

5. Smithville's arrears of \$339.00 cover the increase of \$1.00 per comm. member for 1970.  
Whereas the Church of Lincoln became independant as of Sept. 1st, 1970, the contributions for both Churches are paid up by Smithville. As of January 1st, 1971 the Church of Lincoln will be assessed separately.
6. Received from Winnipeg cheque for \$165.73, dated December 31st, 1970 and deposited in January, 1971.



## SUPPLEMENT X — (Acts, Art. 94)

March 18, 1971

To the General Synod 1971.  
Dear Brethren,

The **COMMITTEE FOR CONTACT WITH THE CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH** submits the following report on their activities.

### A. MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Your predecessor, the Synod of Orangeville 1968 appointed the brethren M. Kampen, F. Kouwenhoven, M. Van Beveren, D. VanderBoom, and G. VanDooren.

It pleased the Lord to take away the Reverend F. Kouwenhoven.

The Reverend M. Van Beveren accepted a call to the Church at Coaldale, Alberta, and as a result, was no longer able to take part in the activities of the Committee.

The Committee decided to invite the Reverend VanOene to assist the Committee, which he has done, and we request your Assembly to approve this action of the Committee.

### B. MEETINGS

Due to the demise of the Reverend Kouwenhoven, the departure of the Reverend Van Beveren, and illness of the Reverend Van Dooren the work of the Committee has been greatly hampered, so that there was a larger gap than we desired.

The Committee met on January 23, 1969, at which meeting the mandate, given by the Synod Orangeville, 1968 was discussed.

On January 24, 1969 a meeting was held with the Contact Committee of the Christian Reformed Church and on that occasion our mandate was explained to them.

On February 11, 1969 a Communication was sent to the Christian Reformed Committee, of which Communication we enclose a copy. In this Communication our mandate was explained further and reference was made to the Appeal of 1963.

No more meetings were held till April 2, 1970.

In a letter, dated March 25, 1970 your Committee explained to the Christian Reformed Committee why we were not able to meet at an earlier date: the reasons are given in the first paragraph of this section.

A meeting was held on April 2, 1970. This was a meeting with the Christian Reformed Committee. Orally the reasons for the postponement of a meeting were given, and it appeared that the Christian Reformed Committee fully understood our handicap in this respect.

On May 12, 1970 your Committee held another meeting, where we discussed the matters dealt with at the combined meeting of April 2. At

this meeting it was decided to send another Communication to the Christian Reformed Committee, containing our reaction to statements made by them at the above mentioned meeting. Copy of this Communication is enclosed.

On November 18, 1970 your Committee met again. Oral information from the Christian Reformed Committee revealed that they wished to speak about the above mentioned Communication, sent by us; but we came to the conclusion that it would make little sense, unless something new could be discussed, e.g. if something could be reported from the findings of their Standing Committee on Inter-Church Relations. It was decided to inform the Christian Reformed Committee accordingly.

On March 9, 1971 your Committee met again. No word had been received from the Christian Reformed Committee since our meeting of April 2, 1970, nor have we received any copy of the Acts of the Christian Reformed Synod of 1970.

### **C. DIFFICULTIES**

We deem it necessary to point out some of the difficulties which we encounter in this respect.

The Christian Reformed Committee was unable to speak about the matters pertaining to the correspondence with the Synodical Churches in the Netherlands, since that matter had been entrusted to their Standing Committee on Inter-Church Relations. We have repeatedly offered to assist in clarifying the situation in the Netherlands, but all the Contact Committee could do, was to pass on this offer to the Inter-Church Relations Committee. However, we have not heard from the latter Committee and the Contact Committee has no authority in this respect.

Since we have not received the Acts of the Christian Reformed Synod 1970, we are unable to speak about the findings of the Inter-Church Relations Committee.

Another difficulty is that the Christian Reformed Committee has to have its report ready by the middle of March of each year. Thus a meeting e.g. in April, can influence only a report to a Synod of the next year, but it will have been overtaken already by the decision of the previous Synod. Since we did not learn of any decision by the Christian Reformed Synod of 1970, we could not bring to the fore any new material which might have served in the report of the Christian Reformed Committee to their Synod 1971.

