

Appeal of Mr. Darrell DeVries

April 10, 2021

Synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches in America
to convene on June 8, 2021
in Georgetown PRC, Hudsonville, Michigan

I, Darrell DeVries, am appealing to synod that Classis West, Redlands/Peace March 3, 2021, erred in not sustaining my protest to Classis West, March 3, 2021. This is shown in the attached material of the minutes of Classis West, March 3, 2021, Article 29. My protest to Classis West, March 3, 2021 is also included in attached material.

Note for clarity, there seems to be a misunderstanding or two in Classis West on the matter of protest and appeal. The thinking of Classis West is that I skipped a step. To be clear, I did not skip a step. When my consistory, not the clerk, but my consistory, considered the matter to be complete in writing to me, I took their word and made appeal to Classis West. I did not skip a step. My consistory forced me to appeal to Classis West. Now I am accused of not following Church Order of the Green Book. That is why in my protest to Classis West March 3, 2021, I asked the Classis to help my consistory. The other grievance was that I added material. I did not add material. I addressed Classis West and not my consistory on the material that was already laid before them. I did not bring more sermons or any new material. I only tried to show Classis West why my consistory was not clear. As they contradict themselves from one sentence to the next. I followed both the Church Order and the Green Book. Classis West's continual insistence that I do not understand the necessary function of the three forms of unity in the process of protest and appeal is unfounded. My first protest to my consistory was based on Scripture alone. When my consistory would not accept the first protest because I did not include confessions, I did include the confessions in my second protest. I then included confessions in my appeal to Classis West and my protest to Classis West. So to say that I do not understand the confessions is false. In my second protest to my consistory and my appeal to Classis West and protest to Classis West I did include the confessions and how my consistory is going against them.

Darrell De Vries

Protest to Classis West on March 3, 2021
Redlands, California
Darrell DeVries

March 3, 2021

Classes West,
Redlands, CA

I am informing the Classis that I am protesting the decision of Classis West, September 23, 2020, Article 19.

I will respond to Article 19, and everything I write will be considered grounds.

A. 1. My appeal: I am appealing to Classis on whether my consistory is correct in stating in response to my protest, May 5, 2020, which is: It is clear to the consistory that your position on the sermon in question is not in agreement with Scripture or the confessions. That was my appeal.

A. 2. I had talked to Rev. Brummel multiple times about several sermons before I protested. I met alone and also either once or twice with my wife there. I did not just jump to a conclusion that his thinking was in error on this one sermon. I just do not see the need to build a huge case against a minister. Why can we not say what we mean and mean what we say? That is why my appeal to Classis was not against my minister. It was whether or not my consistory rightly judged.

A. 3. I did protest, and in that protest I only included Scripture. Now my question is, did anyone in my consistory or in Classis West carefully read through those Scriptures? My consistory informed me I had to bring confessions and not just Scripture.

A. 4. The further material was to the consistory, that what Rev. Brummel said was also against the confessions. By the grace of God I hope and pray to always start with Scripture and then move to the confessions. Not the other way around. My consistory now states, page 26 of appeal, "we now consider this matter to be completed. It is clear to the consistory that your position on the sermon in question is not in agreement with Scripture or the confessions." I will point out here that when my consistory said we now consider this matter to be complete, I took that they meant that.

A. 5. I took my consistory at their word, that they considered the matter complete. Hence my appeal. The Green Book is quoted farther down in Article 19. I understand the Green Book and a protest. I hope to deal with that later, the Lord willing. For now I will say if I go to a minister multiple times and tell him what he is saying is wrong. I proceed to protest a sermon of the minister, and my consistory does

not uphold my protest and tells me in a written letter they consider this matter to be completed. The next logical step is to appeal to Classis. It would not be to disrespect my consistory's decision. We will hopefully deal with that when we get there.

