

As Jubilee Fellowship Council, we have received this overture from a group of post-secondary students. As the only avenue available to them to have their voices heard at Synod is to follow the flow from Congregation to Classis to Synod, Jubilee Fellowship CRC Council has adopted this overture to provide the means by which these student voices can be heard both at Classis Niagara and at Synod. The following content was written by these students in their own voice. Since some of the students involved in this overture are Jubilee members we are presenting this overture on their behalf to Classis asking Classis to adopt this overture and submit it to Synod. We believe it is important for their voice to be heard and we share their concerns.

Overture to:

- 1. Make amendments to the recommendations of the Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality**
- 2. Create a plan of action to continue careful deliberation of the complex issues around human sexuality (particularly gender identity, same-sex orientation and same-sex marriage) and engagement with people affected by these issues**
- 3. Prioritize the unity of the body of Christ in the CRCNA by delegating the issue of same-sex marriage as a decision of local conscience (while actively studying the fruit of this decision to inform further dialogue)**

I. Introduction to Student Authors

This overture is a collaborative effort by over 25 students across 10 post-secondary campuses. Our team includes student representatives from 6 post-secondary institutions who have ties with the CRCNA (Calvin University, The King's University, Redeemer University, Trinity Christian College, the Institute for Christian Studies, and Calvin Theological Seminary) as well as students from several other post-secondary institutions¹ who heard of our efforts and asked to join us. The school with the most representation was Calvin University with 7 students. Our passion for both the church and LGBTQIA+ concerns inspired us to collaborate, blessing us with new connections and an enriching experience. We are diverse in:

- Gender: Male, female and nonbinary people were represented
- Sexual identity: Both straight and queer sexual identities were represented
- Ethnicity: White American, White Canadian, Dutch American, Jewish, Chinese Canadian, Japanese American, Hispanic, Latino
- Geographical location: Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, South Dakota, Colorado, Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia
- Age: 19 to 45 years with 20 of us under age 25 years

Several churches offered to bring our overture to their councils. In the end, this overture was adopted by Jubilee Fellowship CRC.

¹ Augustana University (Sioux Falls), Seattle Pacific University, University of Western Ontario, Wycliffe College (Toronto School of Theology, U of T), Knox College (Toronto School of Theology, U of T), University of Toronto

Why did we choose to write this collaborative overture in addition to involvement in our local congregations? We seek to follow the intended flow of church order from local congregations to classes to synod and therefore, many of us are also involved in overture efforts within our local congregations. However, it seemed important to also submit an overture entirely written and signed by post-secondary students because we have unique concerns, a unique voice and may be under-represented in these conversations. Although we were approached with requests from youth, alumni, chaplains and faculty members to join our efforts, we limited involvement in this overture to post-secondary students only. We advised these other contacts to engage via their own congregations. While assembling our team, we discovered three categories of post-secondary students who wanted to be involved.

1. Current and active CRCNA members who have serious concerns with the report from the Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality (19 students from 10 CRCNA classes who represent the majority of our team and primary authors of this overture²)
2. Students who were CRCNA members at one time but no longer consider themselves CRCNA members and no longer attend a CRCNA local congregation because of the pain and harm experienced around CRCNA's posture towards human sexuality issues (1 student)
3. Students who are not CRCNA members but are attending schools with ties to the CRCNA and/or care deeply about the flourishing of the denomination (7 students³)

As such, in the Personal Impact Statements section below, students are identified by name, post-secondary institution and CRCNA membership if applicable.

We write to you because we care deeply about the health and unity of the CRCNA. Some of us may even be future ministers or leaders (or current lay leaders) within the CRCNA. We take God's Word very seriously as well as the ongoing flourishing of the church now and into the future. First and foremost, our hearts cry out for unity, forbearance and a commitment to Christian communion. The mystery of God's will has been revealed to us in Christ and its goal is the unity of all things in Christ. "With all wisdom and understanding, he made known to us the

² CRCNA members who signed this overture: Andrews, Jessica (The Road CRC in Classis Alberta South and Saskatchewan); Beck, Renya (Jubilee Fellowship CRC in Classis Niagara); Bouman, Abigail (Neland Ave. CRC in Classis Grand Rapids East); Bouma, Emily (River Park CRC in Classis Alberta South and Saskatchewan); Bonsma, Ben (Jubilee Fellowship CRC in Classis Niagara); Bonsma-Fisher, Madeleine (First CRC Toronto in Classis Toronto); de Boer, Shayanne (Redeemer CRC in Classis Chatham); Clemens, Jonathan (First CRC Toronto in Classis Toronto); DeJager, Catherine (Washington DC CRC in Classis Hackensack); Elgersma, Kat (First CRC of Denver in Classis Rocky Mountain); Klompmaker, Kirsten (Jubilee Fellowship CRC in Classis Niagara); Krале, Lauren (CrossPoint CRC in Classis Toronto); Lise, Nathan (Holland Marsh CRC in Classis Toronto); Overbeek, Nicholas (Calvin CRC in Classis Grand Rapids East); Roseboom, Michelle (Terrace CRC in Classis B.C. North-West); Schat, Kyra (First Hamilton CRC in Classis Hamilton); Tuit, Samuel (Neland Ave. CRC in Classis Grand Rapids East); Jodi VanWingerden (Neland Ave. CRC in Classis Grand Rapids East); Tolsma, Theoren (Fleetwood CRC in Classis B.C. South-East)

³ Non-CRCNA members (or no longer members) who signed this overture: De Martinez, Brandon (Calvin University); Ford, Maggie (Redeemer University); Murashima, Claire (Calvin University); Newton, Jo (Calvin University); Ross Barz (Trinity Christian College); Salamun, Sean (Calvin University); Van Arragon, Emma (The King's University); Young, Justus (Calvin University)

mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in Christ, to be put into effect when the times reach their fulfillment—to bring unity to all things in heaven and on earth under Christ” (Ephesians 1:8-10 NIV).

We acknowledge a charitable posture toward the committee and gratitude for their many efforts so far. We strongly agree with Synod 2016’s grounds for the human sexuality committee in that “the consideration of *status confessionis* is a **weighty matter** that requires **extended and careful deliberation**” (*Acts of Synod 2016*, pp. 926-27; *Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality Report 2020*, p. 3) We lament that from its very inception, both in committee makeup and Synod-assigned mandate, this committee fell short of the deep vulnerability and humility required of “careful deliberation” which, in our understanding of the term, would have required a posture of balanced openness to conflicting Biblical and theological viewpoints and extensive listening, particularly to harmed and marginalized voices among us. We are saddened that the restricted synodical mandate from the outset put the committee members in a tricky and contentious position and our hearts go out to them as our family members in the body of Christ. We experience this as a flawed process with the resulting report falling short of our Reformed heritage and values of fairness, perspicacity, and thorough Biblical scholarship as well as deeply hurtful for its exclusion of the Godly voices and perspectives of LGBTQIA+ family members and allies among us.

