceded the official opening, during which a message was presented with the theme, Through the Jerusalem meeting God safeguards the unity and catholicity of the church. The venue for the conference was the Vrye Gereformeerde Kerk at Rietfontein, Pretoria. The host church, the Free Reformed Churches of South Africa, provided for the needs of the delegates with great generosity and consideration, as numerous members gave selflessly of their time and resources to make our experience in Pretoria a memorable one indeed.
   b. Members and Visitors
      During the meeting, three new members were added to the Conference the Reformed Churches in South Africa, the Reformed Churches of Spain, and the Reformed Confessing Church in Congo bringing the combined membership of the member churches to almost 700,000. The basis of the fellowship among the member churches in the Conference is a commitment to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as confessed in the historic Reformed standards: the Three Forms of Unity and/or the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms. The twenty five member churches are:
      - Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (ARPC)
      - Calvinist Reformed Churches in Indonesia (Gereja Gereja Reformasi Calvinis di Indonesia NTT) (GGRC)
      - Canadian Reformed Churches (CanRC)
      - Christian Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland) (CGKN)
      - Confessing Reformed Church in Congo (Église Réformée Confessante au Congo) (ERCC)
      - Evangelical Presbyterian Church in England and Wales (EPCEW)
      - Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland (EPCI)
      - Free Church of Central India (FCCI)
      - Free Church of Scotland (FCS)
Free Church in Southern Africa (FCSA)
Free Reformed Churches in South Africa (Die Vrye Gereformeerde Kerken in Suid Afrika) (VGKSA)
Free Reformed Churches of North America (FRCNA)
Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC)
Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia (PCEA)
Presbyterian Church in Korea (Kosin) (PCK(K))
Reformed Churches in Indonesia NTT (Gereja Gereja Reformasi di Indonesia NTT) (GGRI)
Reformed Churches in the Netherlands (Liberated) (Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland (vrijgemaakt)) (GKNV)
Reformed Churches of New Zealand (RCNZ)
Reformed Churches in South Africa (GKSA P)
Reformed Churches of Spain (Iglesias Reformadas de España) (IRE)
Reformed Church in the United States (RCUS)
Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland (RPCI)
Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America (RPCNA)
Reformed Presbyterian Church of North East India (RPCNEI)
United Reformed Churches in North America (URCNA)

Ten other churches sent observers or visitors to the Conference, several of which introduced themselves or updated the meeting on current work:
Church of Christ in Sudan Among the Tiv (Nongo u Kristu u ken Sudan hen Tiv) (NKST)
Ethiopian Reformed Presbyterian Church (ERPC)
Evangelical Reformed Church in Sweden (ERCS)
Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) (FCC)
Heritage Reformed Congregations in North America (HRCNA)
Independent Reformed Church in Korea (IRCK)
Mehrete Yesus Evangelical Presbyterian Church in Eritrea (MYEPC)
Reformed Church in Japan (RCJ)
Reformed Churches of South Africa (Soutpansberg Synod) (GKSA S)
United Reformed Churches in Myanmar (URCM)

c. **Missions.** One of the main purposes of the Conference is to encourage cooperation among the member churches in the fulfillment of the missionary mandate. The Conference received the report of its Missions Committee, and noted the successful regional gatherings (Asia/Pacific in Thailand in February 2003 and Africa in the Democratic Republic of Congo in September 2003) since the last meeting. The Missions Committee also presented a summary of the results of the survey it had conducted regarding the worldwide missions work of the member churches. A new mandate for the Missions Committee was adopted, which included development of a list of mission contact representatives for each of the member churches, who will be responsible for disseminating ICRC missions information and materials to their respective churches.

d. **Papers**

(1) The central theme of this meeting was “The Lordship of Christ,” and four papers were presented to open up various aspects Christ’s Lordship in the believer, the church, and the world. Discussions and workshops were conducted with respect to each of the papers.

(2) The first paper was presented by Prof. Dr. A. J. de Visser (CanRC) on *The Lordship in the Life of the Believer*. Prof. de Visser started by giving a biblical perspective on the theme, including the fact of Christ’s Lordship and its implications. He
then discussed the question as to how the Lordship of Christ functions in churches in various parts of the world, and suggested that the Lordship of Christ is a powerful antidote against the widespread problems of both antinomianism and legalism.

(3) The second paper was presented by Prof. Dr. J. W. Maris (CGKN) on *The Lordship of Christ in the Church*. Prof. Maris began the development of his theme by discussing the relation of Christ to the identity of the church. He then explored Christ’s three offices, especially that of King, and the consequences of the Christ’s Kingship for the church’s obedience. The Lordship of Christ also drives the agenda of the church in its mission endeavors, in its quest for biblical unity, and in its government. He concluded by observing some implications for the future of the church, noting that there will be no end to Christ being King and Lord of His people.

(4) The final two papers were presented by the Rev. Messrs. Y. Dethan (GGRC) and D. Robertson (FCS) on *The Lordship of Christ Proclaimed in the World*. Mr. Dethan focused on the proclamation of the gospel to pagans and on the suffering of persecuted believers. He challenged the meeting to bear in mind that, in bringing the gospel to pagans, we should not compromise, but rather confront them with the Scriptures, bearing in mind that this is our duty the result is God’s. He concluded by reminding the meeting that persecutions do not arise by chance. God allows them to test our faith, for our purification, and for His own glory. Mr. Robertson focused on the challenges of proclaiming the Lordship of Christ to a postmodern age, where institutions are suspect, the present is dominant, and there is no master story. In taking up this challenge, he encouraged Reformed churches to be real (rather than simply role play), to be radical (in the sense of taken everything back to the Scriptures), and to be genuine in developing relationships with unbelievers. He concluded with the plea that evangelism and church planting not be relegated to the peripheries in the life of the church, but to remember that the Lord uses the theology, government, and worship that arise out of our Reformed understanding of Scripture to build up His church, to bring sinners to Himself, and glory to His name whether in a post modern, modern, traditional, or whatever culture or age in which we happen to live.

c. **Proposed Amendment to the ICRC Constitution** The meeting determined to propose the following amendment to the ICRC Constitution to the member churches (which must be approved by the major assemblies of two thirds of member churches to go into effect):

> That Article IV.1.a of the Constitution be amended to read:

1. Those churches shall be admitted as members which: a. adhere and are faithful to one or more of the confessional standards stated in the Basis, as each church has adopted one or more of these as its own standards, or adhere and are faithful to Reformed Confessions which are equivalent in content to the Confessions listed in the Basis (Art. 2), and which confession (or confessions) shall be proposed to be added to Article II of the Constitution.

d. **Other Significant Actions**. Among the many actions taken by the meeting, three merit special mention. A conscious effort was undertaken to add members of the newer (to the ICRC) member churches to both the Interim Committee and to the Missions Committee. It was also decided to combine Regional and Mission Conferences of the ICRC, and that, in general, the financing for such conferences should come from within the region, and not through the ICRC assessment. The meeting decided to ask the Interim Committee to appoint someone to assemble and distribute information on existing theological education programs and institutions of all the member churches.

g. **Retirements and Appointments**. The meeting expressed its thanksgiving to the Lord for the labors of the Rev. M. Van Beveren (CanRC), who retired after more than twenty years of service to the Conference as Corresponding Secretary. The
meeting confirmed the appointment of the Rev. C. Van Spronsen (CanRC) as the new Corresponding Secretary of the ICRC. The meeting also expressed its thankfulness for the work of outgoing chairman, the Rev. Jack J. Peterson (OPC), for his services on behalf of the Conference for the past eight years. The Rev. B. de Graaf (CGKN) was appointed as the new Chairman of the meeting.

8. Action regarding the application of the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)


b. ¶ 90. Advisory Committee 4: the Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) (continued)

Rev Richard Holst asked the conference to disregard all previous motions from the committee. A last one was being put before the conference. (See Minutes 76 and 81 for the previous motions).

Prof Maris presented the revised motion, that:

1. The ICRC does not accept the application for membership of the FCC at this time.
2. The ICRC urges the FCC as Christian brothers to cease from civil action against their brothers in the FCS.
3. The ICRC urges both the FCC and the FCS to seek biblical ways of reconciliation.
4. The ICRC encourages the FCC to attend our conference as observers.
5. The ICRC will be most willing to receive a new application from the FCC when there is no longer any civil case between the churches.

Grounds

1. The FCC is currently engaged in civil action against the FCS. No church should be accepted as a member of the ICRC whilst it is taking a member church to a civil court on a matter of church discipline, for the following reasons:
   (a) Taking a member church to court is contrary to the foundations of the ICRC in that it contradicts the teaching of Scripture to which we are bound. 1 Corinthians 6:6-7: “But instead one brother goes to law against another – and this in front of unbelievers! The very fact that you have lawsuits among you means you have been completely defeated already. Why not rather be wronged? Why not rather be cheated?”
   (b) It is contrary to the stated purpose of the ICRC, namely,
      (I) to express and promote the unity of the faith that the member churches have in Christ;
      (ii) to encourage the fullest ecclesiastical fellowship among the member churches;
      (iii) to encourage cooperation among the member churches in the fulfilment of the missionary and other mandates;
      (iv) to present a Reformed testimony to the world.
2. Reconciliation is something that all Christians should seek.

The following is cited from the Minutes and is part of the record”

Prof Maris referred to the question, “If the FCC is admonished, then why not admonish the FCS?” There is a technical difference: the FCS is already a member church and the conference is not considering their actions. However, to be fair, this point should be in our minds. He emphasized that the FCC should abstain from civil action. If they said that they would refrain from it, the advisory committee would immediately change their recommendation.

Prof D McKay addressed the meeting: He had spent many hours considering this problem and he had met both sides. He had always counselled caution, that
they should proceed slowly and seek reconciliation. In the RPCI, there had been sympathy with the FCC at its origins but news that a civil court case was being pursued was met by many with dismay. The news of the appeal had been received in disbelief. On behalf of the church that Prof McKay represented, he had to exhort the FCC to desist from this course of action. It was harmful, damaging, and causing distress.

Rev Procee stated that this is a test case whether we seriously believe in the Lordship of Christ. He noted that the FCC and the FCS were both engaging in actions before the civil courts, yet one is a member and one is not accepted. He commended the advisory committee for its painstaking work. He wanted both parties to express their intention to refrain from legal proceedings against each other, so that both, as they are reformed churches, could be accepted as members.

Rev Maurice Roberts asked whether, if the FCC desists from legal action, the FCS would undertake to cease from all legal action locally and centrally. If so, the delegates would exert themselves energetically to bring that about in the FCC.

Prof Maris invited the FCS to respond. Rev Alex Macdonald said that the FCS had already given that commitment in a meeting for mediation (with a professional mediator). If the FCC drop the court case, the FCS would ensure that there were no further legal proceedings. The only action that the FCS has instituted is a local matter regarding the manse of Rev Roberts.

Rev Roberts thanked Rev Alex Macdonald. He undertook to make strong representations to the FCC courts that his offer be taken up. He wanted to made it clear that he was not motivated by the desire to safeguard the house in which he lived.

Prof Maris stated that they had reached an important moment. He asked if Rev Roberts’ words were to be taken on behalf of the whole delegation.

Rev Fergus Macdonald said that Rev Alex Macdonald was representing the position of the General Assembly of the FCS and that their position had been communicated to the General Assembly of the FCC and had been turned down.

Rev John Macleod would not support Rev Roberts because the FCS’s offer had been conditional.

Prof Maris then presented the advisory committee’s proposal as it stood. He said that they were positive about the FCC but could not reach the outcome that they wanted. There was misery and pity because on both sides are brothers and sisters.

The chairman took a vote:
Recommendation 1: 22 for; 2 abstained; 1 church’s delegates were absent.
Recommendations 2-5: carried.
Prof Maris stressed again that the meeting felt very sad at this result. We had hoped to accept the FCC and we still do hope for that. But we could not succeed in reaching that point. Our hope and prayer is that the FCC will believe that we are sincere in wanting them to be part of our community and that they would settle the matters of conflict.

The chairman invited the FCC to react. Rev Fraser said that he was sad at the outcome. They had become accustomed to facing injustice. The FCC was in this position for the sake of truth and righteousness and a clear conscience. He asked the ICRC to examine what it has done. He referred to Ezekiel 11. He reminded the conference of his past involvement. He referred back to ICRC 2001 Minutes 32 and 34. The FCC accepted that arrangement because they understood that they would be accepted as members in 2005. Now they felt that obstacles were being placed before them to keep them out even though their papers were in order. The conference had asked them to conform to 1 Corinthians 6:6,7. The text applies to brothers, not churches. The church in Scotland has often had to go
to the civil magistrate to protect itself. The civil magistrate has been appointed under Christ’s headship, for that purpose. In 1900, the church survived by going to court. They saw their action as being obedient to Christ. The FCS offer was conditional, not unequivocal. He believed that the ICRC was acting unjustly in accepting one party and refusing the other. He feared that the enemies of the FCC would make much of this rejection.

The chairman responded. He understood that Rev Fraser wanted to say what was on his heart. He underlined the words of Prof Maris.

ICRC 2009 will be hosted by the Reformed Churches of New Zealand.

B. North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC)

1. The Thirty first meeting of the North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council (NAPARC) met on November 1-2, 2005, at the BonClarken Assembly of the ARPC in Flat Rock, NC hosted by the ARPC. The delegates of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church appointed by the Committee were Messrs. Curto, Knight, Peterson and Williamson. The officers for this meeting were Bruce Parnell of the RPCNA as Chairman, James Kim of the KAPC as Vice Chairman, Ron Potter of the RCUS as Secretary and Maynard Koerner of the RCUS as Treasurer.

2. A summary of the meeting
   a. Attending the meeting were representatives of the following member churches: Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Korean American Presbyterian Church, Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Presbyterian Church in America, Reformed Church in the United States, Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America and the United Reformed Churches in North America. The Eglise reformee du Quebec was unable to send representatives.

   Also present were observers from the following invited churches: Canadian Reformed Churches, Free Reformed Churches of North America, Heritage Reformed Congregations and the Presbyterian Reformed Church.

   b. The Member Churches and the Observer Churches present reports. These reports were followed by an opportunity for questions and by prayer for the reporting church by some representative chosen by the chairman.

   c. The URCNA was enrolled as a member church of NAPARC, six of the seven synods/general assemblies of the member churches voted in the affirmative. The seventh church has not yet voted on the question.

   d. The FRCNA has applied for membership in NAPARC. This session of NAPARC has approved this application and “propose to the member churches synods and assemblies of NAPARC that the FRCNA application for membership in NAPARC be approved.” See recommendation 2 below.

   e. There was then a report on Foreign and Home Missions Consultations and a growing sense of the importance of each church knowing what other member churches are doing, and where they are doing it.

   f. NAPARC adopted the following

The 31st annual Meeting of NAPARC, held at BonClarken Assembly (ARPC) Flat Rock, NC, November 1-2, 2005, voted to adopt the following statement regarding Women in the Military subject to the ratification of the member churches of NAPARC at their next regular assembly or synod:

_The Word of God gives no warrant expressed or implied that women are to be conscripted in or employed for military combat roles but rather they are to be defended by men and kept from harms way that they might fulfill their biblical callings and duties under God._

This statement is an amended version of recommendation #2 contained in the 2003 report of the NAPARC Committee on Women in The Military. That 2003 report summarized the positions taken by the NAPARC churches which studied the subject of women serving in the military. I have appended the 2003 report for your information since it serves as the background for the amended statement that NAPARC voted to adopt at its 2005 meeting. Please advise me of the outcome of your assembly vote.

See recommendation 3 below.

g. The next meeting of NAPARC will be hosted by the ERQ, with the meeting being held in Laval, Quebec, Canada on November 14-15, 2006. The OPC delegation includes Messrs. Curto, Knight (Chairman of the delegation), Peterson, and Wallace.

VI BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005 Proposed</th>
<th>2006 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, Phone, copies, etc.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee/NAPARC travel</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Committee expenses</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fraternal delegates |               |               |
| To/from             | 4,000         | 4,000         |
| ICRC                | 1,500         | 1,500         |
| Total Fraternal delegates | 5,500  | 5,500  |

| Dues                | 500           | 500           |
| NAPARC              | 2,500         | 2,500         |
| Total dues          | 3,000         | 3,000         |

TOTAL GAOF BUDGET ITEMS 31,500 32,500

VII RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Your Committee recommends that the 73rd (2006) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church amend the Rules for Ecclesiastical Fellowship as follows:

I. That the policy of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church in its relationship with other Reformed churches (adopted by the general assembly in 1978 [Minutes of the 45th (1978) General Assembly, pages 116–117, and amended by the general assembly in 2000 [Minutes of the 67th (2000) General Assembly, Articles 149 and 151, pages 36–38]) be further amended by:

   A. Adding the following sentence to the end of Article II, so that, as amended, it would read as follows—
II. That our fellowship with other churches consist in three categories. Decisions to enter into or withdraw from such fellowship shall be decided by each church on an individual basis. Because the undertaking of a bilateral relationship of either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations carries with it a commitment of substantial resources—in both time and expense—for its implementation, good stewardship of limited resources requires that these relationships ordinarily be reserved for situations in which the church seeking an ecclesiastical relationship with the OPC is either geographically proximate to the OPC (i.e., situated in North America), or has some other form of substantial contact or history with the OPC (e.g., missionary endeavors, transfers of members, etc.); other churches seeking an ecclesiastical relationship with the OPC are encouraged to seek membership in the ICRC and thereby enter into a relationship of Ecumenical Contact with the OPC.

B. Deleting Article II.C (pertaining to “Limited Contact”) in its entirety and replacing it with the following—

C. **Ecumenical Contact** is that relationship in which mutual contact is maintained with other member churches of the International Conference of Reformed Churches (which have no congregations located in North America and with which the OPC does not presently have either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations), in keeping with the second stated purpose of the Conference, “to encourage the fullest ecclesiastical fellowship among the member churches” (*Constitution of the ICRC*, Article III.2) and in fulfillment of our stated “responsibility to call all churches, including our own, to faithfulness in order to seek the unity of the whole church” (*Biblical Principles of the Unity of the Church*, IV.I). It shall be implemented, as appropriate, by:

1. Meetings, both formal and informal, of delegates to the quadrennial meetings of the Conference
2. Welcome of official observers at the broadest assemblies
3. Communication on issues of joint concern
4. Mutual labors as members of the Conference in discharge of the purposes of the Conference

II. That the names of the member churches of the ICRC with which the OPC does not have either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations be enrolled on the list of Reformed churches with which the OPC sustains a relationship of Ecumenical Contact, and that these two actions be communicated to the member churches of the ICRC and to the churches with which the OPC has either Ecclesiastical Fellowship or Corresponding Relations, for their review and comment.

2) Your Committee recommends that the 73rd (2006) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church approve the membership of the Free Reformed Church in North America (FRCNA) in NAPARC.

*Grounds:*

1. Your Committee has had close contact with these churches for several years.
2. Their confessional standards are the Three Forms of Unity. Their church order has been examined favorably by the Committee.
3. They hold membership in the ICRC
(4) They are a “daughter” church of the CRCN with whom we are in a relationship of Ecclesiastical Fellowship.

3) Your Committee recommends that the 73rd (2006) General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church respond to the request of NAPARC (Communication # 2) as follows:

That the 73rd (2006) General Assembly respectfully decline the request of the 31st (2005) annual Meeting of NAPARC to ratify a new formulation regarding women in combat, and suggest instead to NAPARC that NAPARC might respond to inquiries regarding “NAPARC’s position” on the matter by listing the relevant adopted statements of the member churches.

Ground:
The basis of NAPARC is set forth in Article II of its Constitution: “full commitment to the Bible in its entirety as the Word of God written, without error in all its parts and to its teaching as set forth in [the Three Forms of Unity] and [the Westminster Standards]. The nature and extent of its authority is prescribed in Article IV of the Constitution: “It is understood that all actions and decisions taken are advisory in character and in no way curtail or restrict the autonomy of the member bodies.” We do not believe that it is wise for NAPARC to embark on a course of making pronouncements for its member churches.

VIII ELECTIONS

Terms expiring at this GA are those of Messrs. Bube, Knight and Williamson. Mr. Williamson desires that he not be nominated to serve another term on the Committee. The Committee adopted the following at its spring meeting:

The Committee on Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations gives thanks to our Lord for his servant G. I. Williamson. G. I. does not wish to have his name submitted for nomination to continue his service on the CEIR. He has served the Orthodox Presbyterian Church by his membership on the Committee since 1989, 17 years. He has made significant contributions to the work of the Committee. His labors for 20 years in the Reformed Churches in New Zealand gave him a perspective on the Reformed family of churches which has helped the Committee and the Church better understand the rich Dutch heritage.

Thank you, G. I., you will be solely missed by your brothers on CEIR.
I. INTRODUCTION
The Committee met once on April 24, 2006 to consider an Appeal by Mr. John Vandervliet from a decision of the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario to deny his Appeal of the judgment of excommunication proposed by the Session of Grace Covenant Church (OPC), Sheffield, Ontario, Canada.

II. THE VANDERVLIEET APPEAL

A. Background

This appeal arises from a Presbytery decision which was rendered shortly before the 72nd General Assembly (2005) and which could not be appealed for consideration at that Assembly. The original case involves two charges focusing on 1) slander and 2) violation of the fourth membership vow. As the appeal was before the Presbytery, there were four specifications of error. The first two specifications contested the two charges. The third contested the censure. The fourth alleged procedural irregularity. The Presbytery deemed only the first three specifications to be worthy of consideration as they entailed the substance of the case. It should be noted that the censure passed was excommunication and that no formal censure existed prior to this censure (but cf. items 10 and 24 of the following chronology).

The specifications of error in appealing against the Presbytery decision are six in number, though several numbered specifications contain further alleged errors (cf. Observations, below).

B. Chronology

The following chronology is taken from the report of the Presbytery, except for items in italics.

1. Fall, 2001 – Sermons and a Sunday school class on postmillennialism provoke considerable discussion of apologetics and eschatology at Living Hope OPC, Vineland, Ontario, Canada.

2. October, 2001 – Rev. John Ferguson and Mr. Bill Carson (members of the provisional session of Living Hope) meet with Mr. John Vandervliet and Rev. Tristan Emmanuel regarding Mr. Vandervliet’s concerns over the views of apologetics and eschatology taught at Living Hope.

3. November 4, 2001 – After a particularly heated discussion of apologetics and eschatology during the coffee hour, Rev. Emmanuel asks that the men of the church cease such discussions. Mr. Vandervliet refuses, claiming that so long as Rev. Emmanuel continues to preach and teach on these subjects, he has a right to discuss them. (charge 2, spec. 1)

4. November 9, 2001 – The Provisional Session of Living Hope (Rev. Jim Bosgraf, Rev. John Ferguson, Rev. Peter Wallace and Mr. Bill Carson) meets with Rev. Emmanuel and Mr. Vandervliet. Mr. Vandervliet was requested to present his concerns in writing to the session, and was urged to attend Grace Covenant OPC, Sheffield, Ontario, Canada, with the goal of reconciliation. (Minutes of Provisional Session, 11/9/2001)
Appendix

[After this date Mr. Vandervliet did not attend Living Hope OPC, but attended Grace Covenant OPC in Sheffield.]

5. November 15, 2001 – Mr. Vandervliet meets with Rev. Ferguson, the elders of Grace Covenant OPC, and Rev. Emmanuel. The meeting was cordial and described as “progress toward complete reconciliation.” (Minutes of Provisional Session, 1/18/2002)

6. January 19, 2002 – At the request of the provisional session, the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario transfers oversight of Living Hope OPC to the Session of Grace Covenant OPC (whereby the Vandervliets were transferred to the rolls of Grace Covenant along with the rest of the families of Living Hope).

7. April 27, 2002 – Mr. Vandervliet writes to the Grace Covenant OPC Session presenting his objections to what he terms the “false teachings” at Living Hope. (Charge 1, spec. 1)

8. March 22, 2003 – Mr. Vandervliet writes to Grace Covenant OPC elder Barry Everts to express his objections to Rev. Emmanuel’s teaching of Christian Reconstruction. (Charge 1, spec. 2)

9. May 12, 2003 – Elders Cope Jonkman and Barry Everts meet with Mr. Vandervliet to discuss his concerns. (Charge 1, spec. 3)

10. October 2, 2002 to March 2, 2004 – Several meetings and exchanges of letters between the Session of Grace Covenant OPC and Mr. Vandervliet (charge 2, specs. 2-5)

[In light of the unresolved issues between Mr. Vandervliet and Rev. Emmanuel, a couple of elders from Grace Covenant recommend that Mr. Vandervliet voluntarily refrain from partaking of communion (this is referred to in the Minutes of 2/14/2005 as an “informal suspension.”)]