A. 6. I was told by Classis West's clerk that I needed to give my material submitted to Classis also to my consistory. I was not told a time line in which I had to give to my consistory a certain amount of time before Classis. I finished on a Friday night and printed on a Saturday morning. I took one copy to my consistory clerk, Mr. Wayne DeJong. I then drove the other copy to the Classis West clerk in Doon, Rev. Engelsma. On 08/23/20 I was asked to remove pages 13, 14, and 15, to which I agreed to remove part of page 14 and page 15. Now Calvary PRC consistory informs Classis that portions of the appeal have never been treated by consistory. That would be because the appeal was written to the men of Classis West and not the Calvary PRC consistory. The Calvary PRC consistory considered the matter to be complete. The appeal was written to show Classis West that when on page 26 the Calvary PRC says, "we pray that you will see that clarity and can move forward in agreement with this decision." When you as a consistory have contradictions from one sentence to the next sentence. That is not added material. That is me showing Classis West that my consistory is not clear, and there is no way that I will be in agreement with a decision that makes no sense. That all being said, it is now past the hour of 10 on January 12, 2021. I have now waited months for my consistory to respond. They have not responded in any fashion or form to my appeal. Now they have had four months in which I have heard nothing. Now I come close to the deadline again. Now if you cry wolf again.

I look ahead to B, 1. They have had enough time, four months, to respond.

B. 1. I was told, as stated above, that it had to be to my consistory as well as Classis. I finished it the night before and gave to my consistory before the clerk of Classis.

B. 2. This is where, if you have an appeal that is not legal as you state and voted it to be upheld. Then you go into the appeal that you said was not legal and lift sentences out as grounds. How is that not putting illegal material as grounds to declare the actual appeal not legal? How does that make sense?

B. 2a. Article 30, page 26. My consistory, "we now consider this matter to be complete."

Article 31. This Article is against you as a Classis. As is the decision pertaining to Article 31. If anyone complain that he has been

wronged by the decision of a minor assembly, he shall have the right to appeal to a major ecclesiastical assembly, etc. I complain that I was wronged by a decision of a minor assembly, my consistory. That comes from Article 29: "Three kinds of ecclesiastical assemblies shall be maintained, the consistory, the classis, and the general synod." I then took Article 31 that says I have the right to appeal to a major ecclesiastical assembly. To which I did. I do not read in Article 31 that I cannot explain to Classis why I am appealing. Also now the minor assembly was not clear (my consistory). I do not consider it to be right or in good order to have Classis judge a decision of my consistory on a protest to my consistory without an explanation to Classis in my appeal.

B. 2a, 1) My consistory on May 5, 2020: "consider this matter to be complete." As stated above, you tell me later that I am supposed to be humble and respectful. Therefore with respect to my consistory I took their word and wrote an appeal to Classis. I do not think it respectful to protest a decision my consistory has just made, that makes no sense. I protested a sermon and my consistory did not uphold my protest. Then I am supposed to go right back to my consistory that considered the matter complete? My appeal was an appeal under Article 31. Had it been a protest to my consistory decision, it would have been directed to my consistory and would have been written a lot different. Contrary to your belief, it was written to the men of Classis West, and I do agree with my consistory that the matter was complete at that level.

B. 2a, 2) This is most interesting. You have to read what is written. I did exactly what is written. Even more. I went to my minister multiple times. I then took my wife. My minister then preached the sermon he did. I talked to my minister in the narthex after the sermon was preached. I would not talk about the sermon. I told my minister if I say anything about the sermon it will be in the way of a protest. Which I did. That would be pages 1-27 of the appeal. I did exactly what it says I have to. I did not skip my consistory and go to Classis. I protested to my consistory until they considered the matter complete. I did not introduce anything new. I gave Classis everything I had received and hid nothing. I then gave 27 pages of protest and the rest to Classis for clarity to Classis on how my consistory was not clear. They literally contradicted themselves from one sentence to the next. This was not added new material or something new as you claim. I am following Article 31. That was in regard to page 107 in regards to page 112.

Green Book

B. 1. Gave a copy of the protest with supporting documentation.
B. 2. This was also given to Classis.

B. 3. What you consider added material is my brief explanation of the reason for appealing and/or a brief summary of the case for Classis' benefit. What I wrote that was not the protest to my consistory was my explanation and summary of appealing. This was not added material as you say. May I remind you again that my consistory now considered this matter complete.