II. Background

In response to multiple overtures, Synod 2016 created the Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality (henceforth referred to as the human sexuality committee) with a mandate to:

articulate a foundation-laying biblical theology of human sexuality that pays particular attention to biblical conceptions of gender and sexuality. The central aim of this theological task will be to provide concise yet clear ethical guidance for what constitutes a holy and healthy Christian sexual life, and in light of this to serve the church with pastoral, ecclesial, and missional guidance that explains how the gospel provides redemptive affirmation and hope for those experiencing sexual questioning, temptation, and sin...
(*Acts of Synod 2016*, pp. 919-20)

At the end of October 2020, the report of the human sexuality committee was published in preparation for deliberation at Synod 2021. We commend the committee for their five years of hard work in addressing a multitude of concepts related to human sexuality including pornography, gender identity, homosexuality, singleness, premarital sex and cohabitation, polyamory, divorce and sexual desire. The report highlights the challenges of our current contemporary cultural context around issues of human sexuality and it seems as though its recommendations are based on a genuine desire by its members to demonstrate loyalty and submission to the authority of Scripture (even though we disagree with some of their conclusions). However, the report is lacking in the following key areas:

- A. It insufficiently meets the goal of “extended and careful deliberation” of these “weighty matters” of human sexuality.

- B. It insufficiently reflects and represents the membership of the CRCNA.
- C. It lacks constructive suggestions or guidance for how our denomination might move forward in unity to continue to fulfill our Christian mission while respecting the lack of consensus on human sexuality issues.

A note regarding timing: We acknowledge that our response is limited by the timeline and will lack the level of in-depth study and analysis we would have preferred to include. As such, major areas of concern will be noted but analysis will be brief or absent. Although “prior opportunity” (according to Article 47 of CRCNA Church Order) was met since the final report was published Oct. 29, 2020, the report is much longer than typical committee reports and therefore the timeline provided between October 29, 2020 to March 15, 2021 was insufficient to thoughtfully and thoroughly engage with all aspects of the 175 pages. To meet the church order requirements for submitting an overture through both church council and classis, overtures needed to be completed by the turn of the year. After taking into account our student responsibilities with midterms and finals, this left very little time in November and December to organize ourselves and respond well to this report. We believe that the “how” of being God’s people is as important as “what” we believe and that we are not called to be frantic or rushed, especially in grappling with such important matters. It seems to us that we and many of our contacts within the CRCNA, out of polite respect and good faith in the human sexuality committee, have waited for the final outcome of this report only to be seriously disappointed in the lack of balance therein. We grieve that the result of this will likely be further delay in providing clear, ethical guidance or any prompt resolution to these issues.

*A. The human sexuality report insufficiently meets the goal of “extended and careful deliberation” of these “weighty matters” of human sexuality as referred to in the report’s mandate (Acts of Synod 2016, pp. 926-27; Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality Report 2020, p. 3). Article 29 in Church Order 2020 also states “decisions of ecclesiastical assemblies shall be reached only upon **due consideration**” (p. 44). In light of the clearly lacking denominational consensus regarding credible, sincerely held Biblical interpretations around LGBTQIA+ issues, the human sexuality report does not meet an acceptable standard of careful deliberation or due consideration. The human sexuality report can be received as a hearty effort into exploring a traditional view of Biblical and theological scholarship but it remains a partial effort towards due diligence in adequately examining these issues-- certainly not meeting the standard of due consideration required for either *status confessionis*, confessional status or any change to church order. Additional study and listening to supplement the work of the current human sexuality committee is needed.*

- a. The report insufficiently presents vigorous discussion or exploration of Biblical and theological support in favour of same-sex marriage and full inclusion and celebration of LGBTQIA+ people.
- b. The report insufficiently engaged in robust listening. For example, only four LGBTQIA+ people were interviewed for this report (*Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality Report 2020*, p. 4). In the range of personal stories

included in the report, there were no stories that depicted faithful, married same-sex couples. Theoretical research was given precedence over listening to the voices of real people. In-depth local conversations have also not yet been fostered. There is work yet to do and we cannot consider these teachings settled and binding without generous, extensive listening to our CRCNA members.

- c. There is much contested about the report's claim that "the church's teaching on premarital sex, extramarital sex, adultery, polyamory, pornography, and homosexual sex already has confessional status" (p. 149). According to CRCNA church order expert, the Rev. Dr. Henry DeMoor, the report claims confessional status around same-sex relationships where none exists.⁴ (There is also confusion around the use of the terms *status confessionis* and confessional status which seem to be used interchangeably but may have two different definitions.⁵)
- d. The report insufficiently addresses the potential for a new movement of the Holy Spirit or the abundant evidence of the fruit of the Spirit present in the lives of faithful LGBTQIA+ Christians.
- e. The report does not engage in the level of balanced study or formal listening that we have seen modelled by fellow Reformed denominations.
 - i. For example, the Presbyterian Church of Canada (PCC) is currently grappling with the issue of same-sex marriage. Part of its methodology was for its Committee on Church Doctrine to appoint two teams of learned and gifted people. One team thoroughly articulated the Biblical foundations and theological arguments for a traditional view of marriage as only between one man and one woman and the second team thoroughly articulated the Biblical foundations and theological arguments for a view affirming same-sex marriage. They also attended to the growing evidence of harm done to LGBTQIA+ people and its pastoral implications within Christian communities. In this way, they presented a balanced resource to their General Assembly (Synod) and membership for listening and learning regarding this issue. After this document was shared and widely considered within the PCC, the General Assembly decided to draw up legislation that allows for same-sex marriage and ordination of married LGBTQI clergy while it also allows for freedom of conscience on the matter. This legislation was voted on by each local Presbytery (Classis) and about 70% of these voted in favour of the new legislation. In 2021 this legislation is going back to the General Assembly for a final vote.^{6 7} In regards to listening to marginalized people, the 2019 General Assembly declared it "a matter of urgency...[to] provide a means for those affected by this decision to express their concerns, views and

⁴ DeMoor, Henry. *Status Confessionis*, The Network, November 11, 2020. Retrieved December 31, 2020 from <https://network.crcna.org/church-order/status-confessionis>

⁵ Please refer to the overture from First CRC Toronto and its discussion of *status confessionis* and confessional status.

⁶ Email communication with Dr. Charles Fensham (Knox College professor), December 31, 2020.