11. November, 2003 – Meeting between the Grace Covenant OPC session, Rev. Ferguson, Rev. Ludt (pastor-elect), and Mr. Vandervliet. The session confronts Mr. Vandervliet with his conduct towards Living Hope; Mr. Vandervliet replies by setting forth accusations regarding the ministry at Living Hope. Mr. Ludt tells Mr. Vandervliet that he will investigate these accusations and submit a report. (Charge 1, spec. 4; charge 2, spec. 6)


13. March 2, 2004 – Meeting between the Grace Covenant OPC session and Mr. Vandervliet, where Rev. Ludt presents his findings and urges Mr. Vandervliet to repent. Mr. Vandervliet insisted that he was innocent of the charge of slander. (Charge 2, spec. 7)


16. April 26, 2004 – Presentation of charges against Mr. Vandervliet (Minutes, p. 115):

1. The Session of Grace Covenant OPC charges you, John Vandervliet, with the sin of slandering Tristan Emmanuel, the Presbytery-appointed Gospel Minister serving as Stated Supply of Living Hope OPC. This is a serious sin as it is a breach of the Ninth Commandment (Exodus 20:16) and violates the teaching of the Westminster Standards.

2. The Session of Grace Covenant OPC charges you, John Vandervliet, with breaking the Fourth Vow of OPC Church Membership, in your failure to submit to Christ’s appointed ecclesiastical authorities. This is a serious sin as it is a breech of the
Fifth Commandment (Exo. 20:12), stands against the order established for the Church in the Scriptures, and violates the teaching of the Westminster Standards.

21. August 16, 2004 – Sixth Meeting of Trial-Testimony from Mr. John Vandervliet (Minutes 8/16/2004).
22. August 28-September 21 – Email exchange between Mr. Vandervliet and the clerk of session regarding Mr. Vandervliet’s list of witnesses.
23. November 29, 2004 – Seventh Meeting of Trial-The session informs Mr. Vandervliet of their reasons for not calling the witnesses Mr. Vandervliet had cited, and final Defense of Mr. John Vandervliet. (Minutes, 11/29/2004)
24. February 14, 2005 – Eighth (and Last) Meeting of Trial-The session informs Mr. Vandervliet that he has been found guilty of all the charges and specifications, and that “in light of their dealings with him in the past couple of years, as well as their informally suspending him from the Lord’s Supper in the past year, [they] have therefore decided to move directly to excommunication.” (Minutes, 2/14/2005)
25. February 22, 2005 – Mr. Vandervliet appeals his conviction to presbytery, citing the following specifications of error:
   1. The charge of slander
   2. The charge of breaking the fourth vow
   3. In the censure which calls for my excommunication
   4. In and during the procedure of the trial
26. May 20, 2005 – Presbytery denies the first three specifications of error in the appeal and by-passes “procedural” specifications of error. The following record was submitted to the General Assembly:

   These were the actions taken by the Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario at its May 20, 2005 meeting regarding the Vandervliet appeal. I will be sending hard copies to Don Duff in quadruplicate. Tim Bero.

11. COMMITTEE ON BILLS AND OVERTURES. Mr. Wallace reported for the committee regarding the Vandervliet appeal.
12. PROCEDUAL [sic] RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED. On motion the following procedural recommendations were adopted:
   A. When the vote is taken, the vote shall be taken on the first three specifications of error (since procedural errors are not, in themselves, grounds for overturning a judgment – BD VII.2).
   B. Procedural recommendations:
      1. Presentation of the appellant on specification 1 (10 min.).
      2. Response from session of Grace Covenant OPC on specification 1 (10 min.).
      3. Questions from the presbytery for the appellant and session (20 min.).
      5. Vote on specification 1.
6. Presentation of the appellant of specification 2 (10 min.).
7. Response from session of Grace Covenant OPC on specification 2 (10 min.).
8. Questions from the presbytery for the appellant and session (20 min.).
10. Vote on specification 2.
11. Presentation of the appellant of specification 3 (10 min.).
12. Response from session of Grace Covenant OPC on specifications 3 (10 min.).
13. Questions from the presbytery for the appellant and session (20 min.).
15. Vote on specification 3.

C. All voting shall be done by written ballot.

13. APPEAL HEARD. The presbytery proceeded to hear the Vandervliet appeal as approved in item 12. The appellant, John Vandervliet, represented himself and Ed Ludt represented the session.

25. VOTE ON SPECIFICATION ONE OF THE VANDERVLIEET APPEAL. The moderator called for the vote regarding the Vandervliet appeal, “Shall specification of error number one of the appellant, that the session erred in the charge of slander be sustained?” The vote was taken by written ballot. The moderator announced that specification one was not sustained.

26. VOTE ON SPECIFICATION TWO OF THE VANDERVLIEET APPEAL. The moderator called for the vote regarding the Vandervliet appeal, “Shall specification of error number two of the appellant, that the session erred in the charge of breaking the fourth vow be sustained?” The vote was taken by written ballot. The moderator announced that specification two was not sustained.

29. VOTE ON SPECIFICATION THREE OF THE VANDERVLIEET APPEAL.
The moderator called for the vote regarding the Vandervliet appeal, “Shall specification of error number three of the appellant that the censure of excommunication was in error be sustained?” (Note: Mr. Vandervliet left during the dinner hour but left a written presentation of his appeal regarding specification three, this was read to the presbytery.) The vote was taken by written ballot. The moderator announced that specification three was not sustained.

27. May 30, 2005 – Mr. Vandervliet files notice of intention to appeal to the General Assembly.

C. Observations

The “specifications of error” are confused. Some are overly broad (arguably Specification 3) or contain multiple allegations of error, which are not properly specifications. Other specifications (or portions thereof) are repeated in different contexts. For example: 1.A.i is identical to 2.A, and 5.E overlaps these sections in substance; 1.D and 5.E.v overlap substantively; 1.C is identical to 2.B; 1.B is substantively similar to 5.E.vii (cf. Specification 4 of Appeal to Presbytery); and 4.A and B appear to overlap with Specification 6.
Regarding Specification 3, the Assembly must determine the meaning of the specification; i.e., whether the appellant argues that he should not have been censured at all or that the censure was too severe. If the former, the specification arguably asserts no specification beyond the overall Appeal and should be ruled out of order. The Committee considers it appropriate that the Advisory Committee bring a recommendation in this regard.

D. Recommendation

That the Appeal be found in order and properly before the Assembly.

E. Procedural Recommendations

That the Assembly:

1. Vote separately on whether the rights asserted in 5.E.i-viii have been abridged by presbytery. NB: BD VII.6: “… If the appellate judicatory sustains any specification of error, it shall determine whether the error is of such importance as to require a reversal or modification of the judgment. …”

2. Vote on Specification 1.C (cf. 2.B)

3. Vote on Specification 3 (assuming it is in order)


   Grounds:
   (a) The accusation of bearing false witness constitutes a defense, which should not be entertained apart from separate charges (a “malignant defense”);
   (b) Certain concerns which may be raised in connection with 1.E.i,ii, and iv are addressed in Procedural Recommendation 1.


III. BUDGET: The estimated budget for the coming year is $2000.00.

IV. ELECTIONS: The class of Mr. Jerrell expires at this Assembly, as does that of Mr. Foh (alternate). Other members of the Committee are Messrs. Mallin (2007) and Jones (2008).

John W. Mallin, Chairman
Committee on Appeals and Complaints
REPORT OF THE HISTORIAN

When Cornelius Van Til delivered a lecture on Boston Personalism before the faculty of the Boston University School of Theology in 1956, he began with characteristic modesty. “I would have indeed been happier,” he said, “if you had invited me to listen to you instead of to speak to you. But, in a sense, I have already listened to you a good deal. I have listened to you by reading the great books of your truly great men.”

It has been my privilege to read the books, lectures, and letters of a truly great man as I have labored in the past year to complete a biography of Cornelius Van Til. His leadership at Westminster Seminary and in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church shaped the identity and direction of both institutions for over forty years, encouraging their fidelity to a full-orbed Reformed faith. At the time of Van Til’s death in 1987, Charles Dennison observed that “his importance and love for the Orthodox Presbyterian Church cannot be overestimated.” Nearly twenty years later, however, Van Til’s connection to the Orthodox Presbyterian Church is largely overlooked by many of his interpreters. I am convinced from my study of his life and work that Van Til’s apologetic insights cannot be separated from Van Til the Orthodox Presbyterian churchman.

Along with other Orthodox Presbyterians, Van Til struggled over the question of how to be Reformed and American. This was another subject of study for me this past year as I have worked with Darryl Hart on a survey of American Presbyterianism in the light of the 300th anniversary of the meeting of the first Presbytery in the New World. The fruit of that labor has been a fourteen part series in New Horizons and a book that Presbyterian and Reformed plans to publish later this year.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Muether
Historian
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE HISTORIAN

I. THE COMMITTEE AND ITS ACTIVITIES

A. Composition

The Committee consists of the following: Mr. Douglas J. Smith (class of 2006), Mr. Brenton C. Ferry (class of 2007); Mr. Danny E. Olinger and Mr. David K. Thompson (class of 2008), and Mr. John R. Muether (Historian – ex officio). Officers of the Committee are: Mr. Thompson, Chairman; Mr. Smith, Vice-Chairman, Mr. Olinger, Treasury, and Mr. Ferry, Secretary.

B. Meetings

During 2005, the Committee met a total of five times: Once at Reformed Theological Seminary in Orlando (2/14) and four times via teleconference (3/30, 4/20, 6/18, and 9/13).

C. Book Sales

The Committee continues to distribute several titles. Sales numbers for 2005 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>2005 Sales</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fighting the Good Fight</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a Testimony</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History for a Pilgrim People</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lest We Forget</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machen (Coray)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Conflict</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressing Toward the Mark</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machen (Stonehouse)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Minutes on CD</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of OP DVD</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Other Committee Activities

Efforts this past year have included providing the Historian with assistance in preparing for 2006 pre-assembly conference, converting the 1986 semi-centennial celebration conference video tape to DVD, and the conversion of our oral history audio tapes to digital format for storage on CD. We have also started to make plans for the 75th anniversary celebration planned for 2011.
II. FINANCIAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 (1/1/05 THROUGH 12/31/05)

A. Income and Expenses

Income:
Sales $ 8,279.31
Donations 500.00
Interest 321.57
Total Income $ 9,100.88

Expenses:
Printing/Reproduction $ 13,100.14
Postage/Delivery 80.87
Miscellaneous 356.12
Total Expenses $ 13,537.13

B. Account Summaries (as of December 31, 2005)

Checking $ 6,281.59
Savings $ 1,599.05
CD $ 6,759.62
Totals $14,640.26

C. General Assembly Operating Fund Expenses (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historian’s Honorarium¹</td>
<td>$ 6,200</td>
<td>$ 6,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Management²</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Service</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Project</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC History Project</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 19,050</td>
<td>$ 13,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES:
1. $120 overage due to compensation carryover from FY04.
2. Approved budget line item was “Book Manager’s Honorarium.” The category was renamed “Book Management” for the FY06 budget, and this category designation was retroactively applied to FY05. This line item includes the book manager’s honorarium and other book distribution related expenses.

III. ELECTIONS

The term of Mr. Smith expires with the 2006 assembly. The standing rules require the election of one member to this class. Mr. Smith has requested that he not be nominated for re-election. The composition of the Committee for the Historian must include at least one minister and one ruling elder, a condition which is satisfied.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) That the following proposed budget for fiscal year 2007 be approved by the Assembly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>2006 Budget</th>
<th>2007 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historian’s Honorarium</td>
<td>$ 6,400</td>
<td>$ 6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Management</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Service</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Project</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>75th Anniversary Celebration</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 20,650</td>
<td>$ 23,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: formerly referred to as “OPC History Project,” the $3,000 includes the $500 from that line item. The increase represents planning efforts for the 75th anniversary.
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REVISIONS TO THE
DIRECTORY FOR THE PUBLIC WORSHIP OF GOD
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I. INTRODUCTION

The members of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship are the Rev. Messrs. George R. Cottenden (Chairman), John P. Galbraith, and Larry E. Wilson, and Ruling Elder John O. Kinnaird. The alternate member between the 72nd and 73rd General Assemblies is the Rev. Danny E. Olinger.

   A. The Committee on Revisions to the DPW and its (evolving) mandate

Revision of the Directory for Public Worship (DPW) has been under consideration since the 34th (1967) General Assembly, when a Committee on Revisions to the Book of Discipline and Directory for Worship was erected. The erection of this committee was itself part of a process of revision of the Constitution of the Church that began when the 15th (1948) General Assembly erected a committee to revise the Form of Government (FG). The 18th (1951) General Assembly added to that committee’s mandate the revision of the Book of Discipline (BD). When it became apparent that this added task would delay
the revision of the *Form of Government*, the Committee recommended to the 34th (1967) General Assembly that a separate committee be established to revise the *Book of Discipline*. That Assembly acceded to the recommendation, and added to the mandate of the new committee the revision of the *Directory for Public Worship*. That Committee completed its work on the *Book of Discipline*, which was adopted effective the 50th (1983) General Assembly. It continued working until, at its request, it was reconstituted with new membership by the 56th (1989) General Assembly. From that point the mandate of the Committee developed as follows:

1. The 56th (1989) General Assembly
   a. Complete the Revision
      The Committee was “to complete the revision of the *Directory for the Public Worship of God*.”
   b. Chapter III - The Usual Parts of Public Worship
      The Committee was “urged to provide a proposed revision of *Directory for Worship*, Chapter III, to the 57th (1990) General Assembly, harmonizing this chapter with the *Form of Government*, and taking into account the breadth of understanding of Scriptural Worship in the O.P.C.”
   c. Ruling Elders and the Sacraments
      The Committee was “requested to consider whether, in extraordinary circumstances, ruling elders may administer the sacraments (which would require amendment of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, Chapter XXVII, Section 4, and the *Westminster Larger Catechism*, #169).”

2. The 60th (1993) General Assembly
   a. Special Music in Worship
      The 60th (1993) General Assembly referred to the Committee the issues raised in Complaint #4 to that Assembly (concerning “special music” in worship) and requesting a report to the 61st (1994) General Assembly. (In part because of this task, involving the need to study again, in greater depth, the meaning and application of the regulative principle of worship, the 61st (1994) General Assembly expanded the Committee from three to five members.)
   b. Authority to Propose Amendments to Other Portions of the Book of Church Order
      The 60th (1993) General Assembly also enlarged the mandate of the Committee to include authority to propose amendments to other portions of the *Book of Church Order* where these are necessary to bring the three portions into substantive and linguistic harmony.

3. The 67th (2000) General Assembly
   a. Provide Rationale for Revisions
      The 67th (2000) General Assembly, in response to Overture 1 from the Presbytery of Ohio, adopted the following procedure concerning the consideration of adopting proposed revisions to the *Directory for Public Worship*:
      i. That the 67th General Assembly request its Committee on Revisions to the DPW to provide any further proposed revisions to the *Directory for Public Worship* together with a document explaining its
rationale for the proposed revisions of substance and to distribute these documents to the 68th (2001) General Assembly.

ii. That the 67th General Assembly request the presbyteries diligently and conscientiously to evaluate the proposed revision and to communicate their responses to the Committee on Revisions to the DPW by December 31, 2001.

b. Communication with Other Churches, Bible Translations, and Miscellaneous Overtures

The 67th (2000) General Assembly also referred Overtures 2-5 to the Committee for consideration. These overtures related respectively to requests that the draft DPW revision be sent to churches with whom the OPC has ecclesiastical ties, that only the King James Version and the American Standard Version be used for Scripture citations in the DPW, that the terminology of Chapter III of the present Directory be maintained, and that the wording of the present Directory concerning the distinct office of the pastoral ministry be maintained.

The Advisory Committee that year recommended to the Committee that it also consider Communication 4 which urged that the provisions of Chapter III, Section 8 of the present Directory be maintained. The Committee’s disposition of these matters was reported in prior years.

4. The 70th (2003) General Assembly

The Assembly referred to the Committee for study the “Alternate Proposal” of a Minority Report prepared by one member of the Committee as a substitute for the Committee’s Proposed Revised Version.

5. The 72nd (2005) General Assembly

The Assembly sent the Amended Proposed Revised Version of the Directory for Public Worship to the sessions and presbyteries for study; authorized the Committee to send to the churches when ready proposed amendments to the Form of Government moving the sections on the warrant and nature of the offices of minister, ruling elder, and deacon from the Directory for Public Worship; and instructed the Committee to prepare as an appendix to the Book of Discipline forms for the imposition and removal of censure.

6. Summary

The Committee’s mandate which began in 1967 was a general overview of the Directory with undefined objectives for revision. It has since been given more direction by various General Assemblies as indicated above.

In the course of time two conditions have had special effect on the scope of the Committee’s work. One was the adoption of a broad revision of the Form of Government which raised new issues for a directory for public worship which this committee then had to consider. The other effect on the Committee’s work was the Committee’s invitation to the Church at large to propose to the Committee matters deemed to need attention, which has produced a continuing flow of suggestions and issues. Over the course of its existence, the Committee has considered 2,022 pages of such communications.

B. The Committee’s work in the past year

Since the 72nd (2005) General Assembly the Committee has held one two-day and three one-day meetings. These meetings have been devoted to considering communications received from the Church, reviewing and amending the Alternate Proposed Revised Version, and addressing responsibilities given to it by the General Assembly
concerning amendments to the *Form of Government* dealing with ordinations and installations and the addition to the *Book of Discipline* of suggested forms for the imposition and removal of censures. The Committee’s Amended Proposed Revised Version is found on the OPC website at http://opc.org/GA/DPWdraft0604.pdf and as Appendix 2 attached to this report.

II. THE AMENDED PROPOSED REVISED VERSION OF THE DIRECTORY FOR THE PUBLIC WORSHIP OF GOD.

A. Background

In the course of its work, the Committee considered our Presbyterian heritage. Among its sources of historical background material, the Committee carefully thought about the *Directory for the Publick Worship of God* adopted by the Westminster Assembly (1939), the *Directory of Worship* adopted by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (1788), and the *Directory for the Public Worship of God* adopted by the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (1939).

1. The *Directory for the Publick Worship of God* adopted by the Westminster Assembly (1645)

   a. At the time of the Protestant Reformation in England, godly men developed the *Book of Common Prayer*. Of them, the Westminster divines wrote:

   In the beginning of the blessed Reformation, our wise and pious ancestors took care to set forth an order for redress of many things, which they then, by the Word, discovered to be vain erroneous, superstitious, and idolatrous, in the publick worship of God. This occasioned many godly and learned men to rejoice much in the *Book of Common Prayer*, at that time set forth; because the mass, and the rest of the Latin service being removed, the publick worship was celebrated in our own tongue: many of the common people also receive benefit by hearing the scriptures read in their own language, which formerly were unto them as a book that is sealed” [from “The Preface” to *The Directory for the Publick Worship of God* adopted by the Westminster Assembly, 1645].

   b. Unhappily, it was discovered that human sin was such that it was prone to abuse this well-intentioned tool. In the words of the Westminster divines:

   Long and sad experience hath made it manifest that the Liturgy used in the Church of England, (notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the Compilers of it,) hath proved an offence, not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the reformed Churches abroad. For, not to speak of urging the reading of all the prayers, which very greatly increased the burden of it, the many unprofitable and burdensome ceremonies contained in it have occasioned much mischief, as well by disquieting the consciences of many godly ministers and people, who could not yield unto them, as by depriving them of the ordinances of God, which they might not enjoy without conforming or subscribing to those ceremonies. Sundry good Christians have been, by means thereof, kept from the Lord’s Table; and divers able and faithful ministers
debarred from the exercise of their ministry, (to the endangering of many thousand souls, in a time of such scarcity of faithful pastors,) and spoiled of their livelihood, to the undoing of them and their families. Prelates, and their faction, have laboured to raise the estimation of it to such a height, as if there were no other worship, or way of worship of God, amongst us, but only the Service-book; to the great hinderance of the preaching of the Word, and (in some places, especially of late) to the justling of it out as unnecessary, or at best, as far inferior to the reading of common prayer; which was made no better than an idol by many ignorant and superstitious people, who, pleasing themselves in their presence at that service, and their lip-labour in bearing a part in it, have thereby hardened themselves in their ignorance and carelessness of saving knowledge and true piety.

In the meantime, Papists boasted that the book was a compliance with them in a great part of their service; and so were not a little confirmed in their superstition and idolatry, expecting rather our return to them, than endeavouring the reformation of themselves: in which expectation they were of late very much encouraged, when, upon the pretended warrantableness of imposing of the former ceremonies, new ones were daily obtruded upon the Church.

Add hereunto, (which was not foreseen, but since have come to pass,) that the Liturgy hath been a great means, as on the one hand to make and increase an idle and unedifying ministry, which contented itself with set forms made to their hands by others, without putting forth themselves to exercise the gift of prayer, with which our Lord Jesus Christ pleaseth to furnish all his servants whom he calls to that office: so, on the other side, it hath been (and ever would be, if continued) a matter of endless strife and contention in the Church, and a snare both to many godly and faithful ministers, who have been persecuted and silenced upon that occasion, and to others of hopeful parts, many of which have been, and more still would be, diverted from all thoughts of the ministry to other studies; especially in these latter times, wherein God vouchsafeth to his people more and better means for the discovery of error and superstition, and for attaining of knowledge in the mysteries of godliness, and gifts in preaching and prayer” [from “The Preface” to The Directory for the Publick Worship of God adopted by the Westminster Assembly, 1645].

c. This led to a reaction against the Book of Common Prayer by earnest Christians who began going in many different directions for their public worship. The Presbyterian solution was to develop a directory for public worship. A directory gave instruction to ministers for worship mandated by Scripture providing a basic unity in the church while providing guidance for the judgment of ministers, preserving thereby the purity, peace and unity of the church. The Westminster divines insisted:

Not from any love to novelty, or intention to disparage our first reformers, (of whom we are persuaded, that, were they now alive, they would join with us in this work, and whom we acknowledge as excellent instruments, raised by God, to begin the purging and building of his house, and desire they may be had of us and posterity in everlasting remembrance, with thankfulness and honour,) but that we may in some measure answer the gracious providence of God, which at this time calleth upon us for further reformation, and may satisfy our own consciences, and answer the expectation of other reformed churches, and the desires of many of the godly among ourselves, and withal give some publick
testimony of our endeavours for uniformity in divine worship, which we have promised in our Solemn League and Covenant; we have, after earnest and frequent calling upon the name of God, and after much consultation, not with flesh and blood, but with his holy word, resolved to lay aside the former Liturgy, with the many rites and ceremonies formerly used in the worship of God; and have agreed upon this following Directory for all the parts of publick worship, at ordinary and extraordinary times. Wherein our care hath been to hold forth such things as are of divine institution in every ordinance; and other things we have endeavoured to set forth according to the rules of Christian prudence, agreeable to the general rules of the word of God; our meaning therein being only, that the general heads, the sense and scope of the prayers, and other parts of publick worship, being known to all, there may be a consent of all the churches in those things that contain the substance of the service and worship of God; and the ministers may be hereby directed, in their administrations, to keep like soundness in doctrine and prayer, and may, if need be, have some help and furniture, and yet so as they become not hereby slothful and negligent in stirring up the gifts of Christ in them; but that each one, by meditation, by taking heed to himself, and the flock of God committed to him, and by wise observing the ways of Divine Providence, may be careful to furnish his heart and tongue with further or other materials of prayer and exhortation, as shall be needful upon all occasions” [from “The Preface” to The Directory for the Publick Worship of God adopted by the Westminster Assembly, 1645].

2. The Directory of Worship adopted by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (1788)

In colonial America, the synod of 1729 “recommended” the Westminster Assembly’s Directory for the Publick Worship of God to the churches “as near as circumstances will allow, and Christian prudence direct.”

In 1786 the synod “received” the directory “as in substance agreeable to the New Testament.” In 1788, it adopted a revised Directory of Worship. This Directory remained the basis for worship among American Presbyterians into the 20th century.

