

# The Clerk's Report

2023 Mtg at Synod — Marion, IN  
June 20-23, 2023 @ IWU

Dear Fathers & Brethren,

As usual, “the time is short” for presbytery business at this year’s synod. The following communications are available on our presbytery website (<https://glgpresbytery.org/2022-meeting-at-synod-marion>), along with various other relevant documents.

23-14: Complaint to Synod (Kuehner v. GLGP) *transmitted to synod*

23-15: Complaint to Synod (Allison v. GLGP) *returned to author*

**23-16: Complaint to GLGP (Allison v. Southfield) *hearing on Fri 6/23***

**23-17: Complaint to GLGP (Allison v. Southfield) *hearing on Fri 6/23***

23-18: Communication to AIC re: GLG 23-16/17 (Southfield Session) *received by AIC*

**23-19: Petition to GLGP proposing a standing finance comte (J. Hart) *slotted for Tue 6/20***

23-20: Petition to GLGP requesting Hetherton visitation comte (B. Dage) *comte appointed*

23-21: Petition to Synod re: RPWA lawsuit (Orlando Session) *transmitted to synod*

23-22: Complaint to Synod (Allison v. GLGP) *transmitted to synod*

23-23: Complaint to Synod (Allison v. GLGP) *transmitted to synod*

23-24: Complaint to Synod (Enas v. GLGP) *transmitted to synod*

23-25: Communication to GLGP re: K. Borg (MWP) *received by clerk*

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That presbytery appoint the following parliamentarians (6/20-23): J. Odom, F. Smith, P. Pockras (alt), S. Rhoda (alt).
2. That presbytery adopt the proposed agenda for its meetings on June 20 and June 23.
3. That presbytery refer GLG 23-25 to the Borg Resolution Committee to seek clarification from the Midwest Presbytery regarding the precise nature of its concerns,<sup>1</sup> and report back at the next full meeting of presbytery.
4. That presbytery adopt the 2023 GLGP report to synod.<sup>2</sup>
5. That presbytery grant all RPCNA elders present the privilege of the floor during the remainder of this meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Adam Kuehner, Clerk

---

<sup>1</sup> In particular, the MWP’s communication could be interpreted as implying that our direct interactions with Mr. Borg up to this point have been inappropriate. It should be noted that Mr. Borg himself initiated direct formal contact with the GLGP by way of multiple communications regarding his involvement in the PPP (23-11A, 23-11B, 23-12), along with a request to address the court on the floor via Zoom during our spring meeting. The GLGP’s appointment of a committee to contact the MWP, the Winchester Session, and Mr. Borg himself, came as a response to Mr. Borg’s own initiation of direct formal contact with our presbytery. Moreover, Mr. Borg took the liberty of filing a complaint (23-1) and a charge of sin (23-3A, 23-3B) directly with the GLGP without any mediation by the MWP. It remains unclear why Mr. Borg would be free to contact the GLGP directly, while the GLGP would not be free to respond directly. Of course, GLG 23-25 may simply be urging us not to contact Mr. Borg *moving forward*. Perhaps the Borg Resolution Committee will be able to obtain further clarification regarding the MWP’s intent in sending this communication, so as to help us better understand and honor their request.

<sup>2</sup> Available online: [https://glgpresbytery.org/uploads/2023-at-synod/2023 GLGP Report to Synod.pdf](https://glgpresbytery.org/uploads/2023-at-synod/2023%20GLGP%20Report%20to%20Synod.pdf)