⁷ Kendall, Stephen and Muir, Don. 2019 *General Assembly: Summary of decisions regarding human sexuality*, June 2019. The Presbyterian Church in Canada. Retrieved December 31, 2020 from file:///media/fuse/drivefs-6d44a3bacf91b5e895d80cab61e3d569/root/PCC/2019-General-Assembly-Decisions-re-Sexuality.pdf

pain in a safe environment, and that these concerns be reported back to the 2020 General Assembly”⁴ and the 2017 General Assembly had already “established a listening committee, the Rainbow Communion, to create safe space for LGTBQ+ persons to tell of their experiences in the church.”⁸

- f. The report insufficiently engages with the potential that changing our minds to increased acceptance and celebration of LGBTQIA+ people may be a deeply devout response, particularly in relationship to the harm being caused by non-affirming theology.
- g. The matter of current and historical harm done towards LGBTQIA+ people at the hands of the church is insufficiently addressed in this report.
 - i. As we continue in careful deliberation around these human sexuality issues and a Christian pastoral response, it is essential that we highlight and grapple with the issue of harm towards LGBTQIA+ people at the hands of the church. Theology that does harm calls into question the validity of the theology and Biblical interpretation itself.
 - ii. The human sexuality report has the potential to do harm by assuming that those with developmental sexual disorders or those who identify as LGBTQIA+ have a “disordered sexuality” (p.19) and that this is a result of the fall. There is no clear teaching in Scripture on this. This is an exceedingly important distinction due to the close connection between one’s gender and sexual identity and one’s identity as God’s image bearer.
 - iii. Our students have several pastoral care concerns with the report. For example, in the gender identity section, it says that using correct names and pronouns decreases suicide risk, but immediately follows this by suggesting that congregations need not use correct names and pronouns if they do not want to (p.86).
 - iv. Length of process- Although delay is required for careful deliberation, we acknowledge that further delay in providing resolution to many of these issues of human sexuality is painful to individuals, families and congregations.

Continued careful deliberation of the complex issues around human sexuality (particularly gender identity, same-sex orientation and same-sex marriage) and engagement with people affected by these issues is still required. In the overture section below, we offer some practical suggestions to this end.

B. The human sexuality report insufficiently reflects and represents the membership of the CRCNA.

The report was written by a committee that was restricted in both its make-up and mandate. This restriction does not reflect the broad lack of consensus on these issues within the CRCNA and therefore provides imbalanced Biblical and theological interpretations and recommendations.

- a. In the 2014 survey by the Calvin College Center for Social Research 21% of church members, 31% of CRCNA students, and 14% of ministers agreed with same-sex

⁸ Currie, Amanda. Letter from the Moderator of the 2019 General Assembly, September 3, 2019. The Presbyterian Church in Canada. Retrieved December 31, 2020 from file:///media/fuse/drivefs-6d44a3bacf91b5e895d80cab61e3d569/root/PCC/Pastoral-Letter-from-the-Moderator-2019.pdf

marriage.⁹ Furthermore, 17% of church members, 34% of CRCNA students and 16% of pastors surveyed said that gay Christians should celebrate the sexual identity God has given them.¹⁰ The human sexuality report misrepresents a singular Biblical interpretation as an already settled matter. There are clearly a spectrum of beliefs on this issue within the CRCNA, and therefore it is unwise and injurious to promote a one-sided report to confessional status in light of this reality.

- b. Committee make-up was restricted to adherence to 1973 teaching regarding homosexuality. Restricting the allowed viewpoints on a study committee is discriminatory, reflects poor governance, and is inconsistent with the CRCNA's historical methods and its ethos of valuing thoughtful, multi-faceted scholarship and engagement.
- c. Synod 2016 requested that a chaplain or campus minister be on this committee as a way to represent the diversity of pastoral vocations in the CRCNA. When the committee member that was a campus minister, and perhaps most closely in touch with students such as ourselves, had to resign in 2017 because of his move to Korea, he was not replaced even though there were still three years remaining before the due date for the report's publication (Nov 1 2020).
- d. Synod 2016 specifically articulated its desire that a person who identifies as 'gender dysphoric' serve on the committee. As far as we can tell, no one who identified as gender dysphoric was ever on the committee, and the committee consultation with one "FtM (female to male) transgender person and his father" (p. 4) was very late in their process (May 28, 2020). Given the clarity of this representation desired by Synod 2016, this minimal interaction from the committee is insufficient.
- e. Even if the compositional mandate of the committee as desired by Synod 2016 had been met, the representation of gender minorities and sexual minorities on the committee and in the consultative process is markedly insufficient, especially noting the perspectival requirement around adherence to 1973.
- f. Representation of young adults was missing on the human sexuality committee. Nobody who signed the report was under the age of 40 years. As post-secondary students, most of us young adults ourselves, we may navigate these questions differently than other age groups. In our experience, the younger generation is generally more accepting of unity amidst diversity and remaining in the tension of uncertainty. We tend to be more sensitive to power dynamics that exist due to the influences of patriarchy, colonization, and racism. These are valued parts of our worldview that we feel will serve us well as we faithfully navigate our present and future cultural contexts. We, as the younger generation, are deeply interested in the content of this report because we will carry the long term burden of its ramifications. We also lament the increasing loss of our age group among church membership. For example, in reaching out to post-secondary institutions, numerous students told us that they could not, with integrity, be involved with this overture because they had "already left the CRC far behind" because of its posture

⁹ *Committee to Provide Pastoral Guidance re: Same-sex Marriage (majority report) 2016*, Appendix A, p. 49. Retrieved December 31, 2020 from https://www.crcna.org/sites/default/files/same-sex_marriage.pdf

¹⁰ *Committee to Provide Pastoral Guidance re: Same-sex Marriage (majority report) 2016*, Appendix A, p. 53. Retrieved December 31, 2020 from https://www.crcna.org/sites/default/files/same-sex_marriage.pdf

towards LGBTQIA+ people. We ask you “listen to the voices of every generation”¹¹ as the CRCNA has made this a denominational priority in *Our Journey 2025*.

- g. There is a lack of collective congregational leadership experience among the human sexuality committee members.¹² Pastors may become experts on fostering unity among non-unified congregations to continue worshipping together despite disagreement. We can imagine that the wisdom gained through navigating ‘worship wars’, differences of conviction regarding women in church office, and even the recent COVID19 crisis around worship in person versus worshipping online would be helpful wisdom to guide a denomination towards unity even when there is not a consensus around the issues of human sexuality (particularly gender identity, same-sex orientation and same-sex marriage). This type of wisdom does not seem to be accentuated in this report.

C. The human sexuality report lacks constructive suggestions and guidance for how our denomination might move forward in unity to continue to fulfill our Christian mission while respecting the lack of consensus on human sexuality issues.