3. The Directory for the Public Worship of God adopted by the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (1939)

In 1939, the 6th General Assembly adopted the DPW as a part of the Constitution of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. In 1991, the DPW was amended by addition of the provision in III.8 concerning the role of ruling elders in leading worship.
B. A comparison of the structure of the DPW and the APRV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DPW (1939)</th>
<th>APRV (proposed, 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>Note the terminological distinctions. The provision on legitimate exceptions is drawn from the Westminster Assembly’s <em>Directory for the Publick Worship of God</em> (as are some other provisions throughout the APRV which may seem “new”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ The purpose of this <em>Directory</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ Important terminological distinctions used in this <em>Directory</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ Legitimate exceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ The Scripture version used is the KJV (without prejudice to other translations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Chapter I. Guiding Principles for Public Worship | The APRV seeks to integrate into a logically flowing section the principles which are spread through the present DPW, as well us to further explicate some of their practical implications. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter I. Of the Sanctification of the Lord’s Day</th>
<th>A. God’s Appointment of Public Worship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. God calls all people to worship him in spirit and in truth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. All of life is to be worshipful (&quot;general worship&quot;). but worship consists in specific acts of communion with God (&quot;special worship&quot;).</td>
<td>cf. WCF XXI:6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Such worship is secret (in one’s closet), private (in families), and public (in churches). Public worship occurs when God summons his people by his Word and Spirit through his officers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I:2. The Christian Sabbath is the first day of the week. | c. He does so summon them on the Lord’s Day.  
2. The Lord’s Day is the Christian Sabbath, pointing back to creation, up to salvation in the resurrected Christ, and forward to consummation. | cf. WCF XXI:7. |
| I:1. Sabbath observance is a duty  
I:5. Preparing for public worship  
I:3. Sanctifying the Lord’s Day  
I:4. Not hindering others from sanctifying the Lord’s Day | 3. How to keep the Lord’s Day holy  
1. Preparing for the Lord’s Day  
2. Preparing for public worship  
3. Sanctifying the Lord’s Day  
Note the beautiful definition of public worship in DPW I:5 — “communion with God in his public ordinances.” It is drawn from the Westminster Assembly’s DPW and is retained in the APRV. |
| I:6. Public Sabbath worship is a privilege and a duty | 4. God calls his people to assemble for public worship on the Lord’s Day |  |

**Chapter II. Of the Principles of Public Worship**

| II:2. Public worship is, above all, a meeting of God with his covenant people. | B. The Essence of Public Worship | cf. Ex. 20:24b; Lev. 17:8–9; Dt. 12; Mt. 18:20; Heb. 10:19–25; 12:22–24 |
| II:4. Worship is to be God-produced, God-enabled, God-centered. | 1. At heart, public worship is a meeting of the triune God with his covenant people... in God’s very presence... | “For through him [the Son] we both [the church of Jews and Gentiles] have access in one Spirit to the Father” (Eph. 2:18). |
| II:5. Worship is to be consciously through Christ, under Christ, and for Christ. | 2. through Jesus Christ... | cf. WCF XXI:2–3 |
| II:4. Worship is to be God-produced, God-enabled, God-centered. | 3. by the Holy Spirit… | (Holy Spirit) |
| II:6. Worship is to be sincere and reverent. | 4. assembled corporately as the church… | (Church) |
| II:9. Worship should be marked by penitent humility as well as by faith, thanksgiving, and praise. | 5. in order to manifest and renew their covenant bond with God and one another… | (Goal) |
| II:8. Public worship is a meeting of the covenant community assembled corporately. | 6 according to the Word of God… | (Standard) cf. WCF I:6; XX:2, 4; XXI:1 |
| II:1. The principles of public worship must be derived from God’s Word. | 7. and to the glory of the triune God | (Motive) |
III:1 Because it is a covenant meeting between God and his people (cf. II:2), worship involves two-way communication from God to the people (by the minister speaking to them on behalf of God) and from the people to God (by themselves or by the minister speaking to God on their behalf) and it is appropriate that these parts alternate.

Cf. also this statement in III:2. “The reading of the Scriptures by the minister is to be distinguished from the responsive reading of certain portions of Scripture by the minister and the congregation.” [What is the distinction? In the former, God is addressing the congregation; in the latter, the congregation is addressing God.]

III:7 There is Biblical form, with great freedom within that form, for worship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. The Parts of Public Worship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Because public worship is covenantal communion between God and his people, part of worship is God addressing his people (through a representative voice), part is the people addressing their God (through their own or a representative voice), and it is appropriate that these parts more or less alternate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Both covenant parties are active in each part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sessions and pastors should consider appropriate order in the worship service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sessions and pastors should consider appropriate order in the worship space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Confession of Faith sometimes uses the term “parts” to mean “elements” (see XXI:5). The DPW follows this usage. The APRV, on the other hand, instead always uses “elements” to mean “elements.” The APRV uses “parts” in a different way (e.g., in I.C.), to refer to the two kinds of elements in the communion between the Triune God and his covenant people.

While this terminology is new for the OPC DPW, it is not a change in theology or substance. First, while the Westminster Standards do use “parts” to mean “elements,” they do not seem to make this a technical term. Second, the term “elements” communicates more clearly in our contemporary context (especially in light of debates about the regulative principle and distinctions between elements and circumstances). Third, the present DPW II:2 and III:1 makes precisely the same point as the APRV. Fourth, this terminology is not really new; it is drawn from continental Reformed liturgics, which speaks of elements a parte Dei (those elements done on behalf of God) and elements a parte populi (those elements done by or on behalf of the covenant people).

That the APRV reflects the correct interpretation of the DPW is evidenced by the comments of R. B. Kuiper, one of the principle authors of the OPC DPW (1939): “Since corporate worship is offered to God in a meeting of God and His people, it must consist of two sorts of transactions. In some, as in the reading of Scripture, the preaching of the Word and the benediction, God addresses His people and they worship by reverently attending. In others, as prayer, song and the offering of gifts, they respond in holy fear to what God has spoken. In every part of their worship God’s people either listen to God or reply to God. What glory for the church that the great God condescends thus to commune with it and that
it is privileged thus to commune with Him!” (The Glorious Body of Christ [Banner of Truth], p. 348).

The APRV simply seeks to express our covenant theology in an even more thoroughgoing way than the present DPW does.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II:5. Worship is to be consciously through Christ, under Christ, and for Christ.</th>
<th>D. The Leadership of Public Worship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The exalted Christ leads public worship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He leads public worship by his Word and Spirit through his officers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Practical implications:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Public worship should be overseen by sessions…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. and conducted by ministers…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. and sometimes by licentiates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. and sometimes by ruling elders…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. and sometimes by other men being prepared for the ministry…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. and by no others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter III. describes the elements of worship as conducted by a minister.

III:8. Provides for the involvement of ruling elders in conducting worship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Of the Usual Parts of Public Worship</th>
<th>Chapter II. Elements of Ordinary Public Worship</th>
<th>cf. WCF XXI:5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Some have asked why this title is changed from “Of the Usual Parts of Public Worship” to “Elements of Ordinary Public Worship” and why the sacraments are listed here. The APRV seeks to bring the terminology and structure of the DPW into better accord with the Westminster Standards on this point. According to WCF XXI:5

The elements of the ordinary religious worship of God [cf. APRV II] are:

- the reading of the Scriptures with godly fear,
- the sound preaching and conscionable hearing of the Word, in obedience unto God, with understanding, faith, and reverence,
- singing of psalms with grace in the heart;
- as also, the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ.

In addition, upon special occasions [cf. APRV V] these elements are to be used in a holy and religious manner in their several times and seasons:

- religious oaths,
- vows,
- solemn fastings,
- and thanksgivings.

By listing the sacraments as an element of ordinary worship, the Westminster Standards do not imply that the sacraments must be administered at each worship service, as a comparison of the Westminster Confession of Faith with the Westminster Directory for
the *Publick Worship of God* will show. The APRV implies no more or less about the frequency of the sacraments than do the Westminster Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III:2–4</th>
<th>A. The Part from God to the People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The Call to Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. God’s call itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The congregation’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Public Reading of God’s Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The Scripture reading itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The desirability of reading Old and New Testament texts; and of frequently reading the law of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The public reading of Scripture as the voice of God to the people is to be distinguished from unison or responsive readings which is the voice of the people to God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Preaching of God’s Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The preaching itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The preacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The Sacraments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. The sacraments themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Sacraments are ordinarily administered only in public worship, always under oversight of church government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Administered only by ministers of the Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Blessings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. What blessings are and how they are properly used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The salutation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The benediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cf. FG VIII — “to bless the people from God”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III:5–7</th>
<th>B. The Part from the People to God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Appendix

**III:5. Public prayer**

1. **Public Prayer**
   - a. Prayer
   - b. Silent prayer in preparation for worship
   - c. How public prayer should be led
   - d. The importance of preparation for public prayer
   - e. A prayer of invocation at the beginning of the service
   - f. Comprehensive prayer during the service
   - g. Prayer to confess sin
   - h. Prayer in connection with offering
   - i. Prayer in connection with hearing God’s Word
   - j. What about unison prayer?
   - k. Corporate amen

**III:6. Congregational singing**

2. **Congregational Singing**
   - a. Congregational singing
   - b. The purpose of worship and the character of the songs used
   - c. The place of psalms and hymns
   - d. Choosing songs for public worship
   - e. Using musical gifts to assist congregational worship

*(Cf. V, which provides for public profession of faith in a service of ordinary worship.)*

**III:7. Bringing of offerings**

3. **Public Confession of Faith**
   - a. Individual public professions of faith
   - b. Corporate confessions of common faith

**4. The Bringing of Offerings**
   - a. The role of offerings
   - b. The duty of the pastor
   - c. The duty of the session
   - d. Diaconal offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter IV. Of the Celebration of the Sacraments</th>
<th>III. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. General Provisions</td>
<td>A. General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5. The Administration of the Sacraments</td>
<td>B. Baptism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Holy Baptism</td>
<td>1. The Baptism of Infants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baptism of Infants</td>
<td>2. The Baptism of Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baptism of Adults</td>
<td>C. The Lord’s Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The Lord’s Supper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note well, the APRV retains the present provisions regarding the frequency of administering the sacraments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chapter V. Of Public Profession of Faith</strong></th>
<th><strong>IV. PUBLIC RECEPTION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. General Provisions</td>
<td>A. General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Reception into Full Communion of</td>
<td>B. Reception into Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncommunicant Members by Profession</td>
<td>Communion of Noncommunicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Faith</td>
<td>Members by Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Reception by Letter of</td>
<td>C. Reception by Letter of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Another Orthodox Presbyterian</td>
<td>Transfer from Another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Church of Like Faith and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Reception by Letter of</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Another Church of Like Faith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Reception by Reaffirmation of Faith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Reception of New Members by Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession of Faith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chapter VI. Of Ordinations and Installations</strong></th>
<th><strong>The APRV proposes that the suggested forms in Chapter VI be moved to FG and incorporated into the provisions for ordinations and installations there.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Ministers</td>
<td>This APRV section is new to the OPC DPW, but it is by no means new. These provisions are a condensed version of provisions which were found in the Westminster Assembly’s <em>Directory for the Public Worship of God</em> and in the various versions of the PCUSA <em>Directory for the Worship of God</em> (1788 and following).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ruling Elders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Deacons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V. SPECIAL OCCASIONS OF PUBLIC WORSHIP</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Prayer and Fasting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Thanksgiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUGGESTED FORMS FOR PARTICULAR SERVICES</strong></th>
<th><strong>SUGGESTED FORMS FOR PARTICULAR SERVICES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. The Solemnization of Marriage</td>
<td>I. The Solemnization of Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. The Funeral Service</td>
<td>II. The Burial of the Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Dedication of a Church Building</td>
<td>III. Thanksgiving for a Church Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note well — these sections are not part of the OPC constitution. Nevertheless that APRV seeks to give guidance that accords with Scripture and the secondary Standards. Re the changed title and content in III., see WCF XXI:6.
III. THE PROCESS THE COMMITTEE ANTICIPATES

1. Such amendments to the Amended Proposed Revised Version of the Directory for the Public Worship of God (APRV) as are proposed to the 73rd (2006) General Assembly by presbyteries, whether by letter or by overture, shall be included in the Agenda if possible.

2. The proposed amendments shall be referred to the same Advisory Committee as the report of the Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship.

3. The Committee on Revisions recommends to the Stated Clerk that he set aside up to both parts of the afternoon session of one day for consideration of and action on the APRV, including amendments proposed by presbyteries and made from the floor.

4. Consideration shall be as follows:
   a. The APRV shall be presented to the Assembly with an introduction of not more than 15 minutes.
   b. There shall be a 45-minute open discussion of the APRV.
   c. The APRV shall be placed on the floor as the main motion: that the 73rd General Assembly propose the APRV to the presbyteries for approval as the new Directory for the Public Worship of God.
   d. Consideration and approval of the APRV shall be “consideration by paragraph or seriatim” (Robert’s Rules of Order, 10th Edition Newly Revised, pp. 266-270).
   e. If consideration and action on the revision of the Directory is not completed before the set adjournment time of the Assembly the Assembly shall refer the already-amended and not-yet-amended APRV to the 74th (2007) General Assembly and to the Committee on Revisions. Presbyteries may submit to the Committee on Revisions through December 15, 2006 further proposals for amendment of the portion of the APRV that the 73rd (2006) General Assembly had not considered for amendment.

   The Committee on Revisions shall report to the 74th (2007) General Assembly as it deems appropriate.

   The 74th (2007) General Assembly shall provide to the appropriate Advisory Committee the amended and unamended text of the APRV, the report of the pertinent Advisory Committee to the 73rd (2006) General Assembly, as well as the report of the Committee on Revisions to the 74th (2007) General Assembly.

   The 74th (2007) General Assembly shall begin further approval of the APRV with consideration by paragraph or seriatim to resume at the point where it was interrupted in the 73rd (2006) General Assembly. No amendments to the previously considered paragraphs may be considered until the entire document is opened to amendment after all paragraphs have been considered.

   f. From the time when the APRV has been approved for proposal to the presbyteries, it shall be henceforth called the Final Proposed Revision (FPR) in order to distinguish it from all earlier drafts.

IV. BUDGET

The Committee requests a budget for the coming year of $1500.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the 73rd General Assembly propose the Amended Proposed Revised Version (APRV) to the presbyteries for approval; that it do so by the procedure proposed in III.
above, and that the document being so proposed be renamed the Final Proposed Revision (FPR).

2. That, if the APRV is approved, the 73rd General Assembly instruct its Clerk to correct the Book of Discipline where it refers to the Directory for the Public Worship of God — II.B.2.c. and d (pp. 89–90 in the 2005 edition) — in order that those citations will be correct. (In II.B.2.b. this will involve changing V.5 to IV.D, in II.B.2.c changing V.5 to IV.E, and in II.B.2.d changing V.5 to either IV.B or IV.F as the case may require; and to correct BD II.B.2.a by the insertion following the words “vote of reception” of the parenthesis (see the Directory for the Public Worship of God, Chapter IV, section c).

3. That the 73rd General Assembly propose to the presbyteries that, contingent upon the approval of the FPR, the statement on the warrant and nature of the office of minister in the present DPW VI.A.2. be moved to FG XXIII.8 and 14 and the statements on the warrant and nature of the offices of ruling elder and deacon be moved to FG XXV.6.a. and XXV.7.a., both with changes necessitated by the new locations as shown in Appendix 3.

4. That the 73rd General Assembly approve including in the Suggested Forms for the Book of Discipline the forms for the imposition and removal of censure. (Appendix 4)

5. That the 73rd General Assembly elect an alternate member of the Committee to serve until the 74th General Assembly

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE AMENDED PROPOSED REVISED VERSION OF THE DPW (from the report of the Committee on Revisions to the 72nd General Assembly)

A. The purpose of the Directory for the Public Worship of God

1. The Committee views the purpose of the Directory for the Public Worship of God for the Orthodox Presbyterian Church as two-fold: it is a summary statement of Reformed principles and practices for the public worship of God, and it is a handbook to guide the Church in its execution of those principles and practices.

a. As a statement of Reformed principles and practices of public worship the DPW must be rooted in the Reformation principle of sola scriptura which requires Christian faith and life to be obedient to the Word of God, and to observe in public worship the regulative principle that God must be worshiped according to the Scriptures, and that he may not be worshiped according to human imaginations or inventions or in any way not prescribed by his Word.

b. As a handbook, the DPW is to inform the Church of elements of public worship that God requires us to observe and of circumstances of Christian prudence consonant with the Word of God that assist us in carrying out the required elements in the interest of godliness, order, and unity. As a handbook, therefore, the DPW contains both required elements distinctive to public worship — those commanded by God — and circumstances and forms which are permissible since, though not in themselves commanded by Scripture, they support the required elements in a manner that is in accord with Scripture.

2. This overall purpose should underlie and undergird each of the disparate sections of the DPW in order to provide for both unity and legitimate diversity in the Church.

3. The DPW has been a part of the Constitution of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church since the 6th (1939) General Assembly. At that time the third ordination vow had not been understood to refer specifically to the tertiary standards (Form of Government, Book of Discipline, Directory for Public Worship). The revision of the Form
of Government effective at the 45th (1978) General Assembly clarified that the DPW is indeed part of the Constitution and focused the third ordination vow to refer specifically to the tertiary standards, so that it now reads, “Do you approve of the government, discipline, and worship of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church?”

B. How should the OPC revise her Directory for the Public Worship of God?

Given the history of the General Assembly’s dealing with this Committee, it would seem to go without saying that the OPC clearly wished to revise her Directory for Public Worship. But should she? And if so, how? In order to discern whether and how she should revise this document, the OPC needs to evaluate her DPW. Toward this end, in our judgment, the current DPW has the following strengths and weaknesses.

1. Strengths:
   a. Its principles, basic structure, and even some of its terminology have strong grounding in, and continuity with, Presbyterian and Reformed liturgical history. For example, the beautiful definition of public worship found in I.5 — “communion with God in his public ordinances” — is drawn from the Westminster Assembly’s Directory for the Publick Worship of God.

   b. Its most significant strength—see II.2 and III.1—is its explication of worship as a meeting, ordained of the triune God, between him and his covenant people. One factor that made the OPC DPW unique in this history was the OPC’s conscious conflating of the American, Scottish, and continental Reformed traditions. Until this point, Presbyterian directories largely consisted of directions for pastors and sessions. The OPC DPW went beyond that by including statements of principles, including this core principle that worship is above all else a meeting between the triune God and his covenant people. In large part, this was drawn from the continental Reformed tradition. Consequently, the OPC was the first church that codified in an official church document this principle and the practical implication that accordingly worship is “dialogical,” with God addressing his people in some elements and God’s people addressing God in other elements. This principle has always been at the heart of a Reformed understanding of worship, but the Orthodox Presbyterian Church was the first church to codify this important Reformed principle of worship in an official ecclesiastical document. This is an important contribution to Reformed liturgics and it has had a salutary influence beyond the borders of the OPC.

2. Weaknesses:
   a. The DPW assumes the validity of Presbyterian and Reformed liturgical tradition without specifically indicating the Scripture underpinnings of those principles and practices. Moreover, at times it assumes Reformed worship practices without spelling them out. Originally, this was not a weakness; the DPW reflected shared assumptions. But as God has continued to bless the OPC and to add new congregations and new members — even ministers — from all sorts of backgrounds, and thus as the OPC confronts new pastoral needs, there has been a growing necessity for a greater explication of the truth, goodness, beauty, and power of biblically Reformed worship. We should praise God for his wonder-work of gathering, building, forming, and reforming his church; at the same time, we need to face directly the new challenges this blessing brings our way.

   b. The most glaring weakness attendant on the DPW is that, in practice, it is largely neglected or ignored. It would seem that this is largely a consequence of the first weakness, a need for increased explanation of the biblical, theological, and pastoral warrant for Presbyterian and Reformed worship.

   c. In this light, we suggest that the DPW should be strengthened in at least the following thirteen general areas:
(1) The DPW should more consistently explicate the implications of the fact that public worship is “divine” (II.4) and that it is “before all else a meeting of the triune God with his chosen people” (II.2). The active, supernatural role of the Persons of the Trinity in a worship assembly should be better explicated. The DPW could more clearly express the scriptural supernaturalism found, for example, in Confession XXV.3.

(2) Closely related, the DPW should be brought into fuller harmony with the Church’s Standards in its treatment of the sacraments.

(a) The DPW places less importance on the sacraments than do the Standards. At one point, the DPW actually conflicts with the Confession of Faith. Confession XXI.5 distinguishes ordinary worship and special occasional worship and lists — the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ — with reading, preaching, and hearing the Word of God and the singing of psalms as “all parts of the ordinary religious worship of God.” In direct contradiction, however, DPW IV.A.1 identifies the sacraments as “occasional elements of the public worship of God.”

(b) Moreover, in its forms — particularly for the Lord’s Supper — the DPW should more clearly express our confessional commitment to the Calvinistic doctrine of the sacraments (that the Supper is an objective means of grace by which our Lord supernaturally grants true communion, our Lord personally applies himself and his benefits to those who receive the sacrament in faith, and our Lord refreshes and refurbishes them for his service [see, for example, Confession XXIX.7, Larger Catechism #168, Shorter Catechism #96]) and lend itself much less to a Zwinglian interpretation (that the Supper is merely a devotional tool by which we examine ourselves, we remember what our Lord did for us long ago, and we recommit ourselves to his service).

(c) More especially, the gospel emphasis of the Lord’s Supper should be more emphatically expressed. Many have understood this form to teach that somehow we must make ourselves to be worthy partakers before we may come to the Table. On this understanding, many have even refused to partake because of their sense of unworthiness. Scripturally, however, to “partake worthily” means precisely that we do recognize our utter unworthiness and that we abhor and humble ourselves before God, abandoning all dependence on our own dead works and clinging to the perfect doing and dying of Jesus Christ. The form really ought to place more emphasis on the wonderful grace of God in Christ Jesus. It should make more clear that the Lord’s Supper is a means of grace.

(3) The DPW should much better spell out the corporate implications of the sacraments (see 1 Cor. 12:13; 10:17). This has become increasingly important in our individualistic and voluntaristic culture.

(4) The DPW should more explicitly spell out some of the positive commitments to the responsibilities of church membership in the membership vows (especially vow #4), and to the corporate character of our covenantal faith.

(5) The DPW should show greater conformity to the fact that, according to our Standards, baptized covenant children are members of the church, albeit non-communicant members. On this point our DPW betrays some accommodation to baptistic, revivalistic, individualistic elements in our religious culture. This is especially egregious when the DPW treats the public profession of faith by a covenant young person identically to the public profession of faith by a new convert from paganism, but other sections are also affected.

(6) The DPW should clearly express the integral relation between the Sabbath day and public worship. This section does not appear in the DPW in order to state our theology of the Sabbath — our Confession and Catechisms already do that — but rather it appears here because there is a relationship between the Sabbath and public worship.
This relationship is barely perceptible in the DPW, although it is implicit. It would be more helpful, however, if it were stated explicitly. If it were, it would provide an important antidote to arguments currently circulating in our churches along this line: “All of life is worship. Therefore worship services do not have any special status or any special regulation.”

(7) The DPW should be brought into greater harmony with our Standards by more explicitly stating the regulative principle of worship (see Confession XX.2; XXI.1; Larger Catechism 107–110; Shorter Catechism 49-52). It is very peculiar that it neglects to do so, since the regulative principle is regarded as the great distinctive of the biblically Reformed approach to worship. But at this point the DPW falls far short of its usual continuity with the Standards and the Presbyterian and Reformed worship tradition. That should be corrected.

(8) The DPW should better clarify the issues surrounding the leadership of worship. As many have noted, III.8 is conspicuous in its stark incongruity with the rest of the document. It is clearly an amendment inserted into the DPW at some point without adequate regard for its consistency with the whole document. The issue of leadership should be addressed more comprehensively first of all to explicate the scriptural rationale behind our practice (where we so unmistakably swim against the stream of modern evangelicalism), and then to reflect a genuine commitment to a true consensus, and to bring inner coherence to the DPW.

(9) The DPW should more completely survey the elements of worship in Chapter III. It omits any mention of the sacraments or of professions of faith (although later chapters provide for those elements). It also omits any provision for corporate professions of faith, although most of our congregations practice these in line with the Presbyterian and Reformed liturgical tradition.

(10) The DPW should show greater care in some of its allusions to Scripture (for example, many have argued that II.2 takes Matthew 18:20 out of context and that II.6 takes John 4:24 out of context).

(11) The Building Dedication Service should be revised because it directly applies Scriptures which spoke of the shadowy old covenant holy place to an earthly church building in this era of new covenant heavenly worship (cf. Jn. 4:24; Heb. 8; 10:19–25; 12:18–29) and repeatedly calls such a building God’s “house.”

(12) Some statements of cultural preference without biblical warrant should be winnowed out (for example, “the stately rhythm of the chorale is especially appropriate for public worship”).

(13) The whole DPW could be organized with a more logical outline and could be formatted in a manner that makes it easier for a pastor to use as a handbook.

C. What this Amended Proposed Revised Version of the DPW (APRV) is not:

1. This APRV is not an effort to alter the Church’s theology of worship. That theology is stated in our Confession and Catechisms, which the DPW is responsible to reflect.

2. It is not an OPC version of a Book of Common Prayer, a sort of set liturgy. It makes no attempt to legislate a fixed order of worship but continues to allow liberty.

3. The proposed revision is not a document that can wholly satisfy everybody in every respect. Many officers spanning several generations—reflecting a variety of perspectives—have worked long and hard on this proposed revision. Not a single one of them has gotten his own way on every point.

D. What this Amended Proposed Revised Version of the DPW is:
1. It is a directory—a summary statement and practical handbook giving guidance for sessions and pastors regarding what, why, and how to oversee and conduct worship that is Reformed according to the Scriptures, worship that accords with the theology of the Standards of the Church.

2. In particular, this Amended Proposed Revised Version of the DPW seeks more explicitly to incorporate our Standards’ Reformed doctrine of the means of grace into its directions and forms than does the present DPW.

3. This proposal represents a diligent attempt both to maintain the bounds required by our Standards and at the same time to allow for diversity within those bounds.