B. 4. I will reference you to Appeal, page 29: "I am appealing to Classis on whether my consistory is correct in stating in response to my protest, May 5, 2020. Which is: It is clear to the consistory that your position on the sermon in question is not in agreement with Scripture nor the confessions."

B. 2b, 1) When I write for lack of time and patience on my part, I am choosing purposefully not to bring in Acts of Synod 2015-2020. That does not mean, as you say, that I did not research and interact with the decisions of the recent PRCA synods. In fact, the very opposite is true. I have researched and interacted with decisions of recent synods. I would love to discuss what was said on the floor of synods in the past years. We can discuss the speech of Professor Cammenga on the floor of Synod 2016. Can we research or interact with the synod that came out one year and told us to go back a year and take a page out of the Acts of Synod the year before? My minister leans heavy on 2018-2019. I think the synods the last five years have not been all that clear. To interact with 2018-2019 can you explain this? Appeal page 1, if I, Darrell obey the Ten Commandments, then I get God's blessing? This was in support of Rev. Brummel's statement in a sermon: "obedience is the way of God's blessing." That is what he was saying in his sermon, he said yes, and what allows him to say this is Synod 2018-2019.

B. 2b, 2) This is most interesting, "though perhaps intended especially for the making of overtures." That might be because it is in the overture section and not in any of the appeal sections. For the sake of argument, that is fine if you want to pull something out of overtures and put it into appeals. Mind you, we are dealing with a sentence from above: "now for the lack of time and patience on my part, I am choosing purposefully not to bring in Acts of Synod 2015-2020" that you as a Classis declared "not legally before it" in B. 2. So if you want to apply something to overtures to appeals that is fine.

Are you, Classis West, telling me that Synod 2018-2019 says obedience is the way of God's blessing if, I, Darrell, obey the Ten Command-

ments then, I get God's blessings? Is that what Synod 2018-2019 said? I understand my consistory to say this is indeed what 2018-2019 said. Hence my appeal to Classis to judge on whether my consistory is correct.

My next question is this, when someone says, "Are we seeking the grace and Holy Spirit that are available to us, day by day?" Is that what synod in the last five years is saying? There is a regeneration grace and then there is a grace that is available to us? If that is what the synod in the last five years have said, can you tell me where? If not, can you tell me where the synod in the last five years have not said that?

B. 2c, 1) The Classis now goes into material that in B, 2 they declared not legally before classes. They took from the illegal material two sentences that I wrote. It appears to me that you took offense that I compared the three forms of unity to a nerf gun as compared to Scripture. Does anyone remember the 416 Rigby? The 416 Rigby was Scripture. I will grant you this, that if you lift a couple of sentences of an appeal or protest where I compare the confessions to a nerf gun without showing that in actuality I was comparing the confessions to Scripture. I could see that you could draw the conclusion that I despise and consider the confessions unimportant. If you leave out the fact that I was comparing them to Scripture. I can assure you that I do not despise or consider the confessions unimportant.

Now if you have a serious discussion about your faith with a Reformed, Christian Reformed, United Reformed, Netherlands Reformed, or a Heritage Reformed person you will inevitably end up at common grace. They will have three or four Bible verses that can be easily refuted and then they will turn to the confessions. They will say the confessions teach common grace, when the Bible only teaches one grace of God that cannot be split. I realize with Hoeksema that the confessions do not teach the splitting of the grace of God. Yet they can more easily be interpreted to say that, the Bible cannot.

I will give you another example. Someone who wants to split the grace of God into a grace of regeneration and an available grace might use Heidelberg Catechism Lord's Day 45 as his defense to split the grace of God. When Scripture clearly teaches that you cannot split the grace of God. Freely given in and through Christ alone. The difference between a nerf gun and a 416 Rigby.

Sin and Grace, Henry Danhof and Herman Hoeksema, page 23. "First of all, therefore, they directed their attack against the so-called harsh statements of the supralapsarians, such as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, Piscator, Perkins, Ursinus, Trigland, Gomarus, and others." Page 24: "It did this in spite of the fact that the majority were infralapsarians and representatives of moderate reformed theology, that some of the

foreign delegates stood closer to Arminius than to Gomarus....”