- a. The human sexuality report implies that holding a view that affirms same-sex marriage is Biblically heretical, condemning such as false teaching with severe words of warning (p. 146-8). Yet there are faithful and respected individuals, leaders and scholars within the CRCNA who hold this view in their best conscience.¹³ We are concerned that some of the teaching in the report will increase divisiveness within the church by unduly burdening those with traditional Biblical perspectives with a fear to remain in communion with those acting upon affirming views (p. 146-8). Generally speaking, it seems that those with LGBTQIA+ affirming views are asking their more traditional church family members to be willing to remain in communion despite disagreement. However, the report encourages those with traditional/non-affirming views to require agreement with a singular Biblical interpretation at the risk of breaching unity.
- b. The report is inconsistent with precedent in CRCNA church history for addressing controversial issues. In previous cases of faithful disagreement around Biblical interpretation (ie. female ordination and divorce), the CRCNA has recognized that differing interpretations may “arise from credible and sincerely held interpretations of Scripture.”¹⁴ Historically, the CRCNA has favored the option of exception at the local level as a way to uphold church unity and allow congregations freedom for careful and deliberate discernment on complex issues. Local discernment can bear healthier fruit on

¹¹ <https://www.crcna.org/news-and-events/news/announcing-our-journey-2025>

¹² The best we could do to research this data was to use the CRCNA’s yearbook website (<https://www.crcna.org/yearbook>). These are the results we found for the 6 committee members who are ordained ministers or commissioned pastors in the CRCNA, noting only their years as pastors of congregations (not total years of ordained service): Jeff Weima-0 years; Mary Vanden Berg-0 years; Paula Seales-4, starting in 2016; Jose Rayas-6, starting in 2014; Charles Kim-20, starting in 2000; Mary Lee Bouma-23 starting in 1997). Adding Matt Tuininga, who supported the report’s creation until nearly the end, adds 0 years of congregational pastoring. Total congregational pastoring years by the report’s signers is 53 years (which includes 16 years from 2016-2020). This total would be close to the amount of years served by many of our retiring ministers all on their own.

¹³ To name a few: Dr. Nicholas Wolterstorff, Dr. Duane Kelderman, and the Rev. Leonard VanderZee

¹⁴ *Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality Report 2019*, p. 82.

- some vulnerable, contentious matters because it is harmful to remove the “particulars” of an individual’s story to create a “universal rule” in our quest for the false idol of certainty.
- c. The practical ramifications of this report claiming confessional status and a singular “right” way of interpreting Scripture are numerous and devastating, yet they are not considered or discussed in this report. Taking a moment to consider the potential fruit of this report were it to be assigned confessional status demonstrates its own insufficiency. For example, would all current office bearers who agree with same-sex marriage be required to relinquish their positions? Would ordination candidates who consider gender diversity to be a reflection of God’s goodness in creation (and not a result of the fall) lose their candidacy status and be blocked from potential ordination? Would this proposed confessional status apply retroactively to remove church membership for those in disagreement with the report or only apply to new members? Would LGBTQIA+ members who do not feel called to celibacy have to leave the denomination? Would non-celibate LGBTQIA+ people or those who affirm same-sex marriage employed at organizations associated with the CRCNA lose their jobs?
 - d. Corpus linguistics analysis indicates room to grow in the human sexuality report.¹⁵
 - i. For example, more use of “we” in the sections on singleness and pornography indicates that the report writers identify more with these groups of people than the sections on gender identity or homosexuality. In particular, frequent use of “you” with less frequent use of “we” in the report’s section on homosexuality may indicate that people who are not heterosexual may be seen as outsiders.
 - ii. Only one case study in the report uses the first person “I” language (p.41). Direct quotations allow people to tell their story in their own words and prevent paraphrasing towards any particular (intended or unintended) bias.
 - iii. It was good to see the recommendation to listen in the sections on gender (7x) and homosexuality (4x) but vocabulary about listening was low in the report in general and absent in the remaining sections.
 - iv. Scriptural arguments made by negation are higher in the gender identity scripture section while absent in the pornography scripture section. Providing more positive arguments prevents straw man arguments.
 - v. The current human sexuality report uses a more passive voice than the 1973 report on homosexuality. This is concerning because it suggests to readers that the report content is from a neutral, objective source, rather than reflective of the views/interpretations of its authors.

In the introduction of the CRCNA’s *Church Order and Its Supplements 2020*, John Calvin is quoted, “Indeed, I admit that we ought not to charge into innovation rashly, suddenly, for insufficient cause. But love will best judge what may hurt or edify; and if we let love be our

¹⁵ Catherine DeJager is a 5th-year senior at Calvin University majoring in Computer Science and minoring in Mathematics, Data Science, and Linguistics. She learned Corpus Linguistics at Calvin in 2018 and has been using it ever since. As a lifelong CRC member and an advocate for LGBTQIA+ issues, Catherine decided to use her Corpus Linguistics skills to investigate and respond to this report. Her full analysis can be found here:

<https://gitlab.com/cmd16/crc-sexuality-reports/-/blob/master/results.ipynb>

guide, all will be safe” (Institutes, IV.X.30). Let us rebuild mutual trust and follow careful and due process while letting the Word, love and the evidence of the fruit of the Spirit be our guide as we continue to navigate these complex issues of human sexuality together.

Personal Impact Statements

We offer the following personal impact statements written by the students behind this overture as additional background information. We do not ever want policy decisions or scholarly discussions to be disconnected from the lived realities of our Christian family.

I have long been proud of the CRC for its commitment to love of neighbor, activism, and thorough, well-rounded biblical scholarship. This report flies in the face of all that. I am devastated. I want a church where I know people will love me and respect me as I am, and where I can love and respect other people in turn. I want a church where I can bring LGBT+ friends and know they will be loved and welcomed just like anyone else. I want a denomination where I don't have to caveat with “well, I agree with them except for the LGBT+ stuff”. I want to know that no matter what someone's sex, gender identity, gender expression, and interaction of all those factors is, that their chosen name and pronouns will be used by everyone in the congregation (or at the very least the leaders will set an example) because that's what it means to love our neighbor. I want full membership in a church that doesn't see me as sinful or broken just for who I love. I am bisexual, and I want a church that doesn't force me to choose between a man and celibacy. I look forward to when I move this summer and get to find a new church that is affirming, because I don't want to stay in the CRC given its treatment of LGBT+ issues.

Catherine DeJager, she/her pronouns, student at Calvin University, member of Washington DC CRC

I am a senior at Calvin University. Four and a half years ago, I spent countless hours searching for a college where I could live authentically as a nonbinary queer person and worship God inside the classroom as well as outside. Calvin was the only place I felt that met both requirements to my satisfaction, and I was amazed to find out it was the flagship institution of the CRC. While the CRC may hold an unaffirming stance, plenty of faculty and staff, and almost three-quarters of the students I've met are affirming. I love that Calvin is a space for diverse opinions and mutual respect, and I hope to see the CRC as a whole move in that direction. Yet this report has made me incredibly anxious, both for LGBTQIA+ members of the denomination and for myself. I fear that, if adopted, this report will force Calvin and the other CRC-affiliated institutions to reprimand their LGBTQIA+ students for living authentically as they feel called to. I'm afraid that, as I pursue transitioning (something I have discussed with two of the three chaplains at Calvin University, as well as my therapist, psychiatrist, and doctor), Calvin will be forced by the CRC to take action against me.