4. This revision proposes to expand and amplify the present DPW in order to increase the familiarity of the Church with our rich heritage of Reformed worship and to increase the general sense of kinship in our Church’s worship practices.
Committee on Revisions to the Directory for Public Worship
Supplemental Report

Since the preparation of the Committee’s report to the 73rd General Assembly, the Committee and the Stated Clerk have received communications and overtures from ten presbyteries concerning changes that they would like to see in the Amended Proposed Revised Version of the Directory for Public Worship. While many of these suggested changes overlap and some of them would cancel out others, the Committee has not been able in the short time available to meet, consider all of these last minute submissions, and organize them in a way that would enable the Assembly to deal with them effectively. Therefore the Committee is withdrawing the recommendations contained in its report and substituting for them the following:

V. Recommendations

1. That for the discussion and question period following the presentation of the Committee’s Report(s) and Report(s) of the Advisory Committee, Standing Rule V.5.e be suspended and in its place the following procedure be adopted:
   a. That the commissioners may, for up to 60 minutes
      (1) Ask questions about the report(s)
      (2) Discuss portions of the report(s) not related to a recommendation
   (3) Discuss matters raised in any overtures or communications relating to the work of the Committee
   b. During this period, a commissioner shall, after having been recognized, announce whether he is asking a question(s) about the report(s), discussing a portion(s) of the report not related to a recommendation, or discussing an overture or communication from a presbytery; discussion of portions of the report(s) related to a recommendation is out of order. A questioner may have up to one minute to ask his question and a speaker may have up to three minutes to make his speech. No speaker may speak twice if another is seeking the floor.

2. That the 73rd General Assembly postpone to the 74th General Assembly consideration of the Amended Proposed Revised Version (APRV) and contingent changes to the Book of Discipline and Form of Government.

3. That the 73rd General Assembly refer to the Committee on Revisions all overtures and communications relating to the revision of the Directory for Public Worship received from presbyteries prior to June 21, 2006, requesting the Committee to consider the suggested amendments contained therein, to make any amendments to the APRV that it deems warranted by such consideration, and to organize the remaining suggested amendments in such a way as to facilitate their consideration by the 74th General Assembly; and further, that the Assembly direct the Committee not to consider any suggested amendments received after the above deadline.

4. That the 73rd General Assembly request the Committee on Revisions to complete its work and post on the OPC web site by December 31, 2006 the form of the APRV that it plans to propose to the 74th General Assembly.

5. That the 73rd General Assembly instruct the Stated Clerk to include in the docket for the 74th General Assembly a full day to allow for consideration of the Amended Proposed
Revised Version (APRV) and contingent changes to the Book of Discipline and Form of Government along with any related matters.

6. That the 73rd General Assembly instruct the Stated Clerk to include in the printed minutes of the present Assembly the Report of the Committee but not the APRV itself nor the contingent proposed amendments to the Form of Government and Book of Discipline (Appendices 1-3).

7. That the 73rd General Assembly approve including in the Suggested Forms for the Book of Discipline the forms for the imposition and removal of censure. (Appendix 4)

8. That the 73rd General Assembly elect an alternate member of the Committee to serve until the 74th General Assembly.
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SUMMARY OF OPC STATISTICS FOR 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL CHURCHES</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Congregations</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Dec: Churches</td>
<td>Prof Reaff Xfer Dcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT &amp; So. NEW YORK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAKOTAS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN &amp; ONTARIO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID- ATLANTIC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK &amp; NEW ENGLAND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIOH</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILADELPHIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHEAST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE WHOLE CHURCH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:
- Prof = Received on Profession of Faith
- Reaff = Received on Reaffirmation of Faith
- Xfer = Received on Letter of Transfer
- Dcd = Died
- Dism = Dismissed on Letter of Transfer
- Bapl = Baptized
- Par = Received with Parents
- D&E = Disciplined or Erased

Jan = January 1, 2005
Dec = December 31, 2005
MW = Mission Works
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### SUMMARY OF OPC STATISTICS FOR 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERSHIP TOTALS</th>
<th>OFFICERS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>OFFERINGS &amp; BEQUESTS ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2253</td>
<td>2313</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2139</td>
<td>2188</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3039</td>
<td>3109</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2067</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>2141</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2771</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2764</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27704</td>
<td>27540</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Associate or Assistant Pastor  
E = Evangelist or Organizing Pastor  
T = Teacher  
S = Stated Supply  
Act. = Active  
N/A = Not Active  
Per CM = Average Total Giving per Communicant Member  
May, Nov = Average weekly Attendance in May and November  
Via Wills = Funds given as Bequests
## STATISTICAL REPORTS OF THE REGIONAL CHURCHES AND CONGREGATIONS

### REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE CENTRAL U. S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town or City</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Jan Add</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Reaff</th>
<th>Xfer</th>
<th>Remov</th>
<th>Dcd</th>
<th>Dismiss</th>
<th>D&amp;E</th>
<th>Dec Add</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Bapt</th>
<th>Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caney OPC</td>
<td>Caney</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Woods OPC</td>
<td>Overland Park</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith OPC</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster OPC</td>
<td>Bartlesville</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members *3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS - CENTRAL U. S.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Member of a former congregation remaining on the roll of the regional church.

### REGIONAL CHURCH OF CONNECTICUT AND SOUTHERN NEW YORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town or City</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Jan Add</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Reaff</th>
<th>Xfer</th>
<th>Remov</th>
<th>Dcd</th>
<th>Dismiss</th>
<th>D&amp;E</th>
<th>Dec Add</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Bapt</th>
<th>Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westminster OPC</td>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community OPC</td>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemia OPC</td>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Square OPC</td>
<td>Franklin Square</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member without rights of presbytery *3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS - CONNECTICUT &amp; So. NEW YORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2 A minister on the roll of the regional church with ministerial credentials held in suspense per FC XXIII:18

### REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE DAKOTAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town or City</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Jan Add</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Reaff</th>
<th>Xfer</th>
<th>Remov</th>
<th>Dcd</th>
<th>Dismiss</th>
<th>D&amp;E</th>
<th>Dec Add</th>
<th>Prof</th>
<th>Bapt</th>
<th>Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield OPC</td>
<td>Brookfield</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation</td>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill OPC</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmaus</td>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverdale *5</td>
<td>Bismarck</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch Memorial</td>
<td>Bismarck</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Reformed</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>Volga</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner OPC</td>
<td>Winner</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ *6</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members *3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS - DAKOTAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>679</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3 Members are on the roll of Bethel, Carson, ND

*4 Members are on the roll of Christ, Salt Lake City, UT

*5 Members of former congregations at large, remaining on the roll of the regional church.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL MEMBERS</th>
<th>Pastor(s)</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>OFFERINGS &amp; REQUESTS ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>R Elders</td>
<td>Deacons Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 3 0</td>
<td>160 160 105 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 0 1 0</td>
<td>30 42 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
<td>33 33 32 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>26 26 18 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE CENTRAL U. S., Continued**

| 532 532 | 7 1 4 0 | 265 265 183 175 | 259.1 56.0 | 1.2 | 316.3 1.3 | 0.0 |

| 88 72   | Calen D. Ketler | 9 0 4 0 | 61 79 | 42 | 42 | 10.8 46.6 | 0.0 | 157.1 2.8 | 0.0 |
| 45 44   | James W. Campbell | 2 0 0 0 | 30 28 23 | 21 | 74.1 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.1 2.8 | 0.0 |
| 96 95   | Robert E. Tarllo | 2 0 1 0 | 75 65 35 35 | 133.8 27.6 | 0.0 | 161.4 2.7 | 0.0 |
| 276 305 | Reinhard Pfleider | 3 1 4 0 | 215 227 118 131 | 430.7 75.6 | 2.6 | 590.0 2.4 | 0.0 |
| 30 26   | William S. Stelko | 1 0 0 0 | 26 29 9 9 | 79.9 2.6 | 0.0 | 82.4 3.2 | 0.0 |
| 1 1     | David A. Conson | 1 1 0 0 | 26 29 9 9 | 79.9 2.6 | 0.0 | 82.4 3.2 | 0.0 |

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF CONNECTICUT AND SOUTHERN NEW YORK, Continued**

| 536 543 | 14 1 8 0 | 407 427 227 243 | 826.9 154.3 | 2.6 | 989.9 2.6 | 0.0 |

| 72 85   | Gregory S. Thurston | 2 0 0 0 | 117 111 101 98 | 119.5 13.7 | 0.0 | 133.2 2.3 | 0.0 |
| 114 126 | Kevin P. Swanson | 4 0 4 0 | 160 130 0 0 | 200.0 12.0 | 0.0 | 212.0 2.8 | 0.0 |
| 66 69   | Matthew K. Kingsbury | 3 0 2 0 | 47 49 23 26 | 111.1 5.1 | 0.0 | 116.2 2.2 | 0.0 |
| 61 65   | Leonard J. Coppee | 3 1 2 1 | 60 50 50 41 | 117.9 3.1 | 0.0 | 121.0 2.7 | 0.0 |
| 33 27   | Archibald A. Allison | 1 0 0 0 | 48 60 48 60 | 60.7 6.4 | 6.5 | 82.6 1.8 | 0.0 |
| 0 0     | Edward S. S. Huntington | 0 0 0 0 | 12 21 9 12 | 12.3 1.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 1.3 | 0.0 |
| 46 43   | W. Vernon Pickett, Jr. | 3 0 1 0 | 24 29 19 22 | 35.6 8.6 | 0.0 | 44.2 1.2 | 9.9 |
| 42 41   | Young J. Son | 2 1 3 0 | 25 25 4 4 | 21.6 1.4 | 1.3 | 24.3 0.7 | 0.0 |
| 60 59   | Randall K. Knyema | 2 1 1 0 | 45 34 31 25 | 38.2 4.2 | 0.0 | 42.4 1.2 | 0.0 |
| 110 116 | Benjamin K. Hipp | 3 6 2 0 | 78 73 14 15 | 82.9 1.9 | 16.4 | 81.2 0.8 | 0.0 |
| 54 52   | Warren S. Thole | 3 1 2 0 | 42 44 27 30 | 46.7 10.0 | 0.0 | 56.7 1.7 | 0.5 |
| 110 41   | Vacant | 2 1 1 1 | 17 13 0 0 | 22.7 1.0 | 0.0 | 23.7 0.6 | 0.0 |
| 75 74   | Terry F. Thale | 4 1 3 0 | 29 32 26 24 | 43.7 3.9 | 0.0 | 47.6 0.8 | 0.0 |
| 0 0     | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 |
| 54 52   | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 |

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE DAKOTAS, Continued**

| 558 910 | 36 12 21 9 | 762 739 352 357 | 978.6 72.3 | 28.7 | 1077.7 1.7 | 11.7 |
### CHURCH OR MISSION WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town or City</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Refl</td>
<td>Xfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Reformed</td>
<td>Walkerton</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain-O-Lakes</td>
<td>Central Lake</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Farms Chapel</td>
<td>Coopersville</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Hills Community</td>
<td>Farmington Hills</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Mills</td>
<td>Gowen</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life Fellowship</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>Hudsonville</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Springs Community</td>
<td>Kentwood</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Manistee</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrim</td>
<td>Metamora</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Springs Community</td>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Royal Oak</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Komoeka</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>Meaford</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Sheden</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Covenant</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Hope</td>
<td>Vineland (Jordan)</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member(s) without rights of presbytery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTALS - MICHIGAN & ONTARIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MID-ATLANTIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town or City</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Refl</td>
<td>Xfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Burtonsville</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Hope</td>
<td>Clarksville</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia OPC</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Covenant Reformed</td>
<td>Jessup</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Reformed</td>
<td>Lanham (Bowie)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>Silver Spring</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Maryland</td>
<td>St. Mary's County</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berea</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Reformed</td>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Leesburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayspring</td>
<td>Manassas</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketoctin Covenant</td>
<td>Purcellville</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Community</td>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling OPC</td>
<td>Sterling</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTALS - MID-ATLANTIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

1 Under the oversight of session, Little Farms Chapel, Coopersville, MI, but not included in their statistics

2 Members are on the roll of Covenant, London, ON.
Yearbook
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Town or City</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant of Grace</td>
<td>Batavia (N. Aurora) IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>De Kalb IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Grayslake IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Hanover Park IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Indian Head Park IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite</td>
<td>Mennonite IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Covenant Community</td>
<td>New Lenox IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Orland Park IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Reformed</td>
<td>Springfield IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Wheaton IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Reformed</td>
<td>Evansville IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Cedar Falls IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Reformed</td>
<td>Des Moines IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Covenant Fellowship</td>
<td>Independence IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Reformed</td>
<td>Houghton MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of the Lakes</td>
<td>Brainerd MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL Mission</td>
<td>St. Paul MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Valley</td>
<td>Appleton (Neenah) WI</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>Cedar Grove WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope</td>
<td>Green Bay WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Janesville WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Madison (Fitchburg) WI</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls</td>
<td>Menomonee Falls WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Milwaukee (New Berlin) WI</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Stockbridge</td>
<td>Morgan Station WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>Oostburg WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Reformed</td>
<td>Reedsburg WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Roberts WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Sheboygan WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite</td>
<td>Zoar WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS - MIDWEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2152</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Members are on the roll of the regional church;

**VI** Under the oversight of Session, Bethel, Wheaton, IL, but not included in their statistics

**VI** Members are on the roll of Apple Valley, Appleton (Neenah), WI.

**VI** Under the oversight of Session, Grace, Hanover Park, IL, but not included in their statistics

**VI** Under the oversight of Session, Falls, Menomonee Falls, WI, but not included in their statistics

**VI** Under the oversight of Session, Bethel, Oostburg, WI, but not included in their statistics

**Members of former congregations etc. remaining on the roll of the regional church**
**REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MIDWEST, Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL MEMBERS</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>OFFERINGS &amp; BEQUESTS ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Pastor(s)</td>
<td>R Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>James R. Megchelsen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Dennis L. Disselkoen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Matthew E. Cotta</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>C. Mark Jenkins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Charles K. Taffler</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Talmage Wagenmaker</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Victor B. Atwood</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Lee L. Smith</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Samuel M. Allison</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Stephen J. Hare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Rodney T. King</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kenneth R. Golden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Todd Wagenmaker</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Roger L. Gibbons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roger L. Gibbons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>William B. Acker III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>Ronald L. Beaudoin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>James E. Ferguson</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>David W. King</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>C. Mark Jenkins</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Snodgrass</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>James T. Hoekstra</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Joshua E. Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>John R. Timsky</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gordon L. Oliver</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Kenneth M. O’Keefe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Brian L. DeJong</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Karl E. Thompson</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3059</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</td>
<td>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</td>
<td>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Reaff Xfer</td>
<td>Doc Dism D&amp;E</td>
<td>Prof Reaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immanuel</td>
<td>Belmar  NJ</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>Bridgeton NJ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabernacle de Gracio</td>
<td>Camden NJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hill OPC</td>
<td>Cherry Hill NJ</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Fair Lawn NJ</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Glassboro NJ</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of the Covenant</td>
<td>Hackensacktown NJ</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Hamilton (Trantow) NJ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immanuel</td>
<td>Medford NJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Bide</td>
<td>North Wildwood NJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Hope</td>
<td>Nulley NJ</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Community</td>
<td>Philpburg NJ</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River of Life</td>
<td>Philpburg NJ</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Pittsgrove NJ</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>Ringoes NJ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Carmel</td>
<td>Somersett NJ</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford OPC</td>
<td>Bradford NJ</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>Toms River NJ</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Vineyard NJ</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuova Esperanza</td>
<td>Vineland NJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immanuel</td>
<td>West Collingswood NJ</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Westfield NJ</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>Whoopary NJ</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>Wilwood NJ</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member without rights 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS: NEW JERSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Reaff Xfer</td>
<td>Doc Dism D&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrim</td>
<td>Bangor ME</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrymeeting Bay</td>
<td>Brunswick ME</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot Bay</td>
<td>Bucksport ME</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Mountain</td>
<td>Denmark ME</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Parish</td>
<td>Portland ME</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview</td>
<td>Rockport ME</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skowhegan OPC</td>
<td>Skowhegan ME</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Covenant</td>
<td>Boston (Newton) MA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Fall River MA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Pres., North Shore</td>
<td>Ipswich MA</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin's Valley</td>
<td>North Andover MA</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Cod</td>
<td>West Barnstable MA</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey OPC</td>
<td>Jaffrey NH</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoskeag</td>
<td>Manchester NH</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Amsterdam NY</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life</td>
<td>Canton NY</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon OPC</td>
<td>Lisbon NY</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Rochester NY</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>Rochester NY</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>Schenectady NY</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Syracuse NY</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Barre VT</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member without rights 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS: NEW YORK &amp; NEW ENGLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Members are on the roll of Immanuel, Belmar, NJ
* Dissolved on 27 Feb 05
* Members are on the roll of Covenant, Vineland, NJ

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND**
### Yearbook

#### Regional Church of New Jersey, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL MEMBERS</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>OFFERINGS &amp; BEQUESTS ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>R Elders</td>
<td>Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Regional Church of New York and New England, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL MEMBERS</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>OFFERINGS &amp; BEQUESTS ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>R Elders</td>
<td>Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members of former congregations et al. remaining on the roll of the regional church**

**A minister on the roll of the regional church with ministerial credentials held in suspnse per FG XXIII:18**

---

1. Members of former congregations et al. remaining on the roll of the regional church.
2. A minister on the roll of the regional church with ministerial credentials held in suspension per FG XXIII:18.
## REGIONAL CHURCH OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town or City</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta Oaks</td>
<td>Antioch CA</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Berkeley CA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Castro Valley CA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Eureka CA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope</td>
<td>Hartford CA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Grace Community</td>
<td>Hughson CA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Modesto CA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Monterey Bay CA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Novato CA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation</td>
<td>Roseville CA</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>San Jose CA</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9                 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill</td>
<td>Sonora CA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Covenant</td>
<td>South San Francisco CA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Sunnyvale CA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Battle Mountain NV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Las Vegas NV</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Rose</td>
<td>Reno NV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTALS - NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE NORTHWEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town or City</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Anchorage AK</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Washilla AK</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arco OPC</td>
<td>Arco ID</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Redeemer</td>
<td>Boise ID</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Geneva</td>
<td>Idaho Falls ID</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellinom</td>
<td>Holena MT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Covenant</td>
<td>Kakepia MT</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>Missoula MT</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Reformed</td>
<td>Bend OR</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Corvallis OR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Grants Pass</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Medford OR</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Newberg OR</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Portland OR</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Grace</td>
<td>Roseburg OR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Bothell WA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>Cañalan WA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>Chavel WA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Commerce WA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>Kent WA</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnwood OPC</td>
<td>Lynnwood WA</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Monroe WA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Mount Vernon WA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Grace</td>
<td>Oak Harbor WA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation</td>
<td>Olympia WA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeeming Grace</td>
<td>Port Angeles WA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTALS - NORTHWEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- **Members are on the roll of the regional church.**
- **Members are on the roll of First, San Francisco, CA**
- **Members of former congregations et al, remaining on the roll of the regional church**

### Regional Church of the Northwest

- Faith
- Grace
- Arco OPC
- Sovereign Redeemer
- New Geneva
- Ellinom
- Faith Covenant
- Garden City
- Grace Reformed
- Westminster
- Faith
- Trinity
- Trinity
- First
- Covenant Grace
- Trinity
- Puget Sound
- Emmanuel
- Covenant
- Emmanuel
- Lynnwood OPC
- Westminster
- Grace
- Sovereign Grace
- Reformation
- Redeeming Grace
- Other members

### Total Members:
- **Regional Church of the Northwest**: 1489 people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL CHURCH OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, Continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael D. Dengerink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne K. Forkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert C. Needham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay C. Nelken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael E. Richline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel C. Robbins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B. Needham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne K. Forkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B. Needham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Church of the Northwest, Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard C. Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Church of the Northwest, Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL CHURCH OF OHIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS - OHIO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Under the oversight of session. Redeemer, Dayton, OH, but not included in their statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL CHURCH OF PHILADELPHIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence Reformed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genja Protestant Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Philips]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna Bible Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS - PHILADELPHIA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REGIONAL CHURCH OF OHIO, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88 Joseph Puglia  
43 Vacant

#### REGIONAL CHURCH OF PHILADELPHIA, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 Members are on the roll of Grace, Columbus, OH  
52 Members are on the roll of Emmanuel Chapel, Philadelphia, PA  
Withdrew from the OPC  
Members of former congregations et al. remaining on the roll of the regional church
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Reaf Xfer</td>
<td>Dcd Dismiss D&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REREGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>Birmingham AL</td>
<td>26 0 0 2 0 2 0 0 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence M</td>
<td>Madison AL</td>
<td>23 5 0 2 0 2 0 0 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Mobile AL</td>
<td>35 1 4 2 0 4 0 0 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence M</td>
<td>Bradenton FL</td>
<td>11 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Reformed</td>
<td>Fort Pierce FL</td>
<td>43 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Hialeah FL</td>
<td>23 0 2 0 2 2 2 0 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys Chapel</td>
<td>Key West FL</td>
<td>19 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>Lake Worth FL</td>
<td>28 2 2 0 0 2 1 0 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Nokomis FL</td>
<td>11 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Ocala FL</td>
<td>35 1 0 2 1 2 1 3 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Sherwood</td>
<td>Orlando FL</td>
<td>127 8 6 2 0 6 12 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation</td>
<td>Oviedo FL</td>
<td>29 1 2 3 0 1 0 3 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant M1</td>
<td>Pensacola FL</td>
<td>45 0 8 7 1 12 0 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hope) M2</td>
<td>Saint Cloud FL</td>
<td>12 0 0 0 0 12 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>Tallahassee FL</td>
<td>112 2 5 4 0 6 0 0 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>Tallahassee LA</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Christ] M3</td>
<td>New Orleans LA</td>
<td>25 0 0 0 0 25 0 0 19 0 0 0 0 19 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineville</td>
<td>Pineville LA</td>
<td>84 0 0 0 2 3 1 1 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Covenant] M4</td>
<td>Forest MS</td>
<td>51 0 0 0 0 51 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 37</td>
<td>0 0 21 0 0 0 0 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS - SOUTH</td>
<td>723 21 38 63 6 130 17 692</td>
<td>273 14 37 14 0 69 9 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Members are on the roll of the regional church,

** Under the oversight of session, Calvary OPC, Tallahassee, FL, but not included in their statistics

1 Members of former congregations at all, remaining on the roll of the regional church

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTHEAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Reaf Xfer</td>
<td>Dcd Dismiss D&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster M</td>
<td>Carrollton GA</td>
<td>14 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>Doraville GA</td>
<td>132 6 0 1 0 2 0 0 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>La Grange GA</td>
<td>52 4 4 0 0 0 0 0 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Marietta GA</td>
<td>72 2 0 2 0 13 1 0 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>London KY</td>
<td>25 0 0 0 0 4 2 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Reformed M1</td>
<td>Neon KY</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>Charlotte NC</td>
<td>48 0 0 0 0 17 0 4 0 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Etowah NC</td>
<td>17 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba Valley</td>
<td>Granite Falls NC</td>
<td>18 0 0 0 0 6 0 0 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Greenboro NC</td>
<td>65 3 3 6 0 0 0 3 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Grace Reformed M</td>
<td>Hickory NC</td>
<td>19 0 2 2 0 0 0 0 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews OPC</td>
<td>Matthews NC</td>
<td>145 14 4 10 0 0 0 0 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Reformed</td>
<td>Mount Airy NC</td>
<td>32 6 5 0 0 2 0 0 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>New Bern NC</td>
<td>42 7 2 2 0 6 6 1 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrim</td>
<td>Raleigh NC</td>
<td>77 5 6 4 0 2 4 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence M</td>
<td>Aiken SC</td>
<td>27 0 0 2 1 0 0 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant Community M</td>
<td>Greenville SC</td>
<td>8 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Reformed</td>
<td>Bristol TN</td>
<td>28 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone</td>
<td>Chattanooga TN</td>
<td>67 3 0 12 0 11 3 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith M1</td>
<td>Cockeville TN</td>
<td>12 0 0 0 1 0 0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Springs</td>
<td>Maryville TN</td>
<td>45 0 4 3 0 0 1 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Chithowie VA</td>
<td>63 5 2 1 0 2 0 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Lynchburg VA</td>
<td>49 0 1 4 0 3 0 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel MI</td>
<td>Roanoke VA</td>
<td>19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS - SOUTHEAST</td>
<td>1084 50 41 66 2 76 19 1144</td>
<td>439 53 46 31 1 49 20 434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Members are on the roll of the regional church,

M1 Members are on the roll of Providence, Chithowie, VA

** Dissolved on 22 April 05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Church Name</th>
<th>R Elders</th>
<th>Deacons</th>
<th>AM Worship</th>
<th>Sun School</th>
<th>General Offering</th>
<th>Benev. Offering</th>
<th>Total Offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Church of the South, Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Church of the Southeast, Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</td>
<td>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</td>
<td>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Town or City</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Non Added</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iglesia Nueva Vida™</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita</td>
<td>Bonita</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview</td>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Costa Mesa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido OPC™</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>Goleta</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(New Life)†</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iglesia Evangélica Ref.™</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Christ™</td>
<td>Mira Mesa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeeming Grace™</td>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Grace™</td>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant of Grace</td>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence Reformed™</td>
<td>Paso Robles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Grace</td>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iglesia Del Señor Viviente™</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeemer</td>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence™</td>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch of Hope</td>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection™</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Members are on the roll of the regional church
† Under the oversight of session, Calvin, Phoenix, AZ, but not included in their statistics
‡ Under the oversight of session, OPC, Westminster, CA, but not included in their statistics
§ Members are on the roll of Theophilus, Diamond Bar, CA
¶ Under the oversight of session, Calvary, La Mirada, CA, but not included in their statistics
∥ Members are on the roll of Harvest, Vista, CA
*† Withdrawn from the OPC on 2 Feb 05.
*‡ Members of former congregations et al. remaining on the roll of the regional church
†† Interim pastor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL MEMBERS</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>OFFERINGS &amp; BEQUESTS ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Pastor(s)</td>
<td>R Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>William E. Warner</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Alberto Gomez</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Charles K. Perkins</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Stephen L. Parker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Dale T. Hanoka</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Roger Wagner</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>George C. Scipione</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Michael D. Pasarilla</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Yousik Hong</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Peter H. Sim</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Zachary R. Keole</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Douglas P. Harley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Donald G. Buchanan, Jr.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Daniel H. Overduin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yang H. Kim</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Gonzalo Salinas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Robert G. Hermann</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mark C. Mueller</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bruce M. Brady</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stephen A. Larson</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Jesse A. J. Puschel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>Paul Vigliano</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Mark A. Schroeder</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jesse A. J. Puschel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>William J. Gorrel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Gonzalo Salinas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Regional Church of Southern California, Continued**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHURCH OR MISSION WORK</th>
<th>COMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
<th>NONCOMMUNICANT MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Reaff</td>
<td>Xfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant of Grace</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Covenant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Cities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Covenant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Redeemer] C1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ the King M2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenant of Grace M2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members M1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS - SOUTHWEST</strong></td>
<td>741</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Members are on the roll of the regional church.
* Under the oversight of session, Tyler Pres., Tyler, TX, but not included in their statistics.
* Members are on the roll of Christ Covenant, Amarillo, TX.
* Dissolved on 16 Jan 05.
* Members of former congregations et al. remaining on the roll of the regional church.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL MEMBERS</th>
<th>CHURCH OFFICERS</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>OFFERINGS &amp; BEQUESTS ($1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastor(s)</td>
<td>R Elders</td>
<td>Deacons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin W. Van Der Linden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph A. Keller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chad E. Bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Hoitson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regional Church of the Southwest, Continued*
## RECAPITULATION OF MEMBERSHIP STATISTICS
### 1938-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ministers*</th>
<th>Communicant Members</th>
<th>Baptized Children</th>
<th>Total** Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>19,965</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>27,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>19,998</td>
<td>7,706</td>
<td>28,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>19,725</td>
<td>7,857</td>
<td>27,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>18,804</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>26,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>18,293</td>
<td>7,601</td>
<td>26,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>17,938</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>26,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>17,279</td>
<td>7,513</td>
<td>25,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>16,620</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>24,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>15,936</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>23,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>15,072</td>
<td>6,693</td>
<td>22,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>14,256</td>
<td>6,412</td>
<td>20,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>13,659</td>
<td>6,141</td>
<td>19,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>12,915</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>18,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>12,580</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>18,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>18,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>12,159</td>
<td>5,653</td>
<td>18,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>12,573</td>
<td>5,814</td>
<td>18,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>5,933</td>
<td>19,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>13,013</td>
<td>5,827</td>
<td>18,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>12,919</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>18,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>5,523</td>
<td>18,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>12,278</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>17,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>17,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>11,956</td>
<td>5,186</td>
<td>17,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>11,884</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>17,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>10,939</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>16,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>9,197</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>14,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6,734</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>10,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>7,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ministers were included in Total Membership beginning December 31, 1972. Total membership figures given above for all years have been adjusted to include ministers; they will differ, therefore, from the figures that appear in the Minutes of the General Assembly for years prior to 1973.*

**Total membership in each year was revised in the following year’s Statistician’s report, and the revised figures are shown above. Figures for communicant members and baptized children prior to 1984 were not revised, so their totals differ slightly from revised total memberships.*
STATISTICAL REPORTS OF THE PRESBYTERIES - 2005

PRESBYTERY OF THE CENTRAL U. S.