Page 25: “We must accept the Canons of Dordt as orthodox. In the Canons is found not the maximum, but the minimum of the Reformed doctrine of predestination.” Then we skip to the bottom of the page: “The lifeline that is cast out to the person through the preaching of the Word, if it is to save him, must be grasped by his own strength, and he must persevere in clinging to it to the very end. His ability to do all this lies in what is retained by the sinner after the fall. Thus the doctrine of God’s free grace is made dependent upon the individual’s free will. Salvation depends upon the whim of the sinner, and therefore on less than a cobweb.” I have another 15 pages marked through the book that I would like to quote. For brevity I will leave off and encourage you to read.

The “Declaration of Principles,” written by Rev. Hoeksema, adopted by Synod 1951.

H. A. “That election, which is the unconditional and unchangeable decree of God to redeem in Christ a certain number of persons is the sole cause and fountain of all our salvation, whence flow all the gifts of grace, including faith.”

He then quotes Canons of Dordt I, A, 6, 7; Heidelberg Catechism XXI, 54; and also the Form for the Administration of Baptism.

This was a man writing against men who were trying to twist the confessions. Now notice the wording is an unconditional and unchangeable decree of God to redeem in Christ. Christ is the sole cause and fountain of all our salvation. This includes the whole part of sanctification, all the blessings we receive from God. To enforce the thought, he says the gifts of grace, including faith. The gifts of grace, which have to include God’s blessings, are not given because of our obedience. You have the opposite of what this says. You have with the Calvary consistory, obedience is the way of God’s blessing. If I, Darrell DeVries, obey the Ten Commandments (that would be your condition) then I get God’s blessing. That was taken directly off of page 1 of my protest to my consistory. It was also as I have marked page 1 of my appeal to Classis West, 09/23/2020.

B, 1. “That all the covenant blessings are for the elect alone.”

B, 2. “That God’s promise is unconditionally for them only, for God cannot promise what was not objectively merited by Christ.” Notice here that it is again not a condition, also that God cannot promise what was not objectively merited by Christ. It is merited by Christ, not by you doing the law. Your only merit is in Christ. There is no merit in the law other than that Christ has fulfilled the law.

B, 3. “Little infants surely cannot fulfill any conditions. And if the promise of God is for them, the promise is infallible and unconditional and therefore only for the elect.” Rev. Hoeksema then quotes a lot of

confessions. If you try to use the infant argument or someone who is mentally handicapped as an example, most in the PRC will say those are special cases. Rev. Hoeksema states the opposite. He uses these cases to show that you can do nothing. Not in any part of your salvation, including sanctification.

II. C. "That faith is not a prerequisite or condition unto salvation, but a gift of God and a God-given instrument whereby we appropriate salvation in Christ. Faith is the gift of God whereby we appropriate salvation in Christ." Not in the way of obedience, or if I obey the Ten Commandments.

Salvation and all of salvation is by the gift of God, faith, in and through Christ.

III. B, 2 "The sure promise of God which He realizes in us as rational and moral creatures not only makes it impossible that we should not bring forth fruits of thankfulness, but also confronts us with the obligation of love, to walk in a new and holy life, and constantly to watch unto prayer."

The sure promise of God, the sure promise of God. Everything comes out of that sure promise of God, I AM. Not in the way of our obedience. Article 19, B, C, 2. My protest included confessional grounds, pages 7-12. My protest included what my consistory called a voluminous amount of Scripture, pages 1-4. The Scripture was what I started with. With almost all the Scripture I wrote an explanation. My consistory's complaint on page 5 is that I did not give a detailed explanation. My explanation was sufficient to tell how the Scriptures were against what my consistory was saying. I followed the rules of synod for a protest to my consistory (Green Church Order Book, p. 112). I also followed the rules of appeals to Classis as well as the advice of the clerk of Classis West.

Now "understood is that a Reformed assembly cannot deliberate a matter in which an appellant refuses to acknowledge the authority of the Reformed confessions." I did not refuse to acknowledge the authority of the confessions. I compared the confessions to Scripture. The confessions being a nerf gun, not very strong. Weak as compared to Scripture. In *Sin and Grace*, as quoted above, the confessions are mostly infra and are a "minimum and not the maximum of what it is to be Reformed." Neither did I despise them or consider them unimportant. I have used them in my protest to my consistory, in my appeal to Classis, and now in my protest to Classis. As the "Declaration of Principles" are cited.