Jo Newton, student at Calvin University, they/them pronouns

Having grown up in a CRC church and being a current member, I find the CRC an almost impossible thing to talk about with my non-Christian friends. Since my faith is an important part of my identity I would like to be able to share why it is important to my many non-Christian friends. However, I find it impossible to tell others about a loving God when the Church I am part of is actively causing harm. When I do share with others it is full of caveats stating that the current church I attend, Jubilee CRC, is relatively accepting and that I myself am not, "one of those conservative Christians." Without these caveats my statement of faith would have little bearing with others who can see the harm the Church has done, and being kind and loving people themselves, want nothing to do with the CRC or Christianity as a whole. It is tragic that the part of me that most motivates me to love others, is the part of me that I have to both hide and caveat to actually show others that I love.

Ben Bonsma, he/him, student at Redeemer University, member of Jubilee Fellowship CRC

I am currently an MDiv student who is candidating for ordination within the CRCNA. I experienced a strong vocational call toward pastoral ministry later in life, when my three kids were grade school age. I love my church and the people that I am blessed to be in relationship with through the church. Supportive Christian community has and continues to be one of the most formative aspects of my lifelong faith journey. Three years ago I had an uninspected, inherited theology that was non-affirming. After two years of praying, studying and researching these issues, as well as listening to stories of faithful LGBTQIA+ Christians, I felt compelled by my faith in Jesus to change my theology to become fully affirming. The resulting peace of God around this issue in my life has brought my spirit much consolation. One of the biggest factors for me in this journey was hearing about the harm LGBTQIA+ people had experienced from the very body of Christ that had always been so supportive of me. This human sexuality report has hit me like a ton of bricks. I have felt incredulous, grieved, angry, suffered insomnia and shed many tears. My love of Jesus compels me to fully accept and celebrate my LGBTQIA+ family members and I know that the church's future is in God's hands. However, because I am in favour of same-sex marriage, I am scared that when I am examined for ordination, I will be rejected.

Jessica Andrews, she/her, student at Knox College (University of Toronto), member of The Road CRC

For several generations, my family has been involved with the CRC as active members, teachers at CRC affiliated schools, and preachers. I was raised in the church and attended Fellowship CRC in Edmonton for most of my life. However, I no longer feel at home in the CRC and cannot foresee a future where I return to the denomination. While there were many factors leading to this decision, the biggest one was that I could not be a part of a denomination that does not recognize LGBTQIA+ identities as biblically legitimate. This was not a doctrinal concern but a personal one, as I am a lesbian. Despite the support of many in my congregation, being a part of a denomination that views LGBTQIA+ identity as incompatible with Christianity made it impossible to stay. How can we say we want to emulate Christ while preaching an exclusive, conditional understanding of what it looks like to love our neighbor? How can we claim to represent the love of God when we fail to

adequately love each other? I attend a CRC affiliated university, where I have been working to establish support for LGBTQIA+ students. Despite significant progress, our connection to the CRC has caused many problems. The CRC's position on human sexuality limits the ability of LGBTQIA+ students to integrate within the community and limits the ability of the administration to support students without fear of repercussions. If there is a future for the CRC, it is embodied in the grace of LGBTQIA+ people who remain in a church that does not fully accept them. However, for myself and many other LGBTQIA+ people who were raised in the CRC, staying within the denomination is no longer possible.

Emma Van Arragon, she/her pronouns, student at The King's University, former/inactive member of Fellowship CRC

I personally do not identify as a member of the CRC church. Yet, I am a student at Calvin University, which predominantly consists of students who are of the CRC faith. I was raised in the Roman Catholic church my entire life. My own faith, like others in the CRC, is very important to my wellbeing and plays a vital role in my life everyday. Here at Calvin University, I am honored with the incredible opportunity to have an intimate look into many of the views and beliefs that CRC Christians follow. It allows me to use my own faith upbringing and filter it through this lens, while trying to better understand that even though we are of different faiths, we are still branches of the same Divine Tree.

At Calvin University, we follow the mission statement of "to think deeply, to act justly, and to live wholeheartedly." As Christians and non-Christians alike, we must believe that the LGBTQIA+ community is loved; they too are just as Christian and vital as any one of us, and they must be validated with that same Christian spirit as well. Many friends that I have made while attending Calvin University, who also identify as Christian and the LGBTQIA+ community are personally affected by this Report. Their voices and their views absolutely matter because they too are "Christ's agents of renewal in the world." So, I plead with the readers of this report that you carefully, thoughtfully, listen and follow the recommendations these important voices in this response have outlined. It's so imperative to make considerations and edits for a true, equal, and equitable future.

Sean Salamun, he/him, Student Senate Team Leader at Calvin University

I have attended a CRC church and CRC affiliated schools all my life and have been thoughtfully disciplined and cared for by these communities. As most of the institutions within which I have been disciplined have held what the report refers to as a "traditionalist" perspective on issues of gender and sexuality, I also held this perspective without a great deal of consideration for much of my life. However, in recent years, I have felt called upon to engage with a greater variety of perspectives in this conversation. As I have allowed space for tension, made note of areas of dissonance, and wrestled prayerfully with my theological convictions, my relationships, both with God and with my neighbours, have been enriched and deepened. I am grateful for the report insofar as it thoroughly and thoughtfully provides one perspective on issues of gender and sexuality held by members of the CRC and serves as a much-needed catalyst for dialogue within our denomination. That said, I lament the significant reality that my LGBTQIA+ family members and friends have experienced fear, anger, and grief in reading this report. I am concerned about its implications for myself and

others considering, pursuing, or participating in vocational ministry within the CRC who do not support all of its conclusions. While this report is helpful in some respects, I believe that it ultimately falls short of adequately including the voices of our denomination's LGBTQIA+ members, thoughtfully representing the variety of perspectives held by members of the CRC, and engaging fully with its pastoral and missional implications. Ultimately, I worry that the adoption of this report will further inhibit the fostering of unity (already so rare in the context of this conversation) and create a confessional barrier to full participation for many who currently call this denomination home.

Kyra Schat, she/her, student at Redeemer University, member of First Hamilton CRC

I have grown up in the CRC denomination and it has been something that I have found great comfort in. When I left for university, the CRC was something that I strongly identified with and was a community that I longed to extend in a new city. I especially connected with new friends over our shared CRC background. As I have developed more relationships with people who are not part of the CRC denomination or do not consider themselves Christian, I have become increasingly aware of how the CRC's statement demonstrates an exclusive stance. While the congregation that I grew up in nurtured my faith and encouraged my exploration of my faith – especially through my youth group – I felt an underlying tension about how the church viewed and (un)welcomed the LGBTQIA+ community and how we are called to be in relationship with others. Although I am blessed to have several CRC mentors, friends, and other perspectives who I can discuss LGBTQIA+ inclusion with, I am more hesitant to share my CRC affiliation with others because of its position on the LGBTQIA+ community. Despite personally identifying as a cisgender female, I cannot – and I believe that we as a church cannot – simply ignore, forget, or even worse, punish our fellow believers who identify differently than I do; I am not called to judge my neighbour but to love them. Being part of and growing up in the CRC is something that I treasure and am grateful for, but it is also something that brings discomfort in identifying with because I know the harm that the CRC has brought and will continue to bring until we amend our perspective to be inclusive of our LGBTQIA+ neighbours.