General Information
Membership: 8 Ministers, 8 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: January, May, and September
Stated Clerk: Mark T. Harrington, term expires Jan 09
Moderator: LeRoy E. Miller, term expires Jan 07

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 4 churches and no unorganized mission work
Changes in congregations: None

Ministers
Ordinations: None
Ministers received: None
Ministers removed: None
Ministers installed: None
Ministerial relationships dissolved: None
Roll of ministers:

J. Michael Arnaud  Mark T. Harrington  V. Robert Nilson
Joseph A. Auksela  Chester H. Lanious  Geoffrey C. Smith
Edward A. Eppinger  LeRoy E. Miller

Licentiates
Roll of licentiates: None

PRESBYTERY OF CONNECTICUT AND SOUTHERN NEW YORK

General Information
Membership: 11 Ministers, 15 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 3rd Saturday of January, April, September, and November
Stated Clerk: John W. Mallin III, term expires Jan 07
Moderator: Robert E. Tarullo, term expires Jan 07

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 5 churches and no unorganized mission work
Changes in congregations: None

Ministers
Ordinations:
  Benjamin W. Miller, 17 Dec 05
Ministers received:
  David A. Corson, 26 Mar 05, formerly Independent Baptist
Ministers removed: None
Ministers installed:
  David A. Corson, teacher, OPC, Franklin Square, N.Y., 26 Mar 05
  Benjamin W. Miller, assoc. pastor of OPC, Franklin Square, N.Y., 17 Dec 05
Ministerial relationships dissolved: None
Roll of ministers:

James W. Campbell  David A. Corson  Richard R. Gerber
Calvin D. Keller  Daniel G. Osborne  Sabry Tanios
John W. Mallin III  Meindert Ploegman  Robert E. Tarullo
Benjamin W. Miller  William Shishko

Licentiates
Licensures:
    Benjamin W. Miller, 11 Nov 05
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
    Benjamin W. Miller, ordained, 17 Dec 05
Roll of licentiates: None

PRESBYTERY OF THE DAKOTAS

General Information
Membership: 16 Ministers, 48 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 1st Tuesday of April
    4th Tuesday of September
Stated Clerk: Archibald A. Allison, term expires Apr 08
Moderator: Matthew W. Kingsbury, term expires Apr 06

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 13 churches and 3 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations: None
Mission works: Parent church:
    Covenant, Bismarck, N.D.  Bethel, Carson, N.D.
    Christ, Logan, Utah  Christ, Salt Lake City, Utah
    Christ, Provo, Utah  Christ, Salt Lake City, Utah

Ministers
Ordinations: None
Ministers received: None
Ministers removed: None
Ministers installed: None
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
    Scott L. Seder, presbytery evangelist, Christ, Provo*, Utah, 30 Apr 05
Roll of ministers:

Archibald A. Allison  Randall K. Klynsma  Gregory L. Thurston
Leonard J. Coppes  W. Vernon Picknally, Jr.  D. Jason Wallace
Richard G. Hodgson  Scott L. Seder  Gerald I. Williamson
Benjamin K. Hopp  Kevin P. Swanson  Richard Wynja
Edward S. S. Huntington  Darren S. Thole
Matthew W. Kingsbury  Terry F. Thole
Licentiates
Licenses: None
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed: None
Roll of licentiates:
   Shawn C. Mathis

* Reported in error in the 2004 report as having been installed as presbytery evangelist in Logan, Utah.

PRESBYTERY OF MICHIGAN AND ONTARIO

General Information
Membership: 32 Ministers, 84 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: January, May, and September
Stated Clerk: Alan M. Flowers, term expires Jan 08
Moderator: Robert M. Van Manen, term expires Jan 07

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 19 churches and 5 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations:
   Cedar, Hudsonville, Mich., organized as a new and separate church, 4 Nov 05
Mission works:
   Parent church:
   Providence, Manistee, Mich.
   Living Hope, Jordan, Ont.
   OPC, Meaford, Ont.
   Grace, Shedden, Ont.
   OPC, Toronto, Ont.
   Little Farms Chapel, Coopersville, MI
   Grace Covenant, Sheffield, Ont.
   Covenant, Komoka, Ont.

Ministers
Ordinations: None
Ministers received: None
Ministers removed:
   Brian L. DeJong, dismissed to Presbytery of the Midwest, 9 Sept 05
Ministers installed:
   Jorge L. Barros, evangelist in Toronto, Ontario, 6 Feb 05
   Stephen W. Igo, pastor of Cedar, Hudsonville, Mich., 4 Nov 05
   Michael D. Knierim, associate pastor of Cedar, Hudsonville, Mich., 4 Nov 05
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
   Brian L. DeJong, as pastor of Covenant, Brighton, Mich., 31 Aug 05
   Stephen W. Igo, as associate pastor of Harvest, Grand Rapids, MI, 4 Nov 05
Roll of ministers:

Jorge Luiz Barros   Douglas A Felch  Glenn D. Jerrell
Timothy L. Bero    John R. Ferguson  Michael D. Knierim
Perry G. Brackin    John N. Fikkert  Edward W. Ludt
K. Dale Collison    Alan M. Flowers  Frank J. Marsh
Norman DeJong      Eric R. Hausler  Gerry J. Mynders
Lap O. Duong       Kenneth J. Hovingh  Gerald J. Neumair
Abe W. Ediger      Stephen W. Igo  Martin A. Novak
Licentiates

Licentiates received:
  Christopher L. Post, from Presbytery of the Midwest, 20 May 05
Licentiates removed: None

Roll of licentiates:
  Benjamin Johnson
  Christopher L. Post
  J. Wesley White
  Aldo A. Yannon

Note

Tristan Emmanuel, a minister on the roll of the regional church with credentials held in suspense per FG XXIII: 18, was divested without censure, 21 May 05.

PRESBYTERY OF THE MID-ATLANTIC

General Information

Membership: 26 Ministers, 61 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 1st Saturday of May; Spring (retreat);
  3rd Saturday of September; 1st Saturday of December
Stated Clerk: Leonard E. Miller, term expires Sept 06
Moderator: Stuart R. Jones, term expires Sept 06

Churches and Mission Works

Number of congregations: 14 churches and 4 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations:
  Ketocin Covenant, Purcellville, Va., organized as a new and separate church, 5 Nov 05
  Berea, Harrisonburg, Va., dissolved 31 Dec 05

Mission works:
  Parent church:
  Living Hope, Clarksville, Md. The regional church
  Christ Covenant Reformed, The regional church
  Md. House of Corrections, Jessup, Md.
  Southern Maryland The regional church

Ministers

Ordinations:
  Timothy W. Flora, 17 May 05
  Peter Y. Lee, 17 May 05
Ministers received: None
Ministers removed:
  Lyman M. Smith, by erasure, effective 8 June 05
Ministers installed:
  Albert J. Tricarico, Jr., missionary evangelist to Uganda, 8 Jan 05
  Timothy W. Flora, associate pastor of Columbia, Columbia, Md., 17 May 05
Peter Y. Lee, presbytery evangelist serving in Clarksville, Md., 17 May 05
Charles R. Biggs, pastor of Ketoctin Covenant, Purcellville, Va., 5 Nov 05
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
  Charles R. Biggs, as presbytery evangelist, 5 Nov 05
  Stephen J. Dufresne, as pastor of Berea, Harrisonburg, Va., 31 Dec 05
Roll of ministers: (*emeritus)

Charles R. Biggs  George C. Hammond  Vincent J. Tauriello
Daniel P. Clifford  Allen H. Harris  Gerald S. Taylor
Stephen D. Doe  Stuart R. Jones  Albert J. Tricarico, Jr.
Stephen J. Dufresne  Peter Y. Lee  Jeremy J. Tuinstra
Richard N. Ellis  Robert M. Lucas*  Edwin C. Urban
Bryan D. Estelle  Thomas A. Martin  Laurence N. Vail*
Timothy W. Flora  Michael A. McCabe  Bennett B. Wethered
Stephen B. Green  Anthony A. Monaghan  S. Scott Willet
George W. Hall, Jr.  James Stastny

Licentiates
Licenses: None
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
  Timothy W. Flora, ordained 17 May 05
  Peter Y. Lee, ordained 17 May 05
Roll of licentiates: None

PRESBYTERY OF THE MIDWEST

General Information
Membership: 42 Ministers, 175 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 3rd Friday and Saturday of March
  2nd Friday and Saturday after Labor Day (September)
Stated Clerk: Rodney T. King, term expires Mar 06
Moderator: Lendall H. Smith, term expires Mar 06

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 23 churches and 7 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations:
  Covenant Reformed, Evansville, Ind., organized as a new and separate church, 29 Apr 05
  New Covenant Fellowship, Independence, Iowa, organized as a new and separate church, 15 May 05
  Covenant, Roberts, Wis., received from independency, 26 Aug 05
  OPC, Momence, Ill., received from independency, 27 Dec 05
Mission works: Parent church:
  De Kalb, Ill.  Bethel, Wheaton, Ill.
  Portage Reformed, Houghton, Mich.  The regional church
  Church of the Lakes, Brainerd, Minn.  The regional church
  Mission OPC, St. Paul, Minn.  The regional church
  Providence, Madison (Fitchburg), WI Grace, Hanover Park, Ill.
  Covenant, Milwaukee (New Berlin)  Falls, Menomonee Falls, Wis.
  Covenant Reformed, Reedsburg, Wis.  Bethel, Oostburg, Wis.
Ministers

Ordinations:
- Paul T. Berghaus, 22 May 05
- C. Mark Jenkins, 7 Oct 05
- Kenneth R. Golden, 28 Oct 05

Ministers received:
- Michael J. Matossian, from Presbytery of Southern California, 18 Mar 05
- Kim M. Kuhfuss, from independency, 26 Aug 05
- Ronald L. Beabout, from independency, 1 Sept 05
- Brian L. DeJong, from Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario, 9 Sept 05

Ministers removed: None

Ministers installed:
- Sam M. Allison, pastor of Covenant Reformed, Evansville, Ind., 29 Apr 05
- Paul T. Berghaus, evangelist, serving as chaplain, U.S. Army, 22 May 05
- Kim M. Kuhfuss, pastor of Covenant, Roberts, Wis., 26 Aug 05
- Ronald L. Beabout, pastor of Calvary, Cedar Grove, Wis., 1 Sept 05
- Brian L. DeJong, pastor of Grace, Sheboygan, Wis., 9 Sept 05
- C. Mark Jenkins, evangelist at Grace, Hanover Park, Ill., assigned to Providence, Madison, Wis., 7 Oct 05
- Kenneth R. Golden, pastor of New Covenant Fellowship, Independence, Iowa, 28 Oct 05

Ministerial relationships dissolved:
- Richard M. Edwards, as pastor of Calvary, Cedar Grove, Wis., 29 Jan 05
- Ivan J. DeMaster, as pastor of Grace, Sheboygan, Wis., 17 July 05

Roll of ministers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William B. Acker III</th>
<th>Richard M. Edwards</th>
<th>James R. Megchelsen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam M. Allison</td>
<td>James E. Ferguson</td>
<td>Stephen J. Oharek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor B. Atallah</td>
<td>Roger L. Gibbons</td>
<td>Gordon L. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald L. Beabout</td>
<td>Kenneth R. Golden</td>
<td>Donald F. Ritsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul T. Berghaus</td>
<td>Heero E. C. Hacquebord</td>
<td>Lendall H. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Bosgraf</td>
<td>James T. Hoekstra</td>
<td>Benjamin J. Snodgrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric D. Bristley</td>
<td>Bruce H. Hollister</td>
<td>Alan D. Strange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas B. Clawson</td>
<td>C. Mark Jenkins</td>
<td>Charles K. Telfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David W. Cole</td>
<td>David W. King</td>
<td>Karl E. Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew E. Cotta</td>
<td>Rodney T. King</td>
<td>John R. Tinsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian L. DeJong</td>
<td>Kim M. Kuhfuss</td>
<td>Cornelius Tolsma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan J. DeMaster</td>
<td>Joshua E. Martin</td>
<td>David M. VanDrunen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis L. Disselkoen</td>
<td>Michael J. Matossian</td>
<td>Todd Wagenmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry E. Dowds</td>
<td>Christian McShaffrey</td>
<td>Iain A. M. Wright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Licentiates

Licensures: None
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
- David A. Smiley, dismissed to Presbytery of the South, 8 Apr 05
- Christopher L. Post, dismissed to Presbytery of Michigan and Ont., 20 May 05
- Paul T. Berghaus, ordained, 22 May 05
- C. Mark Jenkins, ordained, 7 Oct 05
Roll of licentiates:
  Thomas Lockheed
  Timothy McConnel
  Jason John Stewart

PRESBYTERY OF NEW JERSEY

General Information
  Membership: 36 Ministers, 70 Ruling Elders
  Stated meetings: 4th Saturday of February; 4th Tuesday of April
  4th Saturday of September; 1st Tuesday of December
  Stated Clerk: Richard A. Barker, term expires Sept 07
  Moderator: David J. Harr, term expires Sept 06

Churches and Mission Works
  Number of congregations: 20 churches and 3 unorganized mission works
  Changes in congregations:
  Living Hope, Nutley, N.J., dissolved, 27 Feb 05
  Mission Works:
  Parent church:
  Tabernaculo de Gracia, Camden, N.J.  The regional church
  Immanuel, Medford, N.J.  Immanuel, West Collingswood, N.J.
  Neuva Esperanza, Vineland, N.J.  Covenant, Vineland, N.J.

Ministers
  Ordinations:
  Glen A. Clary, 29 Oct 05
  Ministers received:
  Calvin K. Cummings, Jr., from Presbytery of Philadelphia, 6 Nov 05
  Ministers removed:
  Patrick W. Malone, dismissed to Metro New York Presb. (PCA), 26 Apr 05
  Ministers installed:
  Glen A. Clary, pastor, Immanuel, West Collingswood, N.J., 29 Oct 05
  Calvin K. Cummings, Jr., missionary evangelist to Japan, 6 Nov 05
  Ministerial relationships dissolved:
  Patrick W. Malone, as pastor of Living Hope, Nutley, N.J., 27 Feb 05
  Neil J. Lodge, as pastor of Calvary, Bridgeton, N.J., 29 May 05
  Jeffrey T. Fartro, as pastor of OPC, Cherry Hill, N.J., 30 June 05
  W. Frederick Rice, as associate pastor of Church of the Covenant, Hackettstown,
  N.J., 30 June 05

Roll of ministers:
  James Allay  David B. Cummings  Robert L. Marshall
  Benjamin Alvira  Howard Currie  John D. McGowen
  Richard S. Anderson  Martin L. Dawson  Richard A. Nelson
  Samuel H. Bacon  Claude D. DePrine III  Ronald E. Pearce
  Michael W. Bobick  David F. Elmer  William Frederick Rice
  Robert J. Cameron  Jeffrey T. Fartro  William O. Slack II
  Kenneth J. Campbell  Ross W. Graham  Albert W. Steever, Jr.
  Leonard F. Chanoux  David J. Harr  Stanford M. Sutton, Jr.
  George S. Christian  Cornelius Johnson  Claude A. Taylor III
  Thomas D. Church  Meredith G. Kline  John Vroegindewey
  Glen A. Clary  George S. Kostas  Geoffrey L. Willour
  Calvin K. Cummings, Jr.  Neil J. Lodge  James A. Zozzaro
Licentiates
Licenses:
   Glen A. Clary, 26 Apr 05
   Sixto Perez, 24 Sept 05
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
   Glen A. Clary, ordained, 29 Oct 05
Roll of licentiates:
   Sixto Perez

PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND

General Information
   Membership: 35 Ministers, 91 Ruling Elders
   Stated meetings: April and October
   Stated Clerk: Stephen L. Phillips, term expires Oct 07
   Moderator: John R. Hilbelink, term expires Oct 06

Churches and Mission Works
   Number of congregations: 20 churches and 2 unorganized mission works
   Changes in congregations: None
   Mission works: Parent church:
      Penobscot Bay, Bucksport, Me. The regional church
      Pleasant Mountain, Denmark, Me. Second Parish, Portland, Me.

Ministers
   Ordinations:
      David S. Phillips, 26 June 05
   Ministers received:
      Russell J. Hamilton, from Presbytery of the South, 8 July 05
   Ministers removed:
      Charles M. Wingard, dismissed to Evangel Presbytery (PCA), 11 Oct 05
      Robert H. Tanzie, dismissed to Gulf Stream Presbytery (PCA), 21 Oct 05
      Robert W. Eckardt, dismissed to Presbytery of Philadelphia, 19 Nov 05
      Wendell L. Rockey, Jr., dismissed to Presbytery of Philadelphia, 19 Nov 05
   Ministers installed:
      David S. Phillips, evangelist, 26 June 05
      Russell J. Hamilton, evangelist serving Bucksport, Me., 8 July 05
   Ministerial relationships dissolved:
      Charles M. Wingard, as pastor of Cape Cod, W. Barnstable, Mass., 11 Oct 05
      Robert H. Tanzie, as pastor of New Covenant, Newton, Mass., 25 Dec 05
   Roll of ministers:
      Paul H. Anderson   Samuel N. Folta   Kevin M. Kisler
      Gordon H. Cook, Jr. Burton L. Goddard   Daniel L. Korzep
      Alonso F. da Cunha   Timothy H. Gregson   Samuel T. Logan, Jr.
      Richard M. Dickinson   D. Leonard Gulstrom   Gary B. Magur
      Harold L. Dorman   Russell J. Hamilton   Gerald P. Malkus
      Carl A. P. Durham   John R. Hilbelink   Stephen A. Migotsky
      Jonathan B. Falk   Gregory A. Hills   Peter J. A. Moelker
      Michael G. Fettes   Matthew A. Judd   Brian D. Nolder
Yearbook

David J. O’Leary  Andrew H. Selle  Thomas Trouwborst
Stephen L. Phillips  Allen C. Tomlinson  Laurence W. Veinott
Gregory E. Reynolds  Stephen J. Tracey

Licentiates
Licenses:
   Todd P. Dole, 19 Apr 05
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
   David S. Phillips, ordained, 26 June 05
Roll of licentiates:
   Todd P. Dole

PRESBYTERY OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

General Information
Membership: 19 Ministers, 43 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 3rd Friday and Saturday of March and September
Stated Clerk: Donald G. Jamieson, term expires Mar 07
Moderator: Robert B. Needham, term expires Mar 07

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 15 churches and 3 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations: None
Mission works:
   Providence OP Chapel, Castro Valley, Cal.  First, San Francisco, Cal.
   Providence Presbyterian, Las Vegas, Nev.  The regional church
   Mt. Rose, Reno, Nev.  The regional church

Ministers
Ordinations: None
Ministers received: None
Ministers removed: None
Ministers installed:
   Andrew J. Preston, evangelist serving Mt. Rose, Reno, Nev., 9 Sept 05
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
   Andrew J. Preston, as pastor of Covenant, Eureka, Cal., 17 July 05
   Charles A. McIlhenny, as pastor of First, San Francisco, Cal., 1 Oct 05
   P. Michael DeLozier, as pastor of Reformation, Roseville, Cal., 31 Dec 05
Roll of ministers:
   Michael L. Babcock  Jeffery A. Landis  Daniel F. Patterson
   P. Shaun Bryant  Richard M. Lewis  Andrew J. Preston
   David P. Bush  Charles A. McIlhenny  Mark E. Richline
   P. Michael DeLozier  Richard C. Miller  Joel C. Robbins
   Michael D. Dengerink  Robert B. Needham  Salvador M. Solis
   Carl E. Erickson  Jay C. Nelken
   Wayne K. Forkner  Donald T. Owsley
Licentiates
Licenses: None
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
  Bruce Buchanan
Roll of licentiates: None

PRESBYTERY OF THE NORTHWEST

General Information
Membership: 32 Ministers, 65 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 4th Friday and Saturday of April and September
Stated Clerk: John W. Mahaffy, term expires Sept 06
Moderator: Rudie Duysings, term expires Sept 06

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 21 churches and 5 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations:
  Elkhorn, Helena, Mont., organized as a new and separate church, 27 May 05
  Westminster, Corvallis, OR, organized as new and separate church, 13 Nov 05
Mission works:
  Parent church:
    Covenant Grace, Roseburg, Ore.
    Emmanuel, Colville, Wash.
    Westminster, Monroe, Wash.
    Reformation, Olympia, Wash.,
    Redeeming Grace, Port Angeles, WA
  The regional church
    Faith, Grants Pass, Ore.
    OPC, Lynnwood, Wash.
    Emmanuel, Kent, Wash.
    Sovereign Grace, Oak Harbor, Wash.