Now if my consistory wants to use the confessions to say obedience is the way of God's blessing, If I, Darrell DeVries, obey the Ten Commandments then I get God's blessing, then I do not consider them any

different than the men that Rev. Hoeksema wrote the "Declaration of Principles" against. Now to say the confessions are weak is to say that they are not strong enough to refute being twisted into something they do not say. Either today or in the days of Hoeksema or before. You could also look at my response: "I would say that is an infra thinking and at best weak. Nerf gun." Directed squarely at my consistory and their infra thinking and their interpretation of Canons V, 5 as weak. In all honesty it was probably both. I was probably upset with the fact it was not written stronger and the fact that my consistory was trying to make it say what they are trying to push.

Much the same as someone who uses Lord's Day 45 to see salvation from two points of view, and then somehow thinks he can split grace into a grace of regeneration and a grace that God holds out to man for him to just grab. Which he would call available grace.

The smallest particle that a man's eye can see without magnification I believe is dust. You sit in your chair on a Sunday afternoon and a child or grandchild comes running through the living room. Then if the sun's rays are shining through the window you will see all the dust particles. When you look closely you will see in the sunlight the particles are different size. Then those particles settle together on the piano or shelf, and when there is enough of them together they show up as dust. Now if it is something that one dust particle wrote such as myself or something a collective amount of dust particles wrote. As compared to the infallible Word of God, the I AM, Logos, Christ, the Word, anything compared to Scripture is weak.

If you do not understand that, one of two things is true, or both. You either do not understand who man is or you do not understand who God is.

I am a baptized member of a PRC church. I made confession of faith under Rev. Key. Have had seven children and have taken the baptism vow as a parent as many times. I take all quite seriously.

I have talked to my minister multiple times. I then protested twice to my consistory. After that my consistory considered the matter to be both clear and complete. My consistory also stated that it was clear that my position on the sermon in question was not in agreement with Scripture or the confessions. From May 5, 2020.

On 09/23/2020 I appealed to Classis. I am appealing to Classis on whether my consistory is correct in stating in response to my protest, May 5, 2020, which is, it is clear to the consistory that your position on the sermon in question is not in agreement with Scripture or the confessions. To which the Classis responded that the material was not legal before them and not done at the consistory level. Then the Classis proceeded to

go into the material that they themselves had ruled as illegal. Took what they said was illegally before them and used it as the grounds to declare it not legally before them. Out of the illegal material before Classis they used my not dealing with the last five years of synods and what they considered my lack of respect of the confessions as grounds to declare not legally before them.

It has now been four months since last Classis and I have not heard anything from my consistory in regards to my two protests to them or my appeal to Classis. They may have taken the advice of one delegate that claimed they didn't have to answer me because I was so misguided on my view of the confessions or other things. He didn't elaborate.

So now, as stated above, we have 7 baptisms and one confession of faith. I have a consistory accusing me of going against all, since I am against both Scripture and the confessions.

At this point I would hope it to be quite clear on the grounds of why I protest the decision of Classis West, 09/23/20, Article 19. My question for Classis is this. As I understand, you do. Do you agree with my consistory that Scripture, the confessions, and the past 5+ years of synod state: obedience is the way of God's blessings? If I, Darrell, obey the Ten Commandments, then I get God's blessings.

I will ask the Classis to deal with the protest to Classis, the appeal to Classis, and the two protests to my consistory which are all legally before them with regards to both the Church Order and the Green Book.

If you as a Classis decide once again to put the matter back as not being finished in minor assemblies, Church Order, 30, to the consistory, Church Order, 29, I will ask you two things. If you do so, do not use what you declare as illegal as grounds to make what you declare illegal. That is not good order. The second is this, if you do not want to deal with me as I have brought an appeal and two protests to my consistory all legally before them and you, now also a protest to the Classis, please advise my consistory on what to do as they seem a bit confused in the last four months. Isaiah 40 and Romans 9. Both of these texts explain who man is. Who man is compared to God. What man can do in regards to all parts of his salvation including sanctification, even the righteousness which is of faith. The works of the law, for they stumbled at that stumbling stone. But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings as eagles. They shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint.