Emily Bouma, she/her, student at The King's University, member of River Park CRC

I have been a member of the CRC all my life and as a child I always thought that it was the best denomination of all. In recent years, and especially upon reading this report, that is no longer my opinion. Church is meant to be a community of people who love and care for each other no matter what. This report does not reflect that love. If I did not feel that I could safely bring my LGBTQIA+ friends into the church before, now I know that I could not. Many of my closest friends have already faced religious harm from other churches and I have always had hope that mine would be different. It hurts to know that my church is still stuck in a place that calls for judgment on LGBTQIA+ members of the community. I cannot comfortably say that I trust in the CRC and its decisions any longer. Our choice should be one of never failing love, like that of Christ, not judgment and harm that could last a lifetime.

Shayanne de Boer, she/her, student at University of Western Ontario, member of Redeemer CRC

The CRC, in unique fashion, has found a way that allows me (a woman) to serve in every possible leadership position. While the denomination's decision to make allowances for differing Scriptural interpretations on this matter has not been embraced by every single individual or congregation within the denomination, I firmly believe that gracious decision has been a witness to the unity of all believers that is possible in Christ—the unity that Jesus himself desired for us—“that all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you ... that they may be brought to complete unity [so that] the world will know that you sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me” (John 17:21-23). Jesus knew that the church would never have uniformity—but yet he tells us that unity is possible through him.

I have had so many opportunities to love and be loved by the church in ways I never would have imagined—Sunday school teacher, committee member, youth elder, classis delegate, chair of council, seminary student. Through those experiences I have received the love and the Word of God. I have learned about God, about grace and forgiveness extended and received, about the beautiful complexity of the body of believers. I have learned that a life of faith is a life of learning how to hold tension—light and darkness, justice and mercy, truth and human fallibility, strength in weakness, power in humility. These opportunities have been a means of grace.

It pains me that the church has become known more for excluding rather than embracing—particularly among younger generations. Who are we to deny these means of grace to others, especially when thoughtful, educated Christians have arrived at different interpretations with strong Scriptural support? In cases like this, we have an opportunity and a responsibility to extend more grace, rather than place more limits on it. And in so doing, we also have an opportunity and a responsibility to be a witness to the world that “in Christ, all things hold together” (Col. 1:17).

Jodi VanWingerden, she/her, M.Div. student at Calvin Theological Seminary, member of Neland Avenue CRC (and previously Calvin CRC, Sheboygan, Wisconsin)

I have grown up within the CRC church and have attended CRC affiliated schools my entire life. Throughout my time at the King's University in Edmonton I have often connected with others who attend CRC churches and this has been a way for me to create many new friendships. However, I have also developed my beliefs and understandings in this time, and have met and formed relationships with many people who do not identify with Christianity or the CRC denomination. I have witnessed people in my life experience exclusion from the CRC due to the views of the CRC regarding LGBTQIA+. I have struggled with seeing this occur and have at times felt embarrassed that the church as a whole has been so exclusive. Upon reading the statement put out by the CRC I was shocked to see just how exclusive it was, and I see that a statement such as this one would be harmful for many people. I am concerned that the CRC is issuing a statement such as this which excludes many from the church and is not loving and accepting of all people equally.

Michelle Roseboom, she/her, student at The King's University, member of Terrace CRC, BC

Growing up in the church has had its impact on my day to day life. My faith growing up always intersected with my race, ethnicity, sexuality and educational opportunities. Because of this, I have always felt that in some way the church has excluded me because of one of my identities. Although I did not grow up as CRC, I did grow up as Roman Catholic and Pentecostal. Because of this, I often did not have a specific church I could go to as my parents did not feel comfortable staying in one church or another because of their immigrant status or because of how they would discuss topics regarding homosexuality. I ultimately felt that there was no place for me in the church and because of this I decided to leave. With that being said, I felt that oftentimes my sexuality intersected with my cultural aspects growing up. Growing up in a Hispanic household, there was not much said on my sexuality. Because of the conservative culture at home on top of the culture outside of the home, I felt the double pressure of conforming to the societal structures of being “straight” or having to be “straight passing” in order to be loved. In other words, growing up in the United States while growing up within a Hispanic house has had its challenges of accepting my LGBTQ+ identity and because of that I felt pressured to leave the church as a result.

However, coming to Calvin University has opened up the possibility of being gay and also being religious. Although some aspects of Calvin are fairly conservative and although Calvin is progressing as a University there is still much work to be done for LGBTQ+ students on campus. Growing up as gay and first generation in the United States has presented its unique challenges within the education system as well. As a gay first generation college student, I grew up attending mostly private academies, Christian school, and public high school, and now I am attending Calvin, a private Christian liberal arts college. Being able to see several perspectives of higher education has given me the privilege to see how my sexuality has intersected with higher education. For example, at Calvin, I have noticed that in the classroom it is not very inclusive with LGBTQ+ acronyms or simply mentioning the existence of LGBTQ+ students. Because of my experiences at Calvin, I have often felt excluded within the classroom because of the religious component. Because of being at Calvin, I noticed the recent CRC report on Human Sexuality summarizing how being “homosexual” is not tolerated and is a sin. Because of the exclusive nature of this statement, it can affect the lives of LGBTQ+ students on campus whether that be socially, politically, or even in a feeling of safety in the classroom. As a first generation, Latinx/Hispanic, multiracial, gay person of color I felt the need to add my personal opinion on this as the LGBTQ+ community is so expansive and often times queer people of color are overlooked. That is why I see it as my duty to ensure that LGBTQ+ student voices are amplified when marginalized.

Brandon De Martinez, he/him/él, Student Senator at Calvin University

I spent the first 20 years of my life in the closet. When I came out publicly in a Calvin Chimes op-ed, I had to rely on my resilience, support systems and my already strong relationship with Jesus when I faced criticism. Every single piece of criticism was from someone who called themselves a Christian- and almost everyone who called themselves a Christian or used scripture did so in a way that made me feel excluded. Additionally, LGBTQIA+ people who aren't believers will not be motivated to join our churches if they see how poorly we treat LGBTQIA+ individuals who are already in our faith communities.

Upon reading this report, the first thing I noticed was how quick we were to judge LGBTQIA+ individuals. Right away, I felt excluded by the use of “we” to describe straight people in the church and “them” as queer individuals who may or may not be in the church. As I read it from the perspective of a bisexual woman, I noticed that it was lacking the nuance that queer voices would have provided.

However, I saw a glimmer of hope when Jess Andrews and I were able to mobilize a team of over 20 students from 10 different universities across the US and Canada to write and edit a 15-page overture in the course of a month. This is the type of inclusion that I love about the CRC and Calvin; there are people who are quick to volunteer their time and talents to pave a way for marginalized populations. I’m proud of my institutions and am sharing my opinion because I want us to see the negative impact that taking a confessional, non-affirming stance will have on already excluded people in our communities.