Ministers
Ordinations:
  Brett A. McNeill, 20 May 05
Ministers received:
  J. Glenn Ferrell, from Presbytery of the Southeast of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, 21 May 05
Ministers removed: None
Ministers installed:
  Richard A. Miller, pastor of Arco OPC, Arco, Id., 12 May 05
  Brett A. McNeill, evangelist serving Reformation, Olympia, WA, 20 May 05
  J. Glenn Ferrell, pastor of Sovereign Redeemer, Boise, Id., 21 May 05
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
  Murray I. Uomoto, Committee on Foreign Missions of the OPC, 31 Dec 05
Roll of ministers:

Brad A. Anderson        Andrew M. Elam        Lloyd G. Pierson
David A. Bass           Martin Emmrich        Marcus J. Renkema
Randall A. Bergquist    J. Glenn Ferrell      Jack L. Smith
Glenn T. Black          David W. Inks         G. Mark Sumpter
Jack D. Bradley         David J. Klein        Murray I. Uomoto
Mark A Collingridge     John W. Mahaffy        Earl W. Vanderhoff
Larry D. Conard         Calvin R. Malcor      Samuel van Houte
James T. Dennison, Jr.  Ronald J. McKenzie    Robert C. Van Kooten
Daniel Dillard          Brett A. McNeill      Richard J. Venema
Stanton P. Durham        Richard A. Miller     J. Peter Vosteena
Albert G. Edwards III   Jay M. Milojevic
Licentiates
 Licenses:
  Daniel W. McManigal, 23 Sept 05
Licentiates received:
  Brett A. McNeill, from Presbytery of the South, 22 Apr 05
Licentiates removed:
  Stephen D. Murphy, recalled, 22 Apr 05
  Brett A. McNeill, ordained, 20 May 05
Roll of licentiates:
  Adam D. King
  Daniel W. McManigal

PRESBYTERY OF OHIO

General Information
 Membership: 29 Ministers, 72 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 1st Friday and Saturday of April
  3rd Friday and Saturday of October
Stated Clerk: Everett C. DeVelde, Jr., term expires Oct 07
Moderator: Leo A. Frailey, term expires Oct 06

Churches and Mission Works
 Number of congregations: 17 churches and 2 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations: None
Mission works: Parent church:
  Christ Covenant, Indianapolis, Ind. Redeemer, Dayton, Ohio
  Trinity, Huntington, W.V. Grace, Columbus, Ohio

Ministers
 Ordinations: None
Ministers received:
  Joseph Puglia, from Presbytery of the South, 4 Feb 05
  Robert Y. Eckardt, from Presbytery of the Southeast, 29 July 05
Ministers removed: None
Ministers installed:
  Joseph Puglia, pastor of Covenant, Mansfield, Ohio, 4 Feb 05
  Leo A. Frailey, associate pastor of Grace, Columbus, Ohio, 24 June 05
  Robert Y. Eckardt, pastor of Redeemer, Dayton, Ohio, 29 July 05
  Timothy W. Baker, assoc. pastor of Christ Covenant, Sheridan, IN, 18 Nov 05
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
  Michael F. Frangipane, as pastor of Redeemer, Dayton, Ohio, 4 Feb 05
  Luis A. Ortega, as pastor of Providence, Pickerington, Ohio, 25 July 05
Roll of ministers:

  Timothy W. Baker  Robert Y. Eckardt  R. Daniel Knox
  Marvin O. Bowman  Leo A. Frailey  Stewart E. Lauer
  Robert L. Broline, Jr. Michael F. Frangipane  Mark S. Melton
  Mark R. Brown  Theodore Hard  Steven F. Miller
  James J. Cassidy  Karl A. Hubenthal  Allen P. Moran
  Everett C. DeVelde, Jr. L. Charles Jackson  Lawrence B. Oldaker
Gerald C. Dodds  William B. Kessler  Danny E. Olinger
Luis A. Orteza  Lawrence Semel  John W. Wilson
Joseph Puglia  Douglas W. Snyder  Larry E. Wilson
Peter J. Puliatti  Bryan J. Weaver

Licentiates
Licenses: None
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
   Jesse R. Cowell, recalled, 21 Oct 05
Roll of licentiates: None

PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA

General Information
Membership: 47 Ministers, 95 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 1st Saturday of February and May
   3rd Saturday of September
   3rd Friday evening and Saturday of November
Stated Clerk: Thomas A. Foh, term expires Sept 06
Moderator: Douglas A. Watson, term expires Sept 06

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 23 churches and 6 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations:
   Redeemer, Carlisle, Pa., organized as a new and separate church, 27 May 05
   Pilgrim, Philadelphia, Pa., withdrew from the OPC, 17 July 05
Mission works:
   Faith, Broomall, Pa.  The regional church
   Gereja Protestant Indonesian Jemaat
   First, Perkasie, Pa.  The regional church
   Providence Ref’d, Mifflinburg, Pa.  The regional church
   Yardley Pres., Yardley, Pa.  The regional church

Ministers
Ordinations:
   Jason J. D. Stewart, 2 Dec 05
Ministers received:
   John Currie, from another denomination, 23 June 05
   Robert W. Eckardt, from Presbytery of New York & New England, 19 Nov 05
   Wendell L. Rockey, Jr., from Presbytery of NY & New England, 19 Nov 05
Ministers removed:
   Edward N. Gross, dismissed to Philadelphia Presbytery (PCA), 17 Sept 05
   Calvin K. Cummings, Jr., dismissed to Presbytery of New Jersey, 6 Nov 05
Ministers installed:
   Wendell S. Stoltzfus, pastor of Covenant, Reading, Pa., 7 Jan 05
   Douglas A. Watson, teacher in Trinity, Hatboro, Pa., 27 Feb 05
   John Currie, pastor of Gwynedd Valley, Gwynedd, Pa., 23 June 05
   Harry R. McLeod, Jr., org. pastor, Yardley Pres., Yardley, Pa., 4 Nov 05
   Jason J. D. Stewart, pastor of Christ Community, Bethlehem, Pa., 2 Dec 05
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
Thomas E. Tyson, as regional home missionary, 30 June 05
Harry R. McLeod, Jr., as assoc. pastor of Gwynedd Valley, Gwynedd, Pa., 30 Sept 05
W. Scott Emery, as pastor of Knox, Lansdowne, Pa., 19 Nov 05

Roll of ministers:
John F. Bettler A. LeRoy Greer Wendell L. Rockey, Jr.
David A. Bottoms Edward D. Guyer Young J. Son
Paul N. Browne Steven R. Hake David J. Stevenson
S. Edd Cathey Graham C. Harbman Jason J. D. Stewart
George R. Cottenden Robert P. Harting Wendell S. Stoltzfus
Wilson L. Cummings Mark W. Holler Barry A. Traver
John Currie Joel C. Kershner A. Craig Troxel
Donald J. Duff Arthur W. Kuschke Thomas E. Tyson
Robert W. Eckardt Robert W. A. Latham John D. Van Meerbeke
W. Scott Emery Richard S. MacLaren Timothy G. Walker
Thomas A. Foh Harold A. McKenzie Douglas A. Watson
Arthur J. Fox Harry R. McLeod, Jr. Larry J. Westerveld
Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. Robert A. Minnig Brian T. Wingard
John P. Galbraith George F. Morton Douglas C. Winward, Jr.
Theodore J. Georgian Jonathan F. Peters Tim W. Young
Jonathan C. Gibbs III Russell D. Piper

Licentiates
Licensures:
Erik A. Ederma, 7 May 05
Steven D. Oeverman, 7 May 05
David C. Holbrook, 14 May 05
Lee F. Veazey, 14 May 05
William B. Snodgrass, 19 Nov 05

Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
C. Adam Ostella, ordained by Presbytery of the Southwest, 11 Nov 05

Roll of licentiates:
Erik A. Ederma John F. A. Kramer William B. Snodgrass
Mark A. Garcia Stephen P. Levine Chad B. Van Dixhorrn
Barry Hofstetter Richard C. Nestel Lee F. Veazey
David C. Holbrook Steven D. Oeverman Jeffrey C. Waddington

PRESBYTERY OF THE SOUTH

General Information
Membership: 20 Ministers, 36 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 2nd Friday and Saturday after Easter
4th Friday and Saturday in October
Stated Clerk: Jeffrey K. Boer, term expires Oct 07
Moderator: Richard L. Guido, term expires Oct 06
Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 12 churches and 4 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations:
- Hope, Saint Cloud, Fla., mission work terminated, 14 Apr 05
- Christ, New Orleans, La., mission work terminated, 9 Dec 05
- Covenant, Forest, Miss., withdrew from the OPC, 15 Dec 05
Mission works: Parent church:
- Providence, Madison, Ala. The regional church
- Covenant, Pensacola, Fla. Calvary, Tallahassee, Fla.
- Covenant, Natchitoches, La. The regional church
- Providence, Bradenton, Fla. The regional church

Ministers
Ordinations: None
Ministers received: None
Ministers removed:
- Joseph Puglia, dismissed to Presbytery of Ohio, 4 Feb 05
- Russell J. Hamilton, dismissed to Presbytery of New York and New England, 8 July 05
- Mark T. Smith, dismissed to Mississippi Valley Presbytery (PCA), 15 Dec 05
Ministers installed: None
Ministerial relationships dissolved:
- Russell J. Hamilton, as pastor of Redeemer, Birmingham, Ala., 8 Apr 05
Roll of ministers:

- Matthew D. Baugh
- Robert A. Berry, Jr.
- Jeffrey K. Boer
- David E. Chilton
- Allen D. Curry
- Robert D. Haehl
- William M. Hobbs
- Hendrick Krabbendam
- Larry G. Mininger
- Donald M. Parker
- Carl G. Russell
- Chad C. Sadorf
- Jack W. Sawyer
- Henry Stanke
- Harold E. Thomas
- Jose Vera
- Eric B. Watkins
- William V. Welzien
- Kenneth L. Wendland
- Mark A. Winder

Licentiates
Licensures: None
Licentiates received:
- David A. Smiley, from Presbytery of the Midwest, 8 Apr 05
Licentiates removed:
- David E. Hodil, recalled, 8 Apr 05
- James H. Ganzevoort, dismissed to Presbytery of the Southeast, 22 Apr 05
- Brett A. McNeill, dismissed to Presbytery of the Northwest, 22 Apr 05
- Dan S. Hickman II, erased from membership by his session, 19 July 05
Roll of licentiates:
- Roberto Quiñones
- John J. Schortmann
- David A. Smiley

PRESBYTERY OF THE SOUTHEAST
General Information
Membership: 29 Ministers, 47 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 4th Friday and Saturday of April
3rd Friday and Saturday of October
Stated Clerk: Hank L. Belfield, term expires Oct 07
Moderator: George W. Knight III, term expires Oct 06

**Churches and Mission Works**

Number of congregations: 18 churches and 6 unorganized mission works

Changes in congregations:

First, Greenville, S.C., dissolved, and the former members were reconstituted a
new mission work named Covenant Community, Greenville, S.C.,
22 Apr 05
Reformed Bible, Hickory, N.C. renamed Sovereign Grace Reformed Presbyterian,
7 Aug 05

Mission works:

- Westminster, Carrollton, Ga.
- Covenant Reformed, Neon, Ky.
- Sovereign Grace Ref. Pres, Hickory, NC
- Providence, Aiken, S.C.
- Covenant Community, Greenville, SC
- Faith, Cookeville, Tenn.

Parent church:

- The regional church
- The regional church
- The regional church
- The regional church
- The regional church
- The regional church

**Ministers**

Ordinations:

- James H. Ganzevoort, 15 July 05

Ministers received: None

Ministers removed:

- Robert Y. Eckardt, dismissed to Presbytery of Ohio, 29 July 05

Ministers installed:

- Mark J. Larson, evangelist serving Providence, Aiken, S.C., 8 July 05
- James H. Ganzevoort, pastor of Sandy Springs, Maryville, Tenn., 15 July 05

Ministerial relationships dissolved:

- Richard E. Knodel, Jr., as pastor of Grace OPC, Lynchburg, Va., 22 Apr 05
- Robert Y. Eckardt, as pastor of Cornerstone OPC, Chattanooga, TN, 1 July 05
- Mark J. Larson, as pastor of Catawba Valley, Lenoir, N.C., 8 July 05

Roll of ministers:

- DeLacy A. Andrews, Jr.
- John W. Belden
- Hank L. Belfield
- Clifford L. Blair
- John Carrick
- Thomas S. Champness, Jr.
- L. Anthony Curto
- Roy Davenport
- William D. Dennison
- Elmer M. Dortzbach

- Sidney D. Dyer
- W. Ralph English
- Brenton C. Ferry
- John V. Fesko
- M. Daniel Fincham
- James H. Ganzevoort
- Richard L. Horner
- John W. Jamison
- George W. Knight III
- Richard E. Knodel, Jr.

- Mark J. Larson
- A. Boyd Miller IV
- Philip T. Proctor
- D. Patrick Ramsey
- E. Cody Ray
- Donald H. Taws
- T. Nathan Trice
- Arie van Eyk
- Douglas M. Withington

**Licentiates**

Licensures: None

Licentiates received:

- James H. Ganzevoort, from Presbytery of the South, 22 Apr 05
Licentiates removed:
  James H. Ganzevoort, ordained, 15 July 05
Roll of licentiates:
  Matthew A. Figura
  Steven Scott

PRESBYTERY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

General Information
  Membership: 45 Ministers, 77 Ruling Elders
  Stated meetings: 1st Friday and Saturday of February and May
                  3rd Friday and Saturday of October
  Stated Clerk: Donald G. Buchanan, Jr., term expires Dec 06
  Moderator: James R. Andruss, term expired Dec 05
              [Robert M. Coie, took office 1 Jan 06, term expires Dec 06]

Churches and Mission Works
  Number of congregations: 18* churches and 10 unorganized mission works
  *Beverly, Los Angeles, and Valley, Santee, have not been dissolved although
  neither congregation is functioning at present. Dissolution is expected
  when financial matters are settled.
  Changes in congregations:
    New Life, La Mesa, dismissed to South Coast Presbytery (PCA), 2 Feb 05
  Mission works:
    Parent church:
    Escondido, Escondido, Cal. The regional church
    Iglesia Evangelica Reformada,
        Los Angeles, Cal. Westminster OPC, Westminster, Cal.
    In Christ, Mira Mesa, Cal. Theophilus, Diamond Bar, Cal.
    Redeeming Grace, Mission Viejo, CA The regional church
    Sovereign Grace, Moreno Valley, CA Calvary, La Mirada, Cal.
    Providence Ref’d, Paso Robles, CA The regional church
    Church of the Living Lord,
        Santa Ana, Cal. Westminster OPC, Westminster, Cal.
    Providence, Temecula, Cal. Harvest, Vista, Cal.

Ministers
  Ordinations:
    Peter H. Sim, 12 Mar 05
    Dale T. Hanaoka, 22 May 05
  Ministers received: None
  Ministers removed:
    George C. Miladin, dismissed to South Coast Presbytery (PCA), 4 Feb 05
    Michael J. Matossian, dismissed to Presbytery of the Midwest, 5 May 05
    Marcus J. Serven, dismissed to Reformed Presbyterian Church, General
        Assembly, 5 May 05
    Nicholas N.T. Ganas, dismissed to Chesapeake Presbytery (PCA), 14 June 05
  Ministers installed:
    Peter H. Sim, associate pastor of Theophilus, Diamond Bar, Cal., 12 Mar 05
    Dale T. Hanaoka, pastor of Grace, Carson, Cal., 22 May 05
  Ministerial relationships dissolved:
Marcus J. Serven, as evangelist/organizing pastor, Providence, Paso Robles, Cal., 5 May 05
Wayne A. Buchtel, as pastor of Calvin, Phoenix, Ariz., 1 June 05
Nicholas T. S. Ganas, as pastor of Redeemer, Santa Maria, Cal., 14 June 05

Roll of ministers:

Josue I. Balderas  C. Phillip Hollstein III  Alan R. Pontier
William J. Baldwin II  Yousik Hong  Donald M. Poundstone
Steven M. Baugh  Bruce P. Jarvis  Timothy J. Power
Bruce M. Brawdy  Zachary R. Keele  Gonzalo Salinas
Donald G. Buchanan, Jr.  Rollin P. Keller  Mark A. Schroeder
Wayne A. Buchtel  Yong Hwan Kim  George C. Scipione
John A. Carter  Stephen A. Larson  Peter H. Sim
David A. Crum  Charles Y. Lee  Michael D. Stingley
Kim Ngoc Dang *  Mark C. Mueller  Robert B. Strimple
Jerome A. Farnik  David A. Okken  Paul Viggiano
John W. Garrisi  Daniel H. Overduin  Roger Wagner
William J. Gorrell  Stephen L. Parker  William E. Warren
Dale T. Hanaoka  Michael D. Patarilla  Douglas L. Watson
Douglas P. Harley  Charles K. Perkins  Andrew E. Wikholm
Robert G. Herrmann  Jesse A. J. Pirschel  Benjamin K. Wikner

*under indefinite suspension

Licentiates
Licensorss:
   Kenneth R. Golden, 4 Feb 05
   Francis E. Van Delden, 6 May 05
Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed:
   Kenneth R. Golden, ordained by Presbytery of the Midwest, 28 Oct 05
   Peter H. Sim, ordained, 12 Mar 05
Roll of licentiates:
   Francis E. Van Delden

PRESBYTERY OF THE SOUTHWEST

General Information
Membership: 22 Ministers, 38 Ruling Elders
Stated meetings: 3rd Friday in January
   1st Thursday in May
   3rd Thursday in September
Stated Clerk: Joseph A. Keller, term expires Jan 06
Moderator: F. Allan Story, Jr., term expires Jan 06

Churches and Mission Works
Number of congregations: 13 churches and 3 unorganized mission works
Changes in congregations:
   Mid Cities, Bedford, Tex., recognized as a mission work, 22 Jan 05
   Providence, Kingwood, TX, organized as new and separate church, 25 Feb 05
   Redeemer, Denton TX, dissolved, 3 May 05
Mission works:  
Mid Cities, Bedford, Tex.  
Christ the King, Longview, Tex.  
Covenant of Grace, Plainview, Tex.

Parent church:
The regional church  
Tyler Pres., Tyler, Tex.  
Christ Covenant, Amarillo, Tex.

Ministers

Ordinations:
C. Adam Ostella, 11 Nov 05

Ministers received: None

Ministers removed:
Michael R. Shipma, dismissed to Presb. of North Texas (PCA), 16 Sept 05

Ministers installed:
Adam A. York, pastor of Providence, Kingwood, Tex., 25 Feb 05
C. Adam Ostella, pastor of Knox, Oklahoma City, Okla., 11 Nov 05

Ministerial relationships dissolved:
Bryan S. Schroeder, as pastor of Grace, Wichita Falls, Tex., 14 May 05

Roll of ministers:
William J. Bomer
Chad E. Bond
Todd S. Bordow
David T. Brack
Gary W. Davenport
William H. Doerfel
Nathan J. Hornfeld
John R. Hunt, Jr.
John H. Johnson, Jr.
M. Scott Johnson
Joseph A. Keller
Robert A. Lotzer
K. Scott Oliphint
C. Adam Ostella
Jack J. Peterson
Arthur G. Riffel
Bryan S. Schroeder
Richard A. Shaw
F. Allan Story, Jr.
Kevin W. Van Der Linden
Christopher H. Wisdom
Adam A. York

Licentiates

Licensures:
Andrew T. Moody, 21 Jan 05
Mark R. Wheat, 16 Sept 05

Licentiates received: None
Licentiates removed: None

Roll of licentiates:
Phil D. Hodson
Andrew T. Moody
Mark R. Wheat
APPORPTIONMENT OF COMMISSIONERS
TO THE 74th GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In accordance with the *Standing Rules of the General Assembly*, Chapter I, commissioners to the Seventy-fourth General Assembly (2007) are apportioned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presbytery</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ruling Elders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut and S. New York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakotas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan and Ontario</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York and New England</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator, 73rd GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Clerk, 73rd GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE
ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS

Class of 2009    Alan D. Strange  
Class of 2008    Stuart R. Jones  
Class of 2007    John W. Mallin III  
Alternate       Thomas A. Foh

ARRANGEMENTS

Class of 2009    Robert M. Meeker  
Class of 2008    David E. Haney  
Class of 2007    Russell W. Copeland, Jr.  
Alternate       John R. Muether

CHAPLAINS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL

Class of 2009    Richard M. Dickinson  
Class of 2008    Robert M. Coie, Gordon E. Kauffman  
Class of 2007    Robert B. Needham

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Class of 2009    Ministers: Archibald A. Allison, Sidney D. Dyer, Thomas E. Tyson*  
                    Ruling Elders: Darryl G. Hart, Ph.D., David Winslow, Jr.*  
Class of 2008    Ministers: Gregory E. Reynolds, A. Craig Troxel,* David M. VanDrunnen*  
                    Ruling Elders: John S. Deliyannides Ph.D., Paul S. MacDonald,  
Class of 2007    Ministers: Rodney T. King, Stephen A. Pribble, Alan D. Strange  
                    Ruling Elders: James S. Gidley, Ph.D.*, John R. Muether*  
General Secretary: The Rev. Danny E. Olinger  
*Member of Subcommittee on Ministerial Training

COORDINATION

Class of 2009    Minister: James L. Bosgraf  
                    Ruling Elder: Ted A. Weber  
Class of 2008    Minister: Stephen W. Igo  
                    Ruling Elder: Paul H. Tavares  
Class of 2007    Minister: Stephen D. Doe  
                    Ruling Elder: John D. Mazunik  
Representative, Christian Education: John S. Deliyannides  
                    The Rev. Danny E. Olinger Gen. Sec., ex officio  
Representative, Foreign Missions: Gary W. Davenport  
                    Mr. Mark T. Bube, Gen. Sec., ex officio  
Representative, Home Missions and Church Extension: Garret A. Hoogerhyde
The Rev. Ross W. Graham, Gen. Sec., *ex officio*
*Director of Finance and Planned Giving:* Mr. David E. Haney

**DIACONAL MINISTRIES**

*Class of 2009*  
**Minister:** Lendall H. Smith  
**Deacons:** John (Jack) T. Swann, Robert J. Wright, Jr.

*Class of 2008*  
**Minister:** David W. King (Chairman)  
**Ruling Elder:** David E. Haney

*Class of 2007*  
**Minister:** Ronald E. Pearce  
**Ruling Elder:** Frode M. Jensen

**ECUMENICITY AND INTERCHURCH RELATIONS**

*Class of 2009*  
Mark T. Bube, John R. Hilbelink, George W. Knight III, Th. D.

*Class of 2008*  
Jack J. Peterson, Jack W. Sawyer, Thomas E. Tyson

*Class of 2007*  
L. Anthony Curto, Robert B. Needham, Peter J. Wallace, Ph. D.

**FOREIGN MISSIONS**

*Class of 2009*  
**Ministers:** Paul N. Browne, Glenn D. Jerrell, Jack J. Peterson  
**Ruling Elders:** R. Arthur Thompson, Bradley Y. Winsted

*Class of 2008*  
**Ministers:** Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., Th.D. (President), David J. O’Leary, Lendall H. Smith  
**Ruling Elders:** Archibald M. Laurie, John D. Williams

*Class of 2007*  
**Ministers:** Gary W. Davenport, William B. Kessler, John W. Mahaffy  
**Ruling Elders:** Luke E. Brown, Robert H. Joss

**General Secretary:** Mr. Mark T. Bube  
**Assistant General Secretary:** Douglas B. Clawson

**COMMITTEE FOR THE HISTORIAN**

*Class of 2009*  
Chad E. Bond

*Class of 2008*  
Danny E. Olinger, David K. Thompson

*Class of 2007*  
Brenton C. Ferry

**HOME MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION**

*Class of 2009*  
**Ministers:** Mark R. Brown, John R. Hilbelink (President), Dale A. Van Dyke  
**Ruling Elders:** Richard A. Barker, Garret A. Hoogerhyde

*Class of 2008*  
**Ministers:** Ivan J. De Master, Jeffrey A. Landis, Larry G. Mininger  
**Ruling Elders:** Keith A. LeMahieu, James W. Van Dam, Ph.D.
Class of 2007  Ministers:  Mark R. Brown, George W. Knight, III, Th.D.,
   Gerald S. Taylor
Ruling Elders:  Robert L. Ayres, John Mauldin
General Secretary:  The Rev. Ross W. Graham
Assistant General Secretary:  The Rev. Richard Gerber

PENSIONS

Class of 2009  Minister:  Robert L. Broline, Jr.
Ruling Elders:  Roger W. Huibregtse (President), Bruce A. Stahl,

Class of 2008  Minister:  Douglas L. Watson
Ruling Elders:  Garret A. Hoogerhyde, Stephen R. Leavitt

Class of 2007  Minister:  Darren S. Thole
Ruling Elders:  Robert M. Meeker, William C. Redington

TRUSTEES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Class of 2009  Minister:  Samuel H. Bacon
Ruling Elder:  Richard A. Barker
Class of 2008  Minister:  Stephen L. Phillips
Ruling Elder:  Bruce A. Stahl
Class of 2007  Minister:  Martin L. Dawson, (President)
Ruling Elder:  Edward K. Tress
SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE
SEVENTY-SECOND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HISTORIAN
John R. Muether

COMMITTEE ON REVISIONS TO THE DIRECTORY
FOR PUBLIC WORSHIP
George R. Cottenden (Chairman), John P. Galbraith, John O. Kinnaird,
Larry E. Wilson, Danny E. Olinger (Alternate member)

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PROPRIETY
OF RECEPTION OF ILLEGAL ALIENS
John V. Fesko, Todd V. Wagenmaker (Convener), David Winslow, Jr.