In Article 7, the Belgic Confession declares that only the "divine Scriptures" are the "infallible rule" that establishes what the church believes and teaches.

Darrell DeVries

Classis West Minutes—March 4, 2021

Art. 29. Committee 3 presents its advice regarding the protest of Mr. Darrell De Vries (Supplement #15).

A. Information:

1. History of the case prior and up to September Classis 2020.
 - a. On November 24, 2019, Rev. Brummel said in a sermon on Haggai 2:6-9, "Obedience is the way of God's blessing" (Agenda, p. 118).
 - b. Mr. DeVries presented a protest of this statement to his consistory dated December 22, 2019 (Agenda, pp. 118-121). In a letter dated February 6, 2020, the consistory informed Mr. De Vries that they did not receive his sermon protest as legally before it (Agenda, pp. 122-123).
 - c. Mr. DeVries presented further material to the consistory in a letter dated February 20, 2020 (Agenda, pp. 124-140). The consistory responded on May 5, 2020, providing Mr. DeVries with their decision and grounds not to sustain his sermon protest (Agenda, pp. 141-143).
 - d. Instead of protesting the consistory's decision, Mr. DeVries appealed to Classis West to judge "whether my consistory is correct in stating in response to my protest...It is clear to the consistory that [Mr. De Vries'] position on the sermon in question is not in agreement with scripture nor the confessions" (Agenda, pp. 113-117).
 - e. At the September 2020 meeting of Classis, a letter was received from Calvary PRC consistory in response to Mr. DeVries' appeal (Art. 19 B.1). In that letter they informed Classis that portions of the appeal and additional material that went into the agenda (Agenda, pp. 144-224) had never been treated by the consistory.
2. September Classis 2020 declared the appeal of Mr. DeVries not legally before it, with the following grounds:
 - a. The requirements of Articles 30 and 31 of the Church Order have not been met.
 - 1) Mr. DeVries brought an objection to a sermon, and when his consistory answered that objection on May 5, 2020 he brought the matter immediately to Classis rather than protesting the decision to his consistory. His appeal essentially consists of a protest to his consistory's decision in which he introduces new material that the consistory has not treated. Therefore, this matter is not finished at the consistory level.

2) The Rules of Synod for protests state, "One who objects to an action of his consistory, therefore, may not begin by bringing that objection to Classis. He must protest to his consistory" (Green Church Order Book, p. 107). The Rules of Synod for appeals state, "Nothing new may be introduced. The already existing protest is the appellant's case" (Green Church Order Book, p. 112).

b. The requirement of Art. 46 of the Church Order has not been met.

1) Mr. DeVries does not research and interact with the decisions of recent PRCA synods that may touch on this matter. He states, "Now for lack of time and patience on my part, I am choosing purposefully not to bring in Acts of Synod 15-20..." (Agenda, p. 8).

2) The Rules of Synod for appeals state, "The stipulation of Article 46, requiring the reading of previous pertinent synodical decisions, though perhaps intended especially for the making of overtures, applies also to matters of appeal" (Green Church Order Book, p. 110).

c. Mr. DeVries gives evidence that he does not understand the necessary function of the Three Forms of Unity in the process of protest and appeal.

1) When his consistory appeals to the confessions in support of their decision, Mr. DeVries responds by openly disparaging the confessions. When his consistory makes reference to Canons 5.5, he responds, "I would say that is an infra thinking and at best weak. Nerf gun." Later he writes, "You hand me a nerf gun and tell me to go kill a lion. The nerf gun being the three forms of unity and the lion being the heresy or error that has crept into the church. That nerf gun is not going to do much" (Agenda, p. 5).