Claire Murashima, she/her, Student Body President at Calvin University

III. Overture

Given the background above as provided by students from across North America, Jubilee Fellowship CRC overture Classis to overture Synod 2021 to:

1. Make amendments to the recommendations of the Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality
2. Create a plan of action to continue careful deliberation of the complex issues around human sexuality (particularly LGBTQIA+ identity and same-sex marriage) and engagement with people affected by these issues
3. Prioritize the unity of the body of Christ in the CRCNA by delegating the issue of same-sex marriage as a decision of local conscience (while actively studying the fruit of this decision to inform further dialogue)

1. Make amendments to the recommendations of the Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality

Recommendation B: We request an amendment to recommendation B that this report be received for information but note that it insufficiently addresses:

1. A careful, in-depth exploration of Biblical and theological foundations for alternate viewpoints that favour the celebration of gender/sexual minorities and same-sex marriage.
2. The diversity of credible and sincerely held interpretations of Scripture within the CRCNA denomination and that 21% of CRCNA church members, 31% of CRCNA students and 14% of pastors agreed with same-sex marriage in 2014, a number likely to be higher at present.¹⁶
3. Practical guidance for moving forward at the level of everyday ministry and for unity in the denomination as a whole.

¹⁶ *Committee to Provide Pastoral Guidance re: Same-sex Marriage (majority report) 2016*, Appendix A, p. 49. Retrieved December 31, 2020 from https://www.crcna.org/sites/default/files/same-sex_marriage.pdf

Grounds:

1. While some of the scholarship is sound in this report, some is contentious or requires additional analysis or supporting references while alternate credible Biblical and theological perspectives have been underemphasized or neglected.
2. Due to the sensitive nature of the topic and the close connection between one's gender and sexual identity and one's identity as God's image bearer, the teachings in this report may therefore be at risk for leading to harm in peoples' lives.

Recommendation C: We offer an amendment for recommendation C. While we believe this report may be worth considering at the local level as per recommendation C, we have offered a more robust suggestion for engagement in our second recommendation below (and particularly 2.a.iii) regarding a committee that would take this report into account as it curates or creates a collection of resources for engagement of human sexuality content from a balanced perspective, giving voice to both a traditional and fully affirming outlook.

Grounds:

1. We strongly support the use of listening circles and restorative practice theory (as per the Challenging Conversations toolkit) and heartily commend Pastor Church Resources for choosing a direction that fosters openness, vulnerability, humility and forbearance.
2. We recommend that this Challenging Conversations curriculum be seen as an insightful and helpful way to engage with parts of the needed dialogue but since a limited perspective is offered, we caution the risk of harm. People may mistakenly interpret this curriculum as addressing the full spectrum of Biblical and theological scholarship around human sexuality, and people may experience active exclusion because of its limitations.

Recommendation D: We strongly request that Synod not accede to recommendation D "that synod declare that the church's teaching on premarital sex, extramarital sex, adultery, polyamory, pornography, and homosexual sex already has confessional status."

Grounds:

1. Confessional status is a "weighty matter" and deeming this teaching as confessional status would cause widespread devastation in our denomination, including mandatory removal of many current office bearers and harm to LGBTQIA+ people and their loved ones.
2. Proposing that the teaching of this report already has confessional status is both erroneous and an overreach.

Recommendation E: We request that Synod not accede to recommendation E "that synod declare that Church Order Article 69-c is to be interpreted in the light of the biblical evidence laid out in this report" due to the aforementioned serious limitations of this report. We suggest that Church Order Article 69-c remain unchanged and not be bound by the teachings of this report.

Grounds: This report may be one of several useful resources to consult in challenging pastoral decisions, but it would be harmful and an overreach of this report to deem it as the primary lens for interpreting this church order article.

2. Create a plan of action to continue careful deliberation of the complex issues around human sexuality (particularly gender identity, same-sex orientation and same-sex marriage) and engagement with people affected by these issues

- a. We request that Synod 2021 create a second human sexuality committee to shepherd the CRCNA through continued careful deliberation and deep listening around these issues. This committee make-up should be devoted to Scriptural authority and pay careful attention to diversity in gender identity (including nonbinary gender identities), ethnicity, binationality, ministry location (including lay leaders and/or post-secondary students), age, and sexual identity and not be restricted to adherence to the 1973 Synod Report on homosexuality. It should contain people holding both traditional/non-affirming and fully affirming views. If possible, we also recommend that this committee have at minimum one member from the human sexuality committee reporting to Synod 2021 and one member that signed the majority report to Synod in 2016 to aid in continuity. We ask Synod 2021 to assign the following tasks to this committee¹⁷:
 - i. As an initial task, create a safe listening space for LGBTQIA+ people associated with the CRCNA to submit their concerns and stories of experiences in the church without fear of repercussion.
 - ii. As another initial task, survey the congregations and classes of the CRCNA to learn how they have (or have not) meaningfully included LGBTQIA+ people in response to the advice of Synod 2016, "That synod advise the classes and congregations to invite, as much as possible, the presence and involvement of same-sex attracted members when dealing with matters that affect the lives and discipleship of same-sex attracted members within the CRCNA" (*Acts of Synod 2016*, p.929) Information gathered may inform best practices for listening to LGBTQIA+ people and for local engagement around LGBTQIA+ issues. It may also demonstrate the distance we have yet to go in terms of meaningfully including LGBTQIA+ people in our midst.
 - iii. As another initial task, curate or create a collection of resources (listening circle curricula, restorative practices, readings, podcasts, videos, etc.) for engagement with LGBTQIA+ issues as individuals, congregations, and classes, perhaps through a collaboration with Pastor Church Resources. This collection should include a balance of both traditional and affirming Biblical and theological articulations around gender identity, same-sex orientation, and same-sex marriage and engage a Reformed worldview. This collection should also include many first-person stories from LGBTQIA+ people without editing them to fit

¹⁷ If Synod 2021 does not decide to adopt our recommendation of creating a second human sexuality committee for ongoing deliberation, we request that these tasks still be adopted by Synod 2021 and delegated to appropriate channels.

conclusions, but intended to help our members hear the complexities of Christian discernment about how to faithfully follow Jesus as sexual beings. It should also include stories of how LGBTQIA+ people have been harmed by the church.