PSALTER HYMNAL
Members to be appointed by the Committee on Christian Education (§99)
## MODERATORS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MODERATOR</th>
<th>PLACE OF ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>R. B. Kuiper</td>
<td>Quarryville, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Everett C. DeVelde</td>
<td>Glenside, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Paul Woolley</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>John P. Clelland</td>
<td>Rochester, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Oscar Holkeboer</td>
<td>Willow Grove, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td>Cedar Grove, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Edward L. Kellogg</td>
<td>Wildwood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Dwight H. Poundstone</td>
<td>Los Angeles, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Lawrence R. Eyres</td>
<td>Glenside, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Calvin K. Cummings</td>
<td>Denver, Col.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Edward J. Young, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Denver, Col.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Bruce F. Hunt</td>
<td>W. Collingswood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Edmund P. Clowney</td>
<td>Oostburg, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>David L. Neilands, Esq.</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Robert L. Atwell</td>
<td>Cedar Grove, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Vineland, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Glenn R. Coie</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Oostburg, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Henry W. Coray</td>
<td>Long Beach, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Arthur O. Olson</td>
<td>Westfield, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Ralph E. Clough</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>George W. Knight, III, Th.D.</td>
<td>Wilmington, Del.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Jack J. Peterson</td>
<td>Oostburg, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Charles H. Ellis</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Laurence N. Vail</td>
<td>Palos Heights, Ill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>George R. Cottenden</td>
<td>Beaver Falls, Pa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55th  1988  Mark T. Bube  Lookout Mountain, Tenn.
56th  1989  Donald J. Duff  Beaver Falls, Pa.
57th  1990  Theodore J. Georgian  San Diego, Calif.
60th  1993  Donald M. Poundstone  Beaver Falls, Pa.
61st  1994  Steven F. Miller  Harvey Cedars, N.J.
63rd  1996  David Winslow  Beaver Falls, Pa.
64th  1997  John W. Mahaffy  Beaver Falls, Pa.
70th  2003  Robert M. Coie  Sioux Center, Ia.
71st  2004  Larry E. Wilson  Beaver Falls, Pa.
### CLERKS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>STATED CLERK</th>
<th>ASSISTANT CLERK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Paul Woolley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>John H. Skilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Paul Woolley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Robert E. Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Leslie W. Sloat</td>
<td>Edward L. Kellogg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Edward Heerema</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Eugene Bradford</td>
<td>Charles H. Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>H. Wilson Albright</td>
<td>Robert L. Vining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Raymond M. Meiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Edwards E. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Robert L. Vining</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Robert L. Vining</td>
<td>Ralph W. Clough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Henry D. Phillips</td>
<td>Theodore J. Georgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Raymond M. Meiners</td>
<td>F. Kingsley Elder, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Raymond M. Meiners</td>
<td>Elmer M. Dortzbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Robert S. Marsden</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Robert S. Marsden</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Robert S. Marsden</td>
<td>Raymond O. Zorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Henry D. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>C. Herbert Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>LeRoy B. Oliver</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Robert W. Eckardt</td>
<td>Laurence N. Vail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Robley J. Johnston</td>
<td>Edwards E. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Robley J. Johnston</td>
<td>Edwards E. Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>John J. Mitchell</td>
<td>Ronald E. Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>John J. Mitchell</td>
<td>Ronald E. Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Robert E. Nicholas</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Robert E. Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45th</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>James L. Bosgraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46th</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearbook</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Co-Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47th</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49th</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53rd</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54th</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>John P. Galbraith</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56th</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58th</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Richard A. Barker</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59th</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>Glenn D. Jerrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>Glenn D. Jerrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61st</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>Glenn D. Jerrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>Glenn D. Jerrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63rd</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>Glenn D. Jerrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64th</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65th</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>Stephen L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69th</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70th</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73rd</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Donald J. Duff</td>
<td>John W. Mahaffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL UNITED STATES</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Mark T. Harrington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2800 Hallmark Rd.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln, NE 68507-2749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Rev. John W. Mallin III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>444 North Allison St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greencastle, PA 17225-1212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONNECTICUT &amp; SO. NY</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. John W. Mahaffy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1709 N. College Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAKOTAS</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Archibald A. Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3808 Ziegler Rd.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Collins, CO 80525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHIGAN &amp; ONTARIO</strong></td>
<td>Rev. Alan M. Flowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8204 Crestview Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenville, MI 48838-8162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MID-ATLANTIC</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Donald H. Potter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3674 Osborne Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warrenton, VA 20187-3911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDWEST</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Rodney T. King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3116 Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des Moines, IA 50301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Jon W. Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2206 New Jersey Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Wildwood, NJ 08260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW YORK &amp; NEW ENGLAND</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Stephen L. Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>548 Park Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarryville, PA 17566-9235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHERN CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Donald G. Jamieson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1813 Comstock Ln.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose, CA 95124-1705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHWEST</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. John W. Mahaffy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1709 N. College Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newberg, OR 97132-9110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHIO</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Everett C. DeVelde, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5549 Georgetown Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin, PA 16323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHILADELPHIA</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Thomas A Foh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR 5, Box 5035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saylorsburg, PA 18353-9806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Jeffrey K. Boer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6270 W. 6th Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hialeah, FL 33021-6529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHEAST</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Hank L. Belfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>532 Vance Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chilhowie, VA 24319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Donald J. Buchanan, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13546 La Jolla Circle, #209D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Mirada, CA 90638-3322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHWEST</strong></td>
<td>The Rev. Joseph A. Keller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>949 Dunkirk Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arlington, TX, 76017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLERKS OF SESSION
(Mission Works Marked with *Asterisks)
(Revised to 08-28-06)

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE CENTRAL UNITED STATES

KANSAS
Caney, OPC - Robert L. Ayres, Rt. 1, Box 190-D, 67333-3210
Overland Park, Park Woods - Robert Gault, 5724 Grand Ave., Kansas City, MO, 64113

NEBRASKA
Lincoln, Faith - Mark T. Harrington, 2800 Hallmark Road, 68507

OKLAHOMA
Bartlesville, Westminster - Jerold W. Barnett, 4101 SE Lakeview Dr., 74006

REGIONAL CHURCH OF CONNECTICUT
AND SOUTHERN NEW YORK

CONNECTICUT
Hamden, Westminster - Frank Emley, 79 Squire Lane, 06518
Newtown, Community - Christopher Crandall, 96 Chapin Rd., New Milford, CT 06776

NEW YORK
Bohemia, OPC - Clerk of Session, 906 Church St., 11716-5008
Franklin Square, OPC - Michael Montemarano, 66 Hudson Rd., Bellerose Village, 11001
Mount Vernon, Westchester - Donald S. Swanson, 247 Lincoln Ave., New Rochelle, 10801

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE DAKOTAS

COLORADO
Broomfield, OPC - Gregory L. Thurston, 1282 Aberdeen Dr., 80020
Castle Rock, Reformation - Kevin P. Swanson, 4663 Beaver Ridge Rd., Elbert, CO 80106
Denver, Park Hill - Cyril Nightengale, 2878 Ash St., 80207-3021
Denver, Providence - Larry D. Sauvain, 20555 E. Maplewood Pl., Aurora, 80016
Fort Collins, Emmaus OPC - Kenneth C. Faurot, 6265 Kremers Ln., LaPorte, 80535

NORTH DAKOTA
*Bismarck, Covenant - Clerk of Session, 811 4th St SW, Mandan, 58554-4010
Carson, Bethel - Stephen Sturlaugson, 5645 73rd. St. SW, 58529
SOUTH DAKOTA
Bancroft, Murdock Memorial - Douglas R. Fox, 42312 199th St., 57353
Bridgewater, Trinity - John Munkvold, 713 S. Poplar, Freeman, 57029
Freeman, Bethlehem Reformed, Ray Schultz, PO Box 519, 57029
Hamill, Westminster - Miles DeJong, HCR 81, Box 50, Kennebec, 57544
Volga, Calvary - James Kleinjan, 20506 463rd. Ave., Bruce, 57220
Winner, OPC - Jon Hansen, 27630 321st Ave, 57580

UTAH
*Logan,
*Provo,
Salt Lake City, Christ OPC - John H. Terpstra, 281 E. Eagleridge Dr., North Salt Lake, 84054

REGIONAL CHURCH OF MICHIGAN AND ONTARIO

INDIANA
Walkerton, Grace Reformed Church - Wayne A. Fleece, 32820 Timothy Tr., 46574

MICHIGAN
Ada, Redeemer OPC - Dean Koopman, 306 Clements Mill Ct., 49301
Brighton, Covenant - Dennis Pfleger, 887 S. Harvey St., Plymouth, 48170-2025
Central Lake, Chain-O-Lakes - Jonas Chupp, 2668 Carpenter Rd., Bellaire, 49615
Coopersville, Little Farms Chapel - Hank Veldman, 2518 Arthur St. Coopersville, MI 49404
Farmington Hills, Oakland Hills – William Martin III, 2568 Skye Dr., 48336
Gowen, Spencer Mills - Alan W. Flowers, 8204 Crestview Dr., Greenville, 48838
Grand Rapids, Harvest - George Molemaar, 3737 Wentworth Dr. SW, Wyoming, MI 49519
Grand Rapids, Mill Creek - Jon Damon, PO Box 140973, 49514-0973
Holland, New Life - John A. McGeehan, 3570 Elk Ct., Zeeland, 49464
*Houghton, Portage Reformed –
Hudsonville, Cedar - David Van Dyke, 4500 Bridgeville Ct., Hudsonville, MI 49426
Kalamazoo, Community - Henry Mejeur, 4821 Weston, 49006
Kentwood, Meadow Springs Community - Vito Lomonaco, 5572 Edgelawn Dr SE, Kentwood, 49508
Lansing, Grace - Stephen A. Pribble, 2009 Loraine, 48910-8731
*Manistee, Providence - James Johnson, 458 4th St, 49660
Metamora, Pilgrim - William Winter, 2255 Deer Creek Trail, 48455
Rockford, Rockford Springs Community - Harold Sexton, 9633 Thornapple Ave., Grant, 49327
*Royal Oak, Providence OPC - Ronald Mills, Sr., 15742 St. Marys, Detroit, 48227

ONTARIO
*Jordan, Living Hope - Cope Jonkman, 16 Main St. Paris, ON N3L 3E1 CANADA
London, Covenant - Alan Quick, 383 Head St. North, Strathroy, ON N7G 2K1 CANADA
Meaford, Emmanuel OPC, - Clerk of Session, c/o Robert Greenfield, RR1 Meaford, ON N4L 1W5 CANADA
*Shedd, Grace - Alan Quick, 383 Head St North, Strathroy, ON N7G 2K1
CANADA
Sheffield, Grace Covenant - Cope Jonkman, 76 Harrisburg Rd., RR 1, Paris, ON, N3L 3E1 CANADA

*Toronto Bethel (Portuguese) - Clerk of Session, c/o Jorge Barros, 1349 Northmount Ave, Mississauga, ON L5E 1Y4 CANADA

Vineland, Living Hope OPC -

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MID-ATLANTIC

MARYLAND
Baltimore, First - L. Fred Baum, Jr., 425 Haslett Rd., Joppa, 21085-4229
Bowie, Trinity Reformed - The Rev. Gerald S. Taylor, 12705 Chesney Ln, Bowie, 20715
Burtonsville, Covenant - Ronald S. Carrier, 15811 Haynes Rd., Laurel, 20707
Clarksville, Living Hope Presbyterian -
Columbia, Columbia -
Frederick, New Hope - William R. Johansen, 2903 Kline Court, 21701-7836
*Germantown, Cornerstone Reformed Fellowship - James Stastny, 10151 Nightingale St., Gaithersburg, 20882-4020
*Jessup, Christ Covenant Presbyterian -
Silver Spring, Knox - Richard Lewis, 3 Linden Wood Ct., Onley, 20832-1556
*Saint Mary’s County, Grace and Peace Presbyterian Church -

VIRGINIA
*Charlottesville, Providence - Anthony A. Monaghan, 2700 Northfield Rd., 22901
*Fredericksburg, Bethel Reformed Presbyterian - Fred Keieg, 6106 Windsor Dr., 22642
Leesburg, Bethel - Edward L. Stoffel, 135 Small Apple Ct., Linden, 22642
Manassas, Dayspring - Donald H. Potter 3674 Osborne Dr., Warrenton, VA 20187-3911
*Purcellville Ketoctin Covenant - Stephen J. Peters, 413 Rusert Dr SE, Leesburg, 20175
Staunton, Covenant Community Church - Anthony A. Monaghan, 2408 Hickory St., 22401
Sterling, Sterling - The Rev. Edwin C. Urban, 202 Stratford Place, S.W., Leesburg 20175-3846
Vienna, Grace - John S. Logan, 1012 N. Potomac, Arlington, 22205

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE MIDWEST

ILLINOIS
Batavia, Covenant of Grace - Richard E. Sackett, c/o James R. Megehlsen, 209 Juniper Dr, N. Aurora, 60543
Grayslake, Hope - Randy Lee, 40555 W. Gridley Dr., Antioch, 60048
Hanover Park, Grace - Lars Johnson, 5324 Niven Lane, 60133
Indian Head Park, Westminster - Charles K. Telfer, 3837 Woodland Ave., Western Springs, 60525
**Seventy-Second General Assembly**

*Momence, Momence OPC, Robert Hoekstra, 4132 N State Rte. 1-17, 60954
New Lenox, New Covenant Community - Bruce Hollister, 1312 Oneida St., Joliet, 60435
Orland Park, Covenant - Jack W. Pluister, 6412 Terrace Dr, Tinley Park, 60477-1832
Springfield, Covenant Reformed - David Maulding, 2005 Appleton Dr., 62707
Wheaton, Bethel - Steven J. Werkema, ON 022 Evans Ave., 60187

**INDIANA**
*Evansville, Covenant Community, - Keith Cannon, 10540 Schissler Rd., 47712

**IOWA**
Cedar Falls, Covenant Presbyterian - Clerk of Session, 2009 Crescent Dr., 50613
Des Moines, Grace Reformed Presbyterian - Mitchel Mahan, 4601 38th St., 50310
Independence, New Covenant - Clerk of Session, 3625 Skyview Dr, Janesville, WI 53546

**MINNESOTA**
*Brrainerd, Church of the Lakes, - Clerk of Session, Box 282, Garrison, 56450

*St. Paul, Clerk of Session, 465 Warwick St., 55105

**WISCONSINS**
Appleton, Apple Valley - Fred Fudge, E 8188 Seefeld Rd., New London, 54961
Cedar Grove, Calvary - David Heuver, 10 Van Altena Ave., 53013
Janesville, Christ Presbyterian - David W. King, 1420 Oaklack Ave, 53545
*Madison, Providence Presbyterian – Clerk of Session, 1104 Wispering Pines Way, Fitchburg, 53713
Menomonee Falls, Falls - Todd Neerhof, 608 Violet Court, Colgate, 53017
Morgan Siding, Old Stockbridge - Joshua Martin, N8004 Morgan Rd, Gresham, 54128-8984
*New Berlin, Covenant - Todd Neerhof, 608 Violet Dr., Colgate, 53017
Oostburg, Bethel - James D. LeMahieu, 415 New York Ave., 53070
*Reedsburg, Grace Reformed - John Sagissor, E9918 Trophy Trail Rd., 53959
Roberts, Roberts Community Church, Kurt Swanson, 302 265th St., Woodville, 54028
Sheboygan, Grace - Roger Arndt, 722 Wilson Ave, Sheboygan Falls, 53085
Zoar, Menominee - Karl E. Thompson, PO Box 345, Gresham, WI 54128

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW JERSEY**

**NEW JERSEY**
Bellmawr, Immanuel - Jerry Falasca, 408 Maple Ave., Haddonfield, 08033
Bridgeton, Calvary - Bruce C. Fenton, 56 Hitchner Ave., 08302
*Camden, Tabernaculo de Gracia - Thomas D. Church, 11 Park Drive, Bellmawr, 08031
Cherry Hill, OPC - Clerk of Session, 37 S. Coles Ave., 08002-1247
Fair Lawn, Grace - Robert A. Reith, 40 N. 17th St., Prospect Park, 07508
Glassboro, Providence - Ward Gibson, 71E. Tomlin Station Road, Mickleton, 08056
Hackettstown, Church of the Covenant - Keith Cumo, 21 Saddlerock Dr., Washington, 07882
Hamilton (Trenton), Grace - Charles L. Maack, 204 Hillcrest Ave., 08618
*Marlton, Immanuel OPC, - Clerk of Session, Gerald Falasca, 408 Maple Ave.,
Haddonfield, NJ 08033
North Wildwood, Central Bible - Clerk of Session, 123 E. 18th St., 08260
Phillipsburg/Harmony, Calvary Community - Gordon E. Kauffman, 2006 Hay Terrace,
Easton, PA 18042
Phillipsburg, River of Life - Thomas E. Notaro, 83 Miller St., 08865
Pittsgrove, Faith - Kevin L. Parks, 19 W. Del A Vue Ave., Carneys Point, 08069
Ringoes, Calvary of Amwell - Jesse J. Denton, Jr., PO Box 380, 08551
Somerset, Mount Carmel Presbyterian - Kenneth Parks, 2 Colby Court, Belvidere, NJ
07823
Stratford, Stratford OPC - Bruce A. Stahl, 64 Dunhill Dr., Voorhees, 08043
Toms River, Redeemer, -Clerk of Session, PO Box 1854, 08754-1854
Vineland, Covenant - Edward A. Duffy. 71 W. Almond St., PO Box 54, 08362
*Vineland, Nueva Esperanza, Clerk of Session, 1029 E. Landis Ave., 08362
W. Collingswood, Immanuel - Michael A. Richards, 1200 Newton Ave., 08107
Westfield, Grace - Richard A. Barker, 639 Shadowlawn Dr., 07090
Whippany, Emmanuel - Robert A. Freeman, Llewellyn Park, West Orange, 07052-
5402
Wildwood, Calvary - Thomas A. Jorgensen, 136 W. Lavender Rd., Wildwood Crest, 08260

PUERTO RICO
San Juan, Jesus es la Verdad – Clerk of Session, PO Box 40660, Minillas Station,
00940

REGIONAL CHURCH OF NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND

MAINE
Bangor, Pilgrim - Jay Rankin, 375 Mt. Hope Ave., 04401-2908
Brunswick, Merrymeeting Bay - Richard J. Stocker, 10 Cathy St., Augusta, 04330
*Bucksport, Penobscot Bay – Paul S. MacDonald, c/o Russell J. Hamilton, 364 Front
Ridge Rd., Orland, 04472
*Denmark, Pleasant Mountain - Clerk of Session, c/o Jon Marshall, 156 Hio Ridge
Rd., 04022
Portland, Second Parish - Stephen A. MacDonald, Ph.D., 85 South St., Gorham,
04038
Rockport, Lakeview - Richard V. Abbott, 550 Ridge Rd., Windsor, 04363-9731
Skowhegan, OPC - c/o Rev. Harold Dorman, 1284 East Ridge Rd, Cornville, 04976

MASSACHUSETTS
Fall River, Grace - Rodney D. Titcomb, 4380 North Main St., #503, 02720-1713
Ipswich, First Pres. Church North Shore - Robert Joss, Ph.D., 60 High St., 01938
Newton Center, Peace - Joseph O. Chapa, 9 Canter Cir., Westford, 01886
North Andover, Merrimack Valley - John W. Coskery, Jr., 32 Kendricks Ct., Amesbury,
01913-3715
West Barnstable, Presbyterian of Cape Cod - Carlos Pereira, 121 Union St.,
Yarmouthport, 02675
NEW HAMSHIRE
Jaffery, Jaffrey OPC - Scott Goodwin, 4 Casalis Rd., Peterborough, 03458
Manchester, Amoskeag Presbyterian - James Graves, 167 Bunker Hill Rd., Auburn, 03032

NEW YORK
Amsterdam, Covenant - Michael Churchill, 1051 Perth Rd., Hagaman, NY 12086
Canton, New Life - Laurence Veinott, 125 Judson Steet Road, 13617
Lisbon, OPC - Harley Lowry, 8820 County Rt. 27, 13658
Rochester, Covenant – Douglas R. Giebel, 500 Brooks Ave., 14619
Rochester, Memorial - Richard Schumacher, 9 Graham Creek Hts., 14619
Schenectady, Calvary - Charles T. Powers, 1058 Palmer Ave., Niskayuna, 12309
Syracuse, Hope - Jonathan T. Looney, 5359 Amalfi Dr., Clay, 13041

VERMONT
Barre, Covenant - Andrew H. Selle, 124 Iroquois Ave., Essex Junction, 05452

REGIONAL CHURCH OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA
Antioch, Delta Oaks - George S. MacKensie, 2264 Gill Port Lane, Walnut Creek, 94598
Berkeley, Covenant - Clerk of Session, 1623 Univeristy Ave., 94703-1323
*Castro Valley, Providence - Clerk of Session, c/o Colin Gunil, 22435 Ruby St, 94546
Eureka, Covenant – Calvin R. Malcor, 2527 Brookside Dr., Medford, OR 97504-6152
Hanford, New Hope - Jay C. Nelken, 515 E Sycamore St, 93230
Hughson, Sovereign Grace - Ken Tucker, 6061 Leedom Rd., 95326
Modesto, Grace – P. Shaun Bryant, 1425 Lansing Ave., 95350-0632
Monterey Bay, Covenant - Joseph L. Hanna, 85 Blake Ave. Corralitas, CA 95076
Novato, Trinity - Marlin E. Viss, PO Box 6009, 94948-6009
Roseville, Reformation - Steve Terwilliger, 9184 Rolling Ln., Fair Oaks, 95628
San Francisco, First -
San Jose, Covenant – Randy Franklin, 20500 Black Rd., Los Gatos, 95033-9590
Sonora, Oak Hill Presbyterian - Dennis J. Fullalove, 427 Heathcliff Dr., Pacifica, 94044-2035
South San Francisco, New Covenant - Dennis J. Fullalove, 427 Heathcliff Dr., Pacifica, 94044
Sunnyvale, First - James Lemen, 8859 McFarland Ave., Saratoga, 95070

NEVADA
Battle Mountain, Grace - Daniel F. Patterson, 30 Lewis Dr., 89820
*Las Vegas, Providence – James Huizenga, 5935 Hosta Ln., San Jose, CA 95124-6560
Reno, Mt. Rose Reformed Presbyterian Church, Clerk of Session, PO Box 6115, 89513

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE NORTHWEST
ALASKA
Wasilla, Grace - Bruce Long, HC 30 Box 5566, 99654
IDAHO
Arco, OPC - Kevin Hays, 3210 W 3000 N, Moore, 83255
Boise, Sovereign Redeemer Fellowship - James Roberts, 5888 S. Sedum, 83704
Idaho Falls, New Geneva - Terry E. Wright, 110 N. Morningside Dr., 83404

MONTANA
*Helena, Elkhorn – James Weaver, c/o Richard J. Venema, 20 Lazy J C Dr., Helena, 59602
Kalispell, Faith Covenant – Tom Jentz, 765 N. Main St., 59901
Missoula, Garden City Presbyterian - Greg Johnson, c/o 2345 S 7th St. W, 59801

OREGON
Bend, Grace Reformed Presbyterian Church - Daniel J. Dillard, 171 SE Windacnce Ct., 97702
Corvallis, Westminster Presbyterian – John W. Mahaffey, 1709 N. College St., Newberg, 97132
Grants Pass, Faith - Frode Jensen, 1355 Ferry Rd., 97526
Medford, Trinity - David A. Van Den Berg, 2544 Samoa Way, 97504
Newberg, Trinity - William R. Elder, 2009 N. Main, Newberg, OR 97132
Portland, First - Tom Bradshaw, 4810 N.W. 179th St., Ridgefield, WA 98642
*Roseburg, Covenant Grace - Clerk of Session, 1427 NW Fiarmount, 97470

WASHINGTON
Bothell, New Life OPC - Marcus J. Renkema, 21701 4th Ave. SE, 98021
Cathlamet, Puget Island - Clerk of Session, 253 Risk Rd., 98612
*Colville, Emmanuel - Jack D. Bradley, 508 N Oak St, 99114
Kennewick, Covenant - George Stanton, 94706 Northstar PR. NE, West Richland, 99353
Kent, Emmanuel OPC - Andrew M. Elam, 11530 SE 319th St, Auburn, 98092
Lynnwood, OPC - Richard D. Mason, 232 East Highland Drive, Arlington, 98223-1518
*Monroe, Westminster - David Harrell, 5122 103 St. SW Mukiteo, WA 98275
*Mount Vernon, Grace - Bruce Bartlett, 290 Lochwood Dr., Camano Island, WA 98282
Oak Harbor, Sovereign Grace - Robert C. Van Kooten, 1902 Zylstra Rd, 98277
*Olympia, Reformation OPC, Clerk of Session, PO Box 11896, 98508
*Port Angeles, Redeeming Grace - Clerk of Session, c/o William Renkema, 1319 W. 12th St., 98363

REGIONAL CHURCH OF OHIO

INDIANA
*Indianapolis, Christ Covenant - Clerk of Session, c/o Larry E Wilson, 5302 E 72nd Pl, 46250
Sheridan, Christ Covenant - Clerk of Session, 307 E 2nd St, PO Box 226, 46069

OHIO
Columbus, Grace - David Huston, 14515 Robison Rd., Plain City, 43064
Dayton (North), Covenant - Clerk of Session, 1100 S. Miami St., West Milton, 45383-1217
Dayton (South), Redeemer - T. Andrew Demana, 356 N. King St., Xenia, 45385
Mansfield, Covenant - Jon Burton, 675 Brae Burn, 44907
Pickerington, Providence - Michael D. Diercks, 189 Citation Rd., SW, Pataskala, 43062-8508