We deemed it necessary to inform you of the above difficulties, lest the Canadian Reformed Churches be accused of more or less obstructing any progress in the discussions.

### **D. MANDATE**

The Acts of the Synod of Orangeville 1968, Art. 134, contain the mandate which was given to this Committee. Re this Mandate we report the following:

- ad. 1. This Committee has informed the Christian Reformed Committee of the decisions of Synod 1968 and has submitted the advisory report to them.
- ad. 2. This Committee has complied with point 2, as may be learned from the Communication dated February 11, 1969.
- ad. 3. The substance, alluded to in the "three questions" was dealt with by the Christian Reformed Synod 1969, which Synod acknowledged that the Synods of 1946, 1949, and 1950 did make "judgment-by-implication."
- ad. 4. Apart from the difficulty that the matter of correspondence has been given to the Inter-Church Relations Committee, there is the difficulty mentioned under C, third paragraph. Yet, discussions with

the Contact Committee did take place, as may be learned from our Communication, further to the meeting of April 2, 1970.

- ad. 5. Your Committee has been diligent in discussing these matters, but has not received any further information from the Christian Reformed Committee. Apparently, that Committee has to wait for further Synodical decisions upon report by the Inter-Church Relations Committee.
- ad. 6. Since little progress was made and few reactions were received, this Committee did not have much to report to the Churches. Once a Press Release was published.
- ad. 7. This Committee has received the Acts of Synod 1969, and could not find any evidence of "official changes in the Christian Reformed Church" apart from the admission that "judgment-by-implication" was made by the Synods 1946, 1949, 1950, of which change this Committee took grateful note.
- ad. 8. The report is herewith respectfully submitted to Synod.

#### **E. OBSERVATIONS**

The following observations are made.

1. The Christian Reformed Church has not refused to discuss the matter of correspondence.
2. This was the main thrust of the mandate received by the Committee.
3. Due to various circumstances, mentioned above, the discussion of correspondence and the rules for same has not been concluded so that a clear picture could be obtained.

#### **F. CONSIDERATIONS**

1. The whole matter of discussions with the Christian Reformed Church was originated by the Canadian Reformed Churches.
2. The desire to bring the Christian Reformed Church back, so that eventually unity might be achieved was the driving force behind our Appeal 1963 and subsequent actions.
3. There is still the possibility to drive the point home, for the sake of the Christian Reformed Church, with which we did have correspondence in so far as we were members of the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland, until the Christian Reformed Church decided that no correspondence should be continued with the liberated Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland.
4. We should, therefore, not leave off right now, even though it seems that little has been achieved during the last year, and we shall have to continue until the Christian Reformed Church listens or -- which we hope not -- until it becomes evident that the Christian Reformed Church refuses to listen.

#### **G. RECOMMENDATION**

Our recommendation is:

That Synod continue the Committee in Contact with the Christian Reformed Church with the mandate to discuss the matter of Church Correspondence with the Synodical Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland, until the position of the Christian Reformed Church has become clear.

Respectfully submitted, The Committee

M. Kampen  
D. VanderBoom  
G. VanDooren  
W. W. J. VanOene

COMMITTEE FOR CONTACT WITH THE  
CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH

(appointed by General Synod  
Orangeville 1968)

Secretary: M. Van Beveren  
350 St. David St. South  
Fergus, Ont.

February 11th, 1969.

The Contact Committee with the  
Canadian Reformed Churches,  
c/o The Rev. Mr. P. M. Jonker,  
Brampton, Ont.

Esteemed Brethren:

In fulfilling the promise of our previous meeting and acting in accordance with points 2 and 3 of our mandate given by Synod 1968, we respectfully submit to you the following materials for discussion.

1. In their Appeal to the Christian Reformed Church (1963) our Churches stated, in its first part, the reasons for the separate existence of the Canadian Reformed Churches (page 1). In other words: if these reasons had not existed, the Canadian Reformed Churches would not have been instituted.

The brethren are kindly requested to keep this in mind when they hear us refer to "the main obstacle" or a *conditio sine qua non*.