- iv. After i, ii and iii, ongoing shepherding of CRCNA communities will be needed to foster the faithful, ongoing work of listening well to both Scripture and stories, of promoting unity amidst diversity, and of continually gathering feedback for future equipping. These may be tasks for this committee or come under the proposed role described in 'b' below. (It may also be helpful to consider ways to foster conversations at the classical level, or even between congregations from different classes, so that we can experience the diversity of deep convictions within the CRCNA as we engage with this complex conversation.)
 - v. Commission a follow-up survey to the 2014 survey done by the Calvin College Centre for Social Research to gather updated denominational data regarding perspectives on human sexuality issues including same-sex orientation, same-sex marriage and gender identity. If possible, include those who have left the CRCNA because of our denomination's posture towards LGBTQIA+ concerns, especially those who seek to be reconciled with a denomination whose decisions brought them pain or harm.
 - vi. After reviewing previous applicable reports regarding human sexuality (ie. at least 1973, 2016, 2020), discern whether additional work is worthwhile regarding the articulation of an affirming Biblical theology of human sexuality to provide information alongside the traditional Biblical theology espoused in the 2020 human sexuality report.
 - vii. Consider if synod would be well served by a new group of gender/sexual minority synodical advisors (parallel to ethnic and women advisors and young adult representatives). Since a similar overture was submitted but not accepted at Synod 2016, this committee could review the grounds of the 2016 decision, discern if there are new grounds for this request, and clarify any specifics related to who might fit on this advisory group.
 - viii. For a final task, help the CRCNA discern what level of agreement is needed around beliefs related to human sexuality going forward (especially same-sex orientation, same-sex marriage and gender identity). We believe that this 'level of agreement' is at the heart of the questions around confessional status. After ongoing careful deliberation and a renewed posture of deep listening with mutual trust, we hope this committee will be prepared to make prayerful recommendations to clarify our denominational level of agreement related to beliefs around human sexuality. If it is foreseen that some congregations, office bearers and members will not be satisfied with the level of agreement recommended, it may also be wise for this committee to discern and recommend ways to kindly and generously part ways with those whose convictions mean they must depart from the communion of the CRCNA.
- b. We request that Synod 2021 recommend the creation of a new role at a senior denominational level (like the Senior Leader for anti-racism) for promoting church dialogue, education and listening around LGBTQIA+ inclusivity. The COD would be

responsible for further clarification of this role once Synod has recommended it, and it would seem wise for the one holding this role to serve *ex officio* on the committee named above. There is an acute need for raising awareness of the harm that we, the church, have caused to our LGBTQIA+ family in order to foster lament, repentance, restoration and reconciliation with LGBTQIA+ people and each other.

- c. We request that Synod 2021 task Pastor Church Resources with creating a curriculum resource and training for LGBTQIA+ support groups that can be hosted at the local level.

Grounds:

1. Issues around human sexuality and any dialogue around changing confessional status are a “weighty matter that requires extended and careful deliberation” (*Acts of Synod 2016*, pp. 926-27; *Committee to Articulate a Foundation-laying Biblical Theology of Human Sexuality Report 2020*, p. 3). Additional study and listening to supplement the work of the current human sexuality committee is needed.
2. We suggest it is time for renewed listening and rebuilding of mutual trust within the denomination-- to recognize the sincerity of the CRCNA community of believers and the deep engagement with Scripture of so many, even when we end up with different conclusions and convictions.
3. As per the *Rules for Synodical Procedure 2017*, which indicate that for “young adult representatives, the pool of selection will, at least in part, depend on recommendations received from the churches and classes” (p.5; *Acts of Synod 2014*, p. 537; *2015*, p. 673). Our cross-campus student response team would be happy to assist synod in finding LGBTQIA+ young adult representatives who hold a variety of Biblical perspectives (traditional and affirming).
4. Our history since 1973 has shown our difficulty in loving our LGBTQIA+ family well. If we want to truly include them and actively listen to them, we need to take formal actions to support their voices while we continue to engage deeply with these issues. Pastoral guidance has not been enough.

3. Prioritize the unity of the body of Christ in the CRCNA by delegating the issue of same-sex marriage as a decision of local conscience (while actively studying the fruit of this decision to inform further dialogue).

Grounds:

1. In order to continue careful deliberation of the full breadth and complexity of the issues of human sexuality including the multiple Biblical perspectives, there will necessarily be a delay in providing ethical and clear pastoral, ecclesial and missional guidance. During this delay, local congregations should be trusted to make decisions around LGBTQIA+ participation and same-sex marriage. Individuals ought not to bear the brunt of institutional delay.
2. The option of local conscience is in keeping with historical CRCNA precedent in addressing issues in which more than one credible and sincere interpretation of Scripture is possible (as exemplified by female ordination).

3. Gathering additional information on the fruit of local interactions with the LGBTQIA+ community will aid our continued careful deliberation on human sexuality issues at the denominational level.

Signatories:

The following post-secondary students from across the USA and Canada are signatories for this overture.

CRCNA Members

NAME	CRCNA CONGREGATION	SCHOOL
Andrews, Jessica	The Road CRC, Calgary, AB (Classis Alberta South and Saskatchewan)	Knox College, University of Toronto
Beck, Renya	Jubilee Fellowship CRC, St. Catharines, ON (Classis Niagara)	Redeemer University
Bouman, Abigail	Neland Ave. CRC, Grand Rapids, MI (Classis Grand Rapids East)	Seattle Pacific University
Bouma, Emily	River Park CRC, Calgary, AB (Classis Alberta South and Saskatchewan)	The King's University
Bonsma, Ben	Jubilee Fellowship CRC, St. Catharines, ON (Classis Niagara)	Redeemer University
Bonsma-Fisher, Madeleine	First CRC Toronto, ON (Classis Toronto)	University of Toronto
de Boer, Shayanne	Redeemer CRC, Sarnia, ON (Classis Chatham)	University of Western Ontario
Clemens, Jonathan	First CRC Toronto, ON (Classis Toronto)	Wycliffe College, University of Toronto
DeJager, Catherine	Washington DC CRC (Classis Hackensack)	Calvin University
Elgersma, Kat	First CRC of Denver (Classis Rocky Mountain)	Augustana University (Sioux Falls, SD)
Klompaker, Kirsten	Jubilee Fellowship CRC, St. Catharines, ON (Classis Niagara)	Redeemer University
Krale, Lauren	CrossPoint CRC, Brampton, ON (Classis Toronto)	Redeemer University
Lise, Nathan	Holland Marsh CRC, Newmarket,	Redeemer University

	ON (Classis Toronto)	
Overbeek, Nicholas	Calvin CRC, Grand Rapids, MI (Classis Grand Rapids East)	Grand Valley State University
Roseboom, Michelle	Terrace CRC, Terrace, BC (Classis B.C. North-West)	The King's University
Schat, Kyra	First Hamilton CRC, Hamilton, ON (Classis Hamilton)	Redeemer University
Tuit, Samuel	Neland Ave. CRC, Grand Rapids, MI (Classis Grand Rapids East)	Calvin University
Jodi VanWingerden	Neland Ave. CRC, Grand Rapids, MI (Classis Grand Rapids East)	Calvin Theological Seminary
Tolsma, Theoren	Fleetwood CRC, Surrey, BC (Classis B.C. South-East)	Institute for Christian Studies

Non-CRCNA Members

NAME	SCHOOL
De Martinez, Brandon	Calvin University
Ford, Maggie	Redeemer University
Murashima, Claire	Calvin University
Newton, Jo	Calvin University
Ross Barz	Trinity Christian College
Salamun, Sean	Calvin University
Van Arragon, Emma	The King's University
Young, Justus	Calvin University