PENNSYLVANIA
Franklin, Trinity OPC – George Elder, 493 East Gilmore Road, Grove City, PA 16127
Grove City, Covenant – Tracy C. Miller, 211 N. Center St, 16127
Harrisville, Calvary - James D. Bailey, 349 Porter Rd., 16038
Hollidaysburg, Westminster - Deane Mann, 1312 Spring Run Dr., Altoona, 16601
Indiana, Faith - Ronald McNutt, 2129 S. Ridge Rd., Shelocta, 15774
Johnstown, Westminster OPC - James J. Cassidy, 205 Orachard St., 15905
Pittsburgh, Covenant - Michael Berkenpas, 17 Nancy Dr., 15235-4232
Pulaski, Nashua – Jack Kaylor, 6893 St Rt 551, Edinburg, 16116

WEST VIRGINIA
*Huntington, Trinity - Clerk of Session, c/o Dr Jeffrey L Shaw, 52 Carriage Ln, 25705
Morgantown, Reformation - James Alexander, 14 Cedar Circle, 26508-9151

REGIONAL CHURCH OF PHILADELPHIA

DELWARE
Middletown, Grace - Douglas A. Watson, 104 Sarah’s Ln, Horsham, PA 19044
Wilmington, Emmanuel - Timothy D. Krizan, 2613 Pennington Dr., 19801-2405

PENNSYLVANIA
Allentown, Living Hope - Harold McKenzie, 3120 Lindberg Ave., Allentown, 18103
Bethlehem, Christ Community Church - William H. Willever, 407 Liggett Bivl., Phillipsburg, NJ 08865
*Carlisle, Redeemer - Dr. J. Lynn Hoffman, 846 W. South St., 17013
*Danville, Redeemer OPC, Clerk of Session, c/o Peter Krol, 102 400 McCracken Rd., 17821
Easton, Covenant - Graham C. Harbman, 1220 Pine Grove Dr., 18045
Fawn Grove, Faith - Dennis C. Henry, 709 Blossom Hill Lane, Dallastown, 17313
Gettysburg, Living Hope - Todd M. Hurd, 494 Brysonia Rd., Siglerville, 17307-9712
Glenside, Calvary – Edward K. Tress, 108 Cathedral Dr., North Wales, 19454-1000
Gwynedd, Gwynedd Valley - Richard B. Gaffin, 727 Locust Lane, Lower Gwynedd, 19002-2537
Hatboro, Trinity - Luke E. Brown, 1585 Bauman Dr., Mapel Glen, 19002
Lampeter, New Life - Leonard G. Brown, 2001 Harrisburg Pk #B416, Lancaster, 17601-2641
Lansdowne, Knox - Andrew P. Duggan, 230 Fairlamb Ave., Havertown, 19083
Mansfield, Grace Fellowship - Joel C. Kershner, 21 Elmira St., 16933
Middletown, Calvary - Christain H. Walmer, 1015 Princeton Dr., Hummelstown, 17036
*Perkasi, First* - Clerk of Session, 441 Dorchester Rd, 18944
Philadelphia, Emmanuel Chapel - Joel L. Cummings, 1931 S. 16th St., Philadelphia, PA 19145
Philadelphia, *Grace* - William Brasch, 1412 Parkside Dr., Havertown, 19083
Philadelphia (Germantown), *Grace Fellowship* - Edward Chappelle, 8516 Williams Ave., 19150
*Pottstown, Living Word* - Paul L. Brandon, 2160 Foxtail Dr, Sanatoga, 19464
Reading, *Covenant* - John R. Sallade, 36 Lawndale Rd., 19610
Tannersville, Pocono - Allen Lewis, 4110 Kesslerville Rd., Easton, PA 18040
Wilkes-Barre, *Susquehanna Bible Fellowship*, John R. Schwartz, 621 Montgomery Ave., West Pittston, 18640
*Yardley, Yardley* - William Redington, 2052 Farmview Dr., Newtown, 18940

**REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTH**

**ALABAMA**
Birmingham, *Redeemer* - Doug Scofield, PO Box 535, Clelsea, 35043
*Huntsville, Providence* - Richard L. Guido, 121 Antebellum Dr., Meridianville, 35759
Mobile, *Heritage* - Jack Bentley, 5757 Deerwood Dr. South, 36618
*Montgomery, Montgomery OPC, Len Atkinson, 119 Sunfest Dr., Deatsville, 36022*

**FLORIDA**
*Bradenton, Providence* - Clerk of Session, PO Box 1892, 34206-1892
Fort Pierce, *Covenant Reformed* - Sam Rowe, 4699 Oleander Ave, 34982
Hialeah, *Sharon* - Raul Montes, 6270 W. 6 Ave., 33012-6529
Key West, *Keys Chapel* - Gregory M. Rowe, 1000 Coppitt Rd., 33040
Lake Worth, *Fellowship* – Clerk of Session, 5536 Hypoluxo Rd., 33463-7302
Niceville, *Grace* - Robert L. Grete, 277 Wawa Ave, 32578
Ocala, *Faith* - Ralph S. Pearson, 256 SE 62 Terrace, 34472
Orlando, *Lake Sherwood* - David J. Bower, 1826 Imperial Palm Dr. Apopka, 32712
Oviedo, *Reformation* - John R. Muether, 1167 Kerwood Cir, 32765-6194
*Pensacola, Covenant* - Clerk of Session, 2885 Olive Rd, 32514
Tallahassee, *Calvary* - Michael L. Andrews, 1990 Beaver Cr Dr, Havana, 32333-9515

**LOUISIANA**
*Nachitoches, Covenant* - Joel Mertens, 144 Sharmard Dr, 71457
Pineville, *Pineville* - Bill Cutter, 2137 Turner St., Alexandria, 71301
REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTHEAST

GEORGIA
Atlanta (Doraville), Redeemer - Richard W. Hastings, 2338 Scarlett Walk, Stone Mountain, 30087
*Carrollton, Westminster - Clerk of Session, PO Box 1189, 30112
La Grange, Covenant - James P. Renshouse Jr., 108 Ember Way, 30240-8497
Marietta, Geneva - John V. Fesko, 109 Towey Trail, Woodstock, 30188

KENTUCKY
London, Christ Presbyterian - Frank VanHoeve, PO Box 4121, Annville, 40402
*Neon, Covenant Reformed - Pat Mecune, 11391 Balsam Dr., Meadoview, VA 24361

NORTH CAROLINA
Charlotte, Redeemer - Gary S. Flye, 10909 Megwood Dr, 28277
Etowah, Christ Presbyterian - Clerk of Session, PO Box 1473, 28729
Granite Falls, Catawba Valley Presbyterian - Tom Lindley, 520 Lower Creek Rd., Lenoir, 28645
Greensboro, Providence Presbyterian- Benny Holder, 6097 Barmot Dr., 27455
*Hickory, Sovereign Grace Reformed Presbyterian - E. Cody Ray, 1911 19th Street Place NE, 28601
Matthews, Orthodox Presbyterian - Chris Dollar, 2703 Weddington Rd., Monroe, NC 28110
Mount Airy, Covenant Reformed – Benjamin F. Holmes, 3115 Swaringer Rd., Traphill, 28685
New Bern, Covenant - Jeremy Huntington, 7430 US Hwy. 17, Pollocksville, 28573-9204
Raleigh, Pilgrim - Joe Jager, 2329 Primrose Valley Court, 27613-8552

SOUTH CAROLINA
*Aiken, Providence, Clerk of Session, c/o Mark J. Larson, 78 deMedicis Blvd., Warreenville, SC 29851
Greenville, Covenant Community - Clerk of Session, PO Box 690, Taylors, 29687

TENNESSEE
Chattanooga, Cornerstone Presbyterian Church - Larry Mehne, 134 Wayside Ln., Lookout Mountain, GA 30750
*Cookville, Faith - Clerk of Session, c/o Mr Dan Harleys, 4310 Cedar Springs Dr, 38506
Maryville, Sandy Springs Presbyterian - William D. Dennison, 411 Fort Trace, Lookout Mountain, GA 30750

VIRGINIA
Chilhowie, Providence - Patrick Mc Cune, 11391 Balsam Dr., Meadowview, 24361
Lynchburg, Grace - Kevin Clauseon, 2212 Rivermont Ave., 24503
Roanoke, Garst Mill - James E. Horner, 3822 Chesterton St., SW, 24018-1806
REGIONAL CHURCH OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

ARIZONA
Phoenix, Calvin Presbyterian - Thomas Sharp, 20619 North 21st Street, 85024-4411
*Phoenix, Iglesia Nueva Vida – Clerk of Session, 8807 W. Cypress St., 85037
Prescott, Prescott Presbyterian, - Robert S. Hendry, 4408 Canary Circle, Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

CALIFORNIA
Big Bear City, Big Bear Valley OPC - Clerk of Session, PO Box 2890, 92314
Bonita, OPC - Maynard B. Skidmore, 10153 Canyon Ridge Place, Spring Valley, 91977
Carson, Grace - Robert E. Lee, III, 5506 Ryan Ave., Lakewood, 90712-1462
Chula Vista, Bayview - Charles J. Teahan, 517 Killey Rd., Chula Vista, CA 91910
Costa Mesa, Grace Presbyterian - James Andruss, 2106 Fremont Ave., Placentia, 92870
Diamond Bar, Theophilus - Sanjay Patel, 16715 Yvette Way, Cerritos, 90703
*Escondido, Escondido OPC – Zachary Keele, Aspen Way, 92026
Goleta, El Camino - Archibald M. Laurie, 909 Chelham Way, Santa Barbara, 93108-1049
La Mirada, Calvary - Leonard Sanchez, 8666 La Tremolina Ln., Whittier, 90605
Long Beach, Faith - Willard C. Gekler, 3252 Quail Run Rd., Los Alamitos, 90720
*Los Angeles, Iglesia Evangelica Reformada - Miguel Cisneros, 6136 Lincoln Ave, South Gate, 90280
*Mission Viejo, Redeeming Grace - Alan R. Pontier, 6129 Hersholt Ave., Lakewood, CA 90712-1345
*Moreno Valley, Sovereign Grace - Nelson Dilworth, 2097 Begonia Ct., Hemet, 92545
Oxnard, Covenant of Grace - Kenneth D. Fields, 235 South “E” Street, 93030
Paso Robles, Providence Reformed - c/o Rollin P. Keller, 1040 Jay St., Carson, 90745-3430
Ramona, Sovereign Grace OPC, - Byron Mettler, 25113 Ecloga Court, 92065
San Diego (Tierrasanta) In Christ OPC - Sanjay Patel, 16715 Yvette Way, Cerritos, 90703
*Santa Ana, Iglesia del Señor Viviente - David Winslow, 10130 Stilbite Ave., Fountain Valley, CA 92708-1012
Santa Maria, Redeemer - Paul de Bruin, 1650 E. Clark Ave, #308, 93455
*Temecula, Providence - Kurt Schmidt, 2241 Hutchison St., Vista, 92084
Torrance, Branch of Hope - Clerk of Session, 2370 W Carson St, 90501
Vista, Harvest - Kurt Schmidt, 2241 Hutchison St., 92084
*Westminster, Resurrection - John Novinger, 11454 Toruga St., Cypress, 90630
Westminster, Westminster - David Winslow, Jr., 10130 Stilbite Ave., Fountain Valley, 92708-1012

REGIONAL CHURCH OF THE SOUTHWEST

NEW MEXICO
Albuquerque, Covenant of Grace - Tery Nighbert, 8208 Sarah Ct. NW, 87114
OKLAHOMA
Norman, Grace - William H. Doerfel, 1116 Westbrooke Terr., 73072-6308
Oklahoma City, Knox – Ted A. Weber, 1321 E. Hwy. 152, Mustang, 73064

TEXAS
Abilene, Covenant Presbyterian - Mitchael Pritchett, 644 A Clark Rd., 79602
Amarillo, Christ Covenant Presbyterian - Mike T. Mahon, 5425 Southside Dr, 79109
Austin, Providence OPC - James W. Van Dam, 10903 Chateau Hill, 78750-3498
*Beafor, Mid Cities Presbyterian, Todd S. Bordow, 10616 Vista Heights, Fort Worth, 76108
Dallas (SW), Christ Covenant, - David T. Mahaffy, 941 Cypress Creek Dr., Plano, 75025
Dallas (Garland), Faith (NE) - John S. Emmett, 1706 Leander Ct., Allen, 75022
Fort Worth, Covenant Presbyterian Church of Fort Worth - Daniel J. Fernandez, 738 Windridge Ln., Burleson, 76028
Houston (Kingwood), Providence - R. C. Simpkins, 3602 Clear Falls Dr., 77339-6101
Longview, Christ the King Presbyterian – Thomas G. Robinson, 3905 Silverwood, Tyler, 75701-9338
Plainview, Covenant of Grace - Michael T. Mahon, 5425 Southside Dr, Amarillo, 79109
San Antonio, Grace - Joe M. Moody, 1530 Brenton Woods, San Antonio, 78258
Tyler, OPC - Thomas G. Robinson, 3905 Silverwood, 75701-9338
Wichita Falls, Grace Presbyterian - Stan Todd, 5127 Langford Ln., 76310
INDEX

Numbers in boldface type, preceded by the symbol §, refer to articles in the JOURNAL. A series of citations in the JOURNAL is preceded by only one §.
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Abbreviations for Church Standards p. ii
Advisory Committees
- Erected and assignments made §15
- Reports and actions
  1 - §40, 49, 51, 142
  2 - §§56, 96, 101, 166, 167
  3 - §§65, 67, 93
  4 - §§90, 105, 113
  5 - §§68, 118, 137, 152, 193
  6 - §160
  7 - §§73, 75, 149
  8 - §203
  9 - §§22, 27, 33, 85, 187, 189, 208
  10 - §171
- Arrangements - §§8, 199
- Examine Presbytery Records - §130
- Examine Standing Committee Records - §131
Affirmative vote recorded §§78, 148
Amendments
- Adopted
  - Instruments §§114, 134
  - Book of Discipline §23
- Proposed
  - Standing Rules §§89, 102
Appeal of John Vandervliet §§171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 182, 183, 184; pp. 78-85
Appeals and Complaints, Committee on
- Actions §§172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 182, 183, 184
- Advisory Committee 10 §171
- Budget §208; p. 482
- Election §185
- Members listed, p. 550
- Report §170, p. 478-482
Appendix (overtures, communications, complaints, reports), pp. 58-508
Apportionment of Commissioners for 73rd General Assembly §6
Apportionment/Enrollment, Commissioners to 74th
  - General Assembly p.549
Arrangements, Committee on
- Standing Committee
  - Budget §208
- Contributions requested for GA Travel Fund §199
Election §200
Members listed, p. 550
Report §8
Temporary Committee
  Actions §199
  Constituted §15
  Date and Place of 74th (2007) General Assembly §213
  Date and Place of 75th (2008) General Assembly §199
  Date and Place of 76th (2009) General Assembly §199
  Excuses granted §199
  Financial Report §199
  Reimbursement of commissioners §199
  Report §199
Arrangements, Committee on, for 74th General Assembly §199
Assessments
  ICRC §208; p. 475
  Joint Commission on Chaplains §208; p. 413
  NAPARC §208; p. 475
Assistant Clerk
  Appointed §30
  Honorarium §208
Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church p. 449
Bible Presbyterian Church (General Synod), pp. 459-460
  Fraternal Observer §7, 122
Book of Church Order, §23
Book of Discipline revisions §23
Budgets
  Appeals and Complaints, Committee on §208; p. 482
  Arrangements for 73rd General Assembly, Committee on §208
  Chaplains and Military Personnel, Committee on §208; p. 412
  Christian Education, Committee on, p. 191
  Coordination, Committee on pp. 342-343
  Diaconal Ministries, Committee on, §154, 155; p. 439-440
  Directory for Public Worship, Committee on Revisions to the §208; p. 501
  Ecumenicity & Interchurch Relations, Committee on, §208; p. 375
  Foreign Missions, Committee on, p. 155-158
  General Assembly Operation Fund §208
  General Assembly Travel Fund §199
  Historian, Committee for the §208; p. 486
  Home Missions and Church Extension, Committee on, p. 201
  Honoraria §208
  Illegal Aliens, Committee on §94
  New Horizons, p. 343
  Stated Clerk (Office of the General Assembly) §208
  Trustees of the General Assembly §208; p. 95
  Worldwide Outreach p. 343
Canadian Reformed Churches, pp. 458-459
Chaplains and Military Personnel, Committee on
  Actions §119
Advisory Committee 5 §118
Budget §208; p. 412
Chaplains listed, pp. 550
Election §120
Members listed, p. 550
Report §117; pp. 401-414
Christian Education, Committee on
Advisory Committee 2 §56
Budget, p. 191
Election §63
Members listed, p. 550
Ministerial Training, Subcommittee on
Election §57
Members listed, p. 550
Report §52, 55; pp. 168-192
Request of Christian Education §99
Christian Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, p. 73-74
Churches
In Corresponding Relationship p. 447-448
In Ecclesiastical Fellowship p. 447
Listed by Regional Churches, pp.
Requests to, in re
Diaconal Ministries, Committee on §151, 154
General Assembly Operation Fund §208
General Assembly Travel Fund §199
Statistical reports, pp. 512-529
Clerks of General Assemblies listed, pp. 556-557
Clerks (Stated) of Presbyteries listed, p. 558
Clerks of Session listed, pp. 559-
Commissioners to the 73rd General Assembly
Apportionment of §6
Members excused §199
Roll §4
Survey of length of service §5
Commissioners to the 74th General Assembly
Apportionment of, p. 549
Committees of the General Assembly
Temporary erected §15
Listed, pp. 550-553
Communications to the General Assembly from, texts pp. 64-77
1. First Presbyterian Church in Picayune, Mississippi p. 64
2. North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council, §160, 161; p. 64-68
3. Presbytery of Michigan and Ontario, p. 68
4. Committee on Diaconal Ministries §67; p.68
5. Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church §160, 161; p. 69
6. Presbytery of the Dakotas pp. 69-70
7. Christian Reformed Churches of Australia §160, 161; p. 70
8. The Presbytery of Gran Columbia of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church §160, 161; p.71
9. Presbytery of the Southeast §99 p. 721-72
10. Presbytery of the Southwest §166; pp. 72-73
11. The Reformed Church of Ireland §160, 161; p.73
12. Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland §160, 161; p. 73-74
13. Presbytery of Philadelphia §167; p. 74
14. Confederation of Reformed Evangelical Churches §160, 161; pp. 74-75
15. Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) §160, 161; pp. 75-76
16. Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Northern Ireland §160, 161; p. 76
17. Presbyterian Church in Japan §160, 161; p. 76-77
18. Free Church of Scotland §160, 161; p.77

Complaints see Appeals
Contributions asked for
Diaconal Ministries, Committee on §154, 155
General Assembly Operation Fund §208
General Assembly Travel Fund §199

Coordination, Committee on
Actions §100, 101, 102 141
Advisory Committee 2 §101
Advisory Committee 4 §90
Budget, pp. 342-343
Election §103
Members listed, p. 550
Report §89; pp. 338-357

Coppes, Leonard D., appreciation §158
Corresponding Members of the General Assembly
Fraternal Delegates §4
Listed §4

Daily schedule §12
Date and Place of 74th (2007) General Assembly §213
Date and Place of 75th (2008) General Assembly §199
Date and Place of 76th (2009) General Assembly §199
Devotionals §17, 45, 80, 106 143

Diaconal Ministries, Committee on
Actions §154, 155
Advisory Committee 5 §152, 193
Budget, pp. 439-440
Election §156
Members listed, p. 551
Report §151; pp. 433-444

Directory for Public Worship, Committee on Revisions to the
Action §204
Advisory Committee 8 §203
Budget, §208; p. 501
Election §205
Members listed, p. 553
Report §202; pp. 487-508

Directory of the OPC, p.
Dissolution of the Assembly §213
Docket adopted §13
Docket amended §
Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, Committee on
   Actions §161
   Advisory Committee 6 §160
   Budget §208; p. 375
   Elections §162
   Members listed, p. 551
   Recommendations §159
   Report §159; pp. 445-477
Elections
   Appeals and Complaints, Committee on §185
   Arrangements, Committee on §200
   Chaplains and Military Personnel, Committee on §120
   Christian Education, Committee on §63
   Coordination, Committee on §103
   Diaconal Ministries, Committee on §156
   Ecumenicity and Interchurch Relations, Committee on §162
   Foreign Missions, Committee on §50
   Historian, Committee for the §190, 192
   Home Missions and Church Extension, Committee on §57
   Illegal Aliens, Committee on §94
   Moderator §10
   Pensions, Committee on §139
   Revision to the Directory for Worship, Committee on §205
   Statistician §34
   Trustees of the General Assembly §31
Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Ireland, p.
Evangelical Presbyterian Church of England and Wales, pp. 467-468
Ex officio commissioners listed §4
Financial Review, Committee on
   Action §112, 114, 115, 123, 127, 133, 134
   Advisory Committee 4 §105, 113
   Report §104, p. 358-400
Foreign Missions, Committee on
   Actions §41, 49, 51, 148
   Advisory Committee 1 §40, 142
   Budget, p. 155-158
   Election §50
   Members listed, p. 551
   Recording of Supplementary Report §42, 48, 148
   Report §37, 39; pp. 100-167
Fraternal delegates
   Listed §4
   Bible Presbyterian Church, General Synod §7, 122
   Free Church of Scotland (Continuing) §110, 165
   Korean American Presbyterian Church §46, 54
   Presbyterian Church in America §98
   Presbyterian Church of Korea, Kosin §18
Reformed Church in the Netherlands (Liberated) §126
Reformed Church in the US §110, 140
Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America §29, 58
United Reformed Churches §7, 88
Free Church of Scotland p. 467
Free Church of Scotland, Continuing §110, 165; p. 467
Address §165
Corresponding member seated §110
Free Reformed Churches in N. A., pp. 464-465, 476
General Assembly Operation Fund §208
General Assembly Travel Fund §199
Great Commission Publications p,
Historian,
Advisory Committee 7 §187
Honorarium §208
Listed, p. 553
Report §186; p. 483
Historian, Committee for the
Advisory Committee 7 §189
Budget §208; pp.
Election §190, 192
Members listed, p. 551
Report §188; pp. 484-487
Home Missions and Church Extension, Committee on
Actions §69, 70
Advisory Committee 3 §65, 67
Advisory Committee 5 §68
Budget, pp. 551-552
Election §57
Members listed pp. 551-552
Report §60, 64; pp. 193-211
ICRC (see International Conference of Reformed Churches)
Illegal Aliens, Committee on §94
Committee listed p. 553
International Conference of Reformed Churches p. 468-494
Instruments of the GA amended §134
Joint Commission on Chaplains and Military Personnel (PRJC),
pp. 404-411
Justification, Committee on
Actions §79, 84, 85, 150, 209
Advisory Committee 10 §73, 75, 149
Report §74; p 212-337
Korean American Presbyterian Church p. 466
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Corresponding member seated §46
L’Église Réformée du Québec (ERQ) pp. 465-466
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North American Presbyterian and Reformed Council pp. 474-475
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Officers of the General Assembly, Inside front cover
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Operation Fund (see General Assembly Operation Fund)
Order of the day §18, 117, 127, 177
Overtures to the General Assembly from, texts pp. 59-63
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Parliamentarian, Appointed §24
Pensions, Committee on
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Advisory Committee 5 §137
Election §139
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Report §136; pp. 415-432
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Presbyterial Records, Committee to Examine
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Erected §15
Report §130
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Presbyterian Church in America, pp. 449-455
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Presbytery of Dakotas
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Communication 3 from the p. 68
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Presbytery of Ohio
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Overture 3 form the §96, 99; pp. 60-63
Presbytery of Southern California
Overture 1 from the §93; p. 59
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Privilege of the floor granted §52, 122
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#1 §132
#2 §194
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#4 §206, 211
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Recesses taken §16, 19, 38, 44, 53, 61, 71, 81, 86, 91, 97, 107, 116, 124, 128, 135, 144, 157, 168, 177, 180, 196
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Chaplains, Committee on §117; pp. 401-414
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Coordination, Committee on §89; pp. 338-357
Diaconal Ministries, Committee on §151; pp. 433-444
Directory for Public Worship, Committee on Revisions to the §202; pp. 487-508
Ecumenicity, Committee on §159; pp. 445-477
Financial Review, Committee on §104; pp. 358-400
Foreign Missions, Committee on §37, 39; pp. 100-167
Historian §186; p. 483
Historian, Committee for the §188; pp 484-487
Home Missions and Church Extension, Committee on §60, 64; pp.193-211
Pensions, Committee on §74; pp. 2312-337
Presbyterial Records, Committee to Examine §130
Standing Committee Records, Committee to Examine §131
Stated Clerk §21; pp. 89-90
Statistician §32; pp. 96-99
Trustees of General Assembly §26; pp. 91-95
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Statistical reports of the churches, pp.
Statistician
    Advisory Committee 9 §33
    Election §34
    Honorarium §208
    Listed inside front cover
    Report §32; pp. 96-99
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