The 'reasons' mentioned in the Appeal 1963 are:

- a. a deviation "from the truly Reformed character of the church both in doctrine and in church government" in the (syn.) Gereformeerde Kerken.
- b. as a result of what we mentioned sub a.: an unscriptural, hierarchical 'removal' of office bearers and members from the church, even of whole churches.
- c. the "duty" of the Christian Reformed Church "to examine" the issues "and to investigate". This duty was an "obligation which the Christian Reformed Church had taken upon herself of her own free will" (see page 1; also our Report to Synod 1968, page 27 sub 1, and your answer, page 29 bottom; these rules for correspondence were reaffirmed in 1944, see Acts Synod Christian Reformed Church, Suppl. 21, page 361, sub 1, and passim).
- d. "the Christian Reformed Church has not kept her promise and has not been faithful to the agreement made." (page 2), which is "evident from her subsequent official actions and decisions" (cf Appeal 1963, pages 2-4; also our Report, page 13, 3 questions (!), and page 27/8 sub 2, with conclusions (1) - (4)).
- e. Appeal 1963, page 5, said, "We ask you most urgently, and hope and pray that you as yet will reconsider your stand in the matter of Church correspondence, according to the promise given when you adopted the above mentioned rules for the said correspondence". This urgent appeal has not been heeded by the Christian Reformed Church up till the present day (cf the answer of your Synod 1968 to a similar request and appeal from the Vrijgemaakte Gereformeerde Kerken).

2. Ever since the 'conflict' in the Netherlands in 1944 the Christian Reformed Church took an ambiguous attitude to this conflict and its result (two opposing Church groups).

On the one hand she repeatedly refused to act upon the request mentioned sub 1, as it came to her from the Vrijgemaakte Kerken and also from her own membership (of our Report, page 27 sub 2), saying that "it is not in our province to sit in judgment over these churches" (Synod 1950) — although it was 'in her province' on the strength of the rules for correspondence; on the other hand she continued to maintain the correspondence with the majority that had deposed the minority as though nothing had happened. At the same time the minority was looked upon as a new Church ("still in its infancy", Synod 1949).

Furthermore, by her refusal 'to sit in judgment', the Christian Reformed Church did sit in judgment indeed by declaring in 1949 that the changes in the Synodical Churches "do not warrant a change in our relation". The honest meaning of these words can only be:

- a. we have stated certain changes;
- b. we have examined them;
- c. we came to the conclusion that they do not constitute an essential change in ecclesiastical conduct.  
Appeal 1963 rightly stated that the Christian Reformed Church "approved of the decisions and actions of the Netherlands churches", page 4.

3. Our mandate now is to urgently ask that the Christian Reformed Church finally remove this ambiguity and fulfil her own promise, on which she insisted when the rules for correspondence were formulated.

We suggest that the Christian Reformed Church give attention to the following issues:

- a. Was it not an essential change when what was intended as (part of) a formula of compromise in 1905 was turned into a weapon of discipline and even 'removal'?
- b. Were the hierarchical actions in 1944 etc., as later legalized in a new 'Kerkorde', not an essential change in Reformed Church Government? The Christian Reformed Church herself has realized this when declining to follow the Dutch example in her own new Church Order (cf Report, page 28, question 3).

4. We expect the remark, "But all this has happened so long ago! Does not Scripture say, 'The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father', Ezek. 18:20?". Indeed, personal responsibility is stressed here. But Scripture also says, "I will visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children" in case these children walk in the footsteps of their parents. (N.B. Please understand these references as an illustration, and do not take offence at the word 'iniquity').

Up till the present day the 'children' of 1968 took a similar decision as their 'parents' in 1946 ff. The Christian Reformed Synod 1968 refused to deal with the matters urgently submitted by the Vrijgemaakte Kerken in their letter of May 7th, 1968. The answer was almost literally a repetition of the synodical decision of 1946, which stated that "it is not in our province to sit in judgment . . .". In reality, however, a verdict was pronounced by entertaining correspondence with the synodical Gereformeerde Kerken.

5. In addition, we must point out that the synodical Churches since 1944 pursued their unreformed course previously taken, as our 'colleagues' in the Netherlands indicated in their letter of May 7, 1968 to the Christian Reformed Church; in this letter Deputies urge the Christian Reformed Church "to reject what is against the Word of God" and point to a growing Bible criticism in said Churches. The Christian Reformed Church can no longer stay aloof of the changes in her Dutch sister-churches. We mention here only a few instances:

- the decision of Assen 1926 in defence of Scripture is removed.
- decision in principle: no objections against joining W.C.C.C.
- women admitted to special offices in Church.
- the New Church Order, giving hierarchical power to synods.
- professors in official, ecclesiastical positions who openly attack the doctrine of infallibility of the Bible, are not disciplined.
- the Reformed foundation under the Free University removed.

