

“Objection!”

16 Problems with the HSR

Weightiness (sort of...)

The HSR ignores ancient near-Eastern context when looking at Genesis 1 & 2, and instead focuses exclusively on basic word meanings, leading to non-contextualized interpretations (see [this article](#) by Dr. James Payton Jr.).

The committee “cherry-picked” science they wanted to use in their report to support their conclusions, without giving a broad, even-handed assessment of the actual science (see [this article](#) from *the Christian Courier*).

The CRC keeps apologizing for harm (see *Acts of Synod 1999*, p. 603; *Agenda for Synod 2002*, pp. 314-51; *Agenda for Synod 2016*, pp. 361-443), yet the harm continues (see [this page](#) from *the Hesed Project* for eg.).

The Committee consistently puts up “weak” versions of various arguments against their preferred interpretation, and then knocks those weaker versions down—as if that is sufficient.

Synod 2016 formed the HSR Committee from *only* people who could “adhere” to the 1973 report on homosexuality. Something that has never been done before, and that biases the committee (see [this article](#) from *the Banner*).

If “our beliefs” about human sexuality, as outlined in the HSR, “already have confessional status” what would that mean for how we minister to those engaging in extra-marital sex, pornography, co-habitation, and more?

The Committee uses the terms “status confessionis” and “confessional status” interchangeably, even though, historically, they are different things (see [this article](#) by Matt Lundberg).

The committee did not consult with our church polity experts (neither Kathy Smith, nor Henry deMoore) regarding “confessional status.”

Gen. 1 & 2

Salvation Threatened

Cherry-Picked Science

Mt. 19

Hypocrisy

Skewed Science

“Straw-men”

One Big Brush

Committee Makeup

Promotor Fidei

Unclear Implications

Lack of Listening

“Status Confessionis” Confusion

Inconsistency

Church Order Expertise?

Synod 1975

The HSR “conclude[s] that...these sins threaten a person’s salvation.” (*Agenda for Synod, 2021*, p. 148). This is explicitly contrary to the doctrine of “Perseverance of the Saints” (see *Canons of Dordt*, V).

The HSR ignores the broader context and the *points* that Jesus is making in Matthew 19, thus leading them to draw erroneous conclusions about *what* Jesus was saying in this passage.

Even with broad consensus in science (e.g., the influence of genes in sexual orientation), the report dismisses or misrepresents findings (see HSR, Appendix A, II, E, pp. 154-6; cf. [this page](#) for critique).

The committee combines many “opposing views” together indiscriminately, and then dismisses them all while, at the same time, they do *not* examine the very weak methods some use to arrive at a traditional view.

The promotor fidei did not provide alternate *theological* views, contrary to Synod 2016’s intention, and acted as more of a “research assistant”, than as a “devil’s advocate” (see [this article](#) from *the Christian Courier*).

Though the HSR contains anonymized scenarios from people at various places on the sexual spectrum, the committee did not thoroughly survey the denomination, nor did it talk to very many people with actual lived experience from the LGBTQ2A community

“Not doing harm” is also applied inconsistently. On p. 86 the authors seem to recommend that using chosen pronouns is a good practice in hospitality, but then seem to indicate that choosing not to is also fine.

The committee ignores the 1975 report on “Synodical Decisions and the Confessions” for clarity on the question of confessional status (*1975 Agenda for Synod*, pp. 423-32),