2) The Rules of Synod for protests state that protests must include "Confessional and biblical grounds for the objection" (Green Church Order Book, p. 112). Understood is that a Reformed assembly cannot deliberate a matter in which an appellant refuses to acknowledge the authority of the Reformed confessions. Prof. Hanks writes in a chapter entitled, "Bringing Matters to the Assemblies" in his *Believers' Manual for Church Order*: "The confessions are statements by the church in the past which contain what the church believes to be the truth of Scripture. These confessions are not to be despised or considered unimportant" (p. 20).

3. Mr. DeVries protests the decision of September Classis 2020 to declare his appeal illegal, with the following main points: 6 of 11

- a. The consistory's response to him was "we now consider this matter to be completed" (Agenda, p. 142).
- b. Mr. DeVries states that he has introduced new material "because the appeal was written to the men of Classis West and not the Calvary PRC consistory" (Agenda, p. 106).
- c. Mr. DeVries says that he has researched and interacted with decisions of recent synods, and that "the synods the last five years have not been all that clear" (Agenda, p. 108). Mr. DeVries asks what it means to interact with the decisions of previous synods.
- d. Regarding the confessions, Mr. DeVries writes, "I did not refuse to acknowledge the authority of the confessions. I compared the confessions to Scripture. The confessions being a nerf gun, not very strong. Weak as compared to Scripture" (Agenda, p. 111).
- e. Mr. DeVries states, "It has now been four months since last Classis and I have not heard anything from my consistory in regards to my two protests to them or my appeal to Classis."

B. Recommendations:

1. That Classis declare the protest of Mr. Darrell DeVries to be legally before it. Ground: The requirements of Articles 30 and 31 of the Church Order have been satisfied. Carried.
2. That Classis not sustain the protest of Mr. DeVries.

Ground: Mr. DeVries failed to prove that the September 2020 Classis erred when it declared his appeal not to be legally before it.

a. Mr. DeVries fails to demonstrate that the requirement of Art. 30 had been satisfied.

1) Mr. DeVries lodged a protest against Rev. Brummel's sermon on February 20, 2020 (Agenda, p. 124). Calvary's consistory responded by not sustaining Mr. DeVries' protest (May 5, 2020). Although Mr. DeVries protested the sermon, he did not protest Calvary consistory's May 5 decision not to uphold him. Because he did not protest his consistory's decision, the matter is not finished on the consistory level.

2) Mr. DeVries introduced new material. He says he did this because his appeal was to Classis West, and not to Calvary's consistory. But the fact remains that he added new material, which violates the Rules of Synod: "Nothing new may be introduced. The already existing

protest is the appellant's case" (Green Church Order Book, p. 112).

b. Mr. DeVries does not prove that the requirement of Art. 46 had been satisfied.

1) Mr. DeVries says that he has researched and interacted with decisions of recent synods, but his appeal to the Sept. 2020 Classis did not give evidence of interaction with the decisions of "recent PRCA synods that may touch on this matter" (Sept. 2020 Classis, Art. 19 B. 2. b. 1)).

2) Although he states that the decisions of synods in the last five years have not been very clear, he still had to interact with the decisions, which he did not do.

c. Mr. DeVries gives no evidence that he understood the necessary function of the Three Forms of Unity in the process of protest and appeal.

1) Regarding the confessions, Mr. DeVries writes, "I did not refuse to acknowledge the authority of the confessions. I compared the confessions to Scripture. The confessions being a nerf gun, not very strong. Weak as compared to Scripture" (Agenda, p. 111).

2) When Mr. DeVries identifies the confessions as a "nerf gun," "not very strong," and "weak as compared to Scripture," he shows that he did, indeed, minimize the confessions, and thus did not understand the necessary function of the Three Forms of Unity in the process of protest and appeal. Carried.

Appeal of Mr. Samuel Vasquez

March 9, 2021

Synod of the Protestant Reformed Churches
to convene June 8, 2021
in Georgetown PRC, Hudsonville, Michigan

Dear Brethren,

Greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. I hereby protest against the decisions of the meeting of Classis West and Appeal to Synod 2021 to be convened on June 8, 2021. I am aggrieved by the recommendations and decisions of Classis West not to sustain my appeal on all four points contained therein. It is my position that I have been wronged by this ecclesiastical body and have a right to appeal to a major ecclesiastical assembly. According to Article 31 of the Church Order "whatever