The Christian Reformed Church, which we assume wants to honour her obligations (rules for correspondence), cannot act as though these things do not exist and happen. In 1944 the Christian Reformed Church still agreed with the 'fathers' of 1898, who considered as one of the main aims of church correspondence the necessity "om alle vreemde bestanddelen in de onderscheiden Gereformeerde Kerken onzer dagen uit te zuiveren en om de gezonde richting allerwege te bevorderen" (cf our Report, page 27).

6. We are convinced that we must also repeat our question, Report, page 29 sub 8: Do the brethren not agree that it is quite impossible for the Christian Reformed Church, with such strict rules for sister-relationship, to establish 'full correspondence as sister churches' with two churches in a foreign country which are not only separated from one another but contest each other as to being the faithful continuance of the previously undivided churches?

7. When we, according to our mandate, urge you, brethren, to urge your next Synod to honour its commitments as described above, we want to stress that this be done, not in the first place or exclusively for the sake of the Canadian Reformed Churches, which came into being because of the attitude of the Christian Reformed Church, but for the sake of the Christian Reformed Church herself first and foremost (cf Report, page 29 sub 9). We gratefully took note of your information that many among your membership are concerned about the development of one of their sister churches. We do not conceive our mandate in such a way that we have to 'rush' either you as Committee or your Synod. On the contrary, we are willing to take our time to discuss all these important aspects in a brotherly way and under the direction, not of any ecclesiastical decision on our part but of the Word of God, as we together confess it in the Creeds and heed it in reformed Church governments.

8. We have good reason to be optimistic. Your Committee has already assured us (cf Report, page 31): "If we e.g. would ENTER into relationship with a Church, we would certainly discuss these matters FIRST". Is it not true that the contact between our committees which has resulted in the removal of the obstacles a, b and d mentioned in the mandate of the Edmonton Synod 1965, leaves but one remaining point of discussion, viz. that of church correspondence, which is directly related to what your Committee called "entering into relationship"? It is our strong desire and hope that you will be able to convince your Synod that she should express the same willingness. This would give us hope that, under the blessing of the LORD, the (re)main(ing) obstacle may also be removed.

With brotherly greetings,  
on behalf of the Committee,  
(M. Van Beveren)

**COMMITTEE FOR CONTACT WITH  
THE CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH**  
c/o 350 St. David St. South,  
FERGUS, Ontario.

The Contact Committee with the  
Canadian Reformed Churches  
c/o The Rev. Mr. P. M. Jonker,  
Brampton, Ontario.

Esteemed Brethren,

Further to our combined meeting, held on April 2, 1970, we held a meeting of our own Committee, in which we discussed the various points which were part of the dealings in our combined meeting. We also considered what we were to do further. We have come to the following conclusions.

1. With all due respect for the interpretation which Rev. Vos gave of the decision of Synod 1969, Acts Art. 76, IV, B 4 (namely "to urge the Canadian Reformed Churches to consider establishing correspondence with the 'Gereformeerde Kerken' (Synodical)", we must inform you that we have not been convinced by his initially so gladly listened to explanation. On the contrary, from the official documents we have not been able to draw the conclusion to which he came.

Even if the intention of Synod's decision were to urge us to start writing letters to the (Synodical) Churches in order to obtain evidence with which we might help the Christian Reformed Church to arrive at the conclusion which we see as being its duty, we must repeat what was already said at our combined meeting, that in our opinion that would be a wrong motive to start a "correspondence". The purpose of such "correspondence" would be: to obtain evidence which would be used against the person or body providing it through the correspondence. We cannot believe that such was, indeed, the intention of Synod 1969.

Besides, correspondence means to us much more than an exchange of letters. Later on in this letter we shall elaborate on this further.

Scrutiny and perusal of the relevant decisions of Synod 1969 led us to believe that this Synod meant, indeed, that the Canadian Reformed Churches should establish a correspondence in the "normal" sense with the (Synodical) Churches in the Netherlands.

