

REPAIR THE TEAR

THE WINDSOR REPORT
AN ASSESSMENT AND CALL FOR ACTION



ANGLICAN MAINSTREAM—UK
and
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
EVANGELICAL COUNCIL



REPAIR THE TEAR

THE WINDSOR REPORT
AN ASSESSMENT AND CALL FOR ACTION



a response from

ANGLICAN MAINSTREAM—UK
and
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
EVANGELICAL COUNCIL

PUBLISHED BY ANGLICAN MAINSTREAM—UK
AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND EVANGELICAL COUNCIL

Acknowledgements

We are deeply grateful for the work of Drs Andrew Goddard, Christopher Sugden and Peter Walker whom we commissioned to provide the initial draft of this booklet. They have given unstintingly of their time and effort as it has passed through successive versions. Responsibility for the final text lies, of course, with Anglican Mainstream UK and CEEC.

All references to The Windsor Report (TWR) are from the printed text *The Lambeth Commission on Communion: The Windsor Report 2004*, published by The Anglican Communion Office, London, UK

Copyright © Anglican Mainstream UK and CEEC.

ISBN: 1-904889-25-5

First Impression November 2004

Typesetting and design by The Good Book Company, Elm House, 37 Elm Road, New Malden, Surrey, KT3 3HB

Printed in the UK

CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
INTRODUCTION.....	9
The Origins of the Commission.....	9
The Commission’s Mandate.....	10
The Commission’s upholding of Lambeth Resolution (I.10).....	11
The Structure and Aims of TWR.....	12
A COMMUNION – IN SICKNESS AND IN HEALTH.....	13
A Healthy Communion: summary of §1-§22.....	13
A Healthy Communion: Comments.....	14
<i>Holiness and Inter-dependence within the Body.....</i>	<i>15</i>
Symptoms of the Communion’s Current Illness: Summary of §23-§30.....	16
Symptoms of the Communion’s Current Illness: Comments.....	17
<i>‘Dissension’ in the face of schismatic acts.....</i>	<i>17</i>
Deeper Diagnosis of the Communion’s Illness: Summary of §31-§42.....	18
Deeper Diagnosis of the Communion’s Illness: Comments.....	19
<i>An under-prescription for a partial diagnosis?.....</i>	<i>19</i>
B BUILDING BLOCKS FOR LIFE IN COMMUNION.....	21
The Nature and Bonds of Communion: Summary of §43-§70.....	22
The Nature and Bonds of Communion: Comments.....	23
<i>The Authority of Scripture, and of Bishops.....</i>	<i>24</i>
Unity in Diversity: Summary of §71-§96.....	24
Unity in Diversity: Comments.....	25
<i>Autonomy and adiaphora.....</i>	<i>25</i>
C RE-FORMING THE STRUCTURES.....	27
Our Future Life Together: Summary of §97-§120.....	27
Our Future Life Together: Comments.....	29
<i>Instruments of Unity: the Covenant.....</i>	<i>29</i>

D PICKING UP THE PIECES	31
The Maintenance of Communion: Summary of §121-§123	31
The Maintenance of Communion: Comments	31
Elections to the Episcopate: Summary of §124-§135	32
Elections to the Episcopate: Comments	33
<i>Repenting and Regretting</i>	33
<i>Consenters and Consecrators</i>	34
<i>Consecration and Ordinations</i>	35
Public Rites of Blessing: Summary of §136-§146.	36
Public Rites of Blessing: Comments	37
<i>Maintaining the faith</i>	37
On care of dissenting groups: Summary of §147-§155.	38
On care of dissenting groups: Comments	39
<i>No moral equivalence</i>	40
<i>DEPO: bishops' authority questioned, then retained</i>	41
<i>Following through its own logic</i>	42
<i>Cat and mouse.</i>	43
The Report's Conclusion: Summary of §156-§157	44
The Report's Conclusion: Comments	44
CONCLUSION	47
Call to the Primates	48
APPENDIX: DELEGATED EPISCOPAL PASTORAL OVERSIGHT	51
A: Perspective on DEPO from the Anglican Network in Canada	51
1. Examples of hostile action by the