In Acts 1969, Art. 76, IV, B sub 3, Synod states,

"Synod takes grateful note of the changed attitude of the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodical) toward the 'Gereformeerde Kerken' (Liberated) by repealing their decision against them and offering their sincere apologies to them."

We draw your attention also to the fact that "Gereformeerde Kerken" when used of the Liberated Churches is provided with quotation marks.

After having thus stated that there is a remarkable change, after having characterized what was done as "offering their sincere apologies" Synod 1969 continues sub 4,

"Synod instructs its Contact Committee with the Canadian Reformed Churches to urge the Canadian Reformed Churches to consider establishing correspondence with the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodical) IN THE LIGHT OF THE CHANGED ATTITUDE OF THE LATTER (emphasis ours) and to verify whether the changes in the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodical) (Agenda, page 219) represent a deviation from true Reformed faith and polity."

We cannot but see the words which we emphasized as a repetition of And we can draw no other conclusion than that Synod 1969 did

the "changed attitude" of which Synod took grateful note sub 3. exactly the opposite of what we see as the only safe course for the Christian Reformed Church. We are convinced that FOR HER OWN SAKE the Christian Reformed Church should discontinue the correspondence with the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodical). But Synod 1969 refused even to discuss that, although as a Committee you recommended that the Inter-Church Relations Committee investigate the changes in official decisions (Your report, Acts 1969, page 353), and, to put it bluntly, gave us a slap in the face and said, in fact, "You suggest that we break off the correspondence, but due to the changes we have noted with gratitude, you had better establish correspondence!"

2. The under 1 mentioned conclusion to which we were compelled to come, is supported by the experience of the Inter-Church Relations Committee. This Committee reported to Synod 1969, Acts 1969, page 458,

"Gereformeerde Kerken (Art. 31) addressed correspondence to our committee last year, making charges against the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodale). Our Committee recommended that these charges be brought to the attention of the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodale). However, synod decided that we should not follow that course of action. Synod's decision was communicated to the Deputies for Correspondence of the Gereformeerde Kerken (Art. 31)."

Although we take grateful note of the decision of Synod 1969 to instruct the Inter-Church Relations Committee "to consider whether any of the changes which have occurred in the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodical) would warrant a change in our relationship to these Churches," we note that Synod 1969 refrained from mentioning the correspondence with the Liberated Churches as one of the sources from which the Inter-Church Relations Committee might receive some help in the fulfilment of its task.

We also note that there is a strong indication that Synod 1969 did not refer to the changes during the years 1942 and following, but only to more recent changes, which are a fruit of the deviation during these years, namely those mentioned under V, B, 3: Extent of Biblical Authority, Women in Office, Attitude toward World Council of Churches, "Revised Church Order and its alleged hierarchical character," Acts 1969, page 53.

That is not what you recommended by implication in your report to Synod 1969, and it also darkens our joy about the admission of Synod 1969 that previous synods did make a judgment-by-implication, for now we must come to the conclusion that that judgment-by-implication still stands, that it is not even subject to discussion. What is going to be investigated is whether subsequent changes warrant a change in relationship.

Thus we come to the conclusion that Synod 1969 continued in the line of Synod 1968, Acts, page 95,

"That Synod do not authorize our Inter-Church Relations Committee to convey the criticism of the Gereformeerde Kerken, Art. 31, to the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodaal) as set forth in the official letter from the Deputies for Correspondence with Foreign Churches appointed by the General Synod of these Churches held at Amersfoort, 1967:

#### Grounds:

- a. This request of our committee is not consistent with the intention of the Gereformeerde Kerken, Art. 31, which is an exhortation that the Christian Reformed Church 'still is being called to judge both the Liberation and the development since then' and 'we believe that you have to take these matters seriously and that you have to take a firm stand.'



- b. It is not fitting nor right that we should convey judgments held by one Christian church against another Christian church. Our committee might be better advised to kindly counsel the Gereformeerde Kerken, Art. 31."

However, brethren, if it appears constantly that the synods decide contrary to the recommendations of the committees, and more especially your Committee, and when the gain which we together have made in our combined meetings is thus ignored and set aside, then we start asking ourselves how we can proceed with contact and discussions in keeping with our mandate received in 1968.

This, as you are well aware, is no threat, no blackmail, or any of that sort. We are bound by our mandate as you are by yours.

If we misunderstood the various decisions of your synods, please convince us of it. And kindly request your forthcoming synod to speak more clearly, so that it can not be misunderstood, at least not by someone who is willing to understand. We are.

3. We also request you to convey to the Inter-Church Relations Committee the information that we are willing to provide material which may help that Committee fulfil its mandate, although we do not consider ourselves to belong to the number of "other competent men who address themselves to other changes in the Gereformeerde Kerken (Synodical)." If the Inter-Church Relations Committee deems it advisable to avail itself of our help, we are most willing to give it, upon their request.

4. We have been discussing the question what we could do further to fulfil our mandate. But we have come to the conclusion that, for the time being, we can do little else than wait for the decisions of your forthcoming synod. We have complied with points 1, 2 and 3 of our mandate, Synod Orangeville 1968, Art. 134, VIII, and cannot do more than that which we have already mentioned above.

5. We wish to make it clear that, for us Church correspondence is more than just an exchange of letters. For us it is not just a formal relationship but it is the relationship as sister-Churches. We know only one form of correspondence and have nothing in between correspondence and no-correspondence. For us correspondence is: being one in faith; if we should be in the same country, we would not exist separately as two groups but would form one Confederation. To us it would be unthinkable to have correspondence with another group in the same country without being one with them.

That's why we bring the matter of correspondence to the fore. That was also the relationship which the Christian Reformed Church had with the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland before the Second World War.

What we are concerned about is not what happens in the Synodical Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland.

What we are concerned about is not correspondence which the Christian Reformed Church has with "a Church" somewhere in the world.

But what we are concerned about is: the influences which, via the correspondence with those particular Netherlands Churches, have entered and are entering the Christian Reformed Church.

If we had nothing to do with the Christian Reformed Church, and if we did not care what happens with her and within her, we might have never bothered you.

But the contact which we have sought and the Appeal which we sent you in 1963 and our subsequent actions were the fulfilment of a promise made when the Canadian Reformed Churches were instituted and when their first major assembly was held.

Humanly speaking, if the Christian Reformed Church had judged correctly and openly, and not wrongly and by implication, there would have been no Canadian Reformed Churches.

Fulfilling a promise made many years ago we have contacted you and we ask, "Is there a possibility that the Christian Reformed Church changes its attitude? Is there a possibility that the injustice is undone and that at least those obstacles are taken away? Are you willing to reconsider that?"

If the answer should be negative — and the above quoted synodical decisions are not very suited to give us much hope of a positive answer — then we have no other course of action left to us but to conclude that the judgment-by-implication has become an express judgment and that we still stand condemned.

We hope that we have succeeded in making clear to you once more why we have to speak about that correspondence: it has occasioned the institution of the Canadian Reformed Churches and it still is the gate through which many impurities enter the Christian Reformed Church. We wish to see that gate closed for your sakes, and also in order that our contact can be continued and — we hope — bear rich fruit.

6. There is a growing uneasiness among our membership about the influences of which we spoke above. Although we understand that an applause, given to a speaker, may be no more than an act of politeness and does not necessarily imply approval of what he said, we also wish to state that the reaction to the address by Dr. D. Van Swigchem to Synod 1969 was not very helpful in allaying that uneasiness. In his address Dr. Van Swigchem promoted the modernistic view of the Holy Scriptures, the Inspired Word of God, and undermined their very authority, Acts 1969, page 478 ff.

The fears of our membership can be taken away only by a firm "NO" to present-day ecumenism, to the new theology, to the false pluri-formity, and whatever else there may be.

Brethren, do whatever you can to open the eyes of the Christian Reformed Church for those dangers. It IS not just the point of a "formal correspondence" which we bring to the fore time and again; the future of the Christian Reformed Church is at stake.

And we are not ALLOWED to advise our synods into the direction of a union unless we have guarantees that the dangers are seen, are fought, and that the sources from which they might enter, are stopped.

With brotherly greetings,  
The Committee for Contact with the  
Christian Reformed Church,

M. Kampen  
D. VanderBoom  
G. VanDooren  
W. W. J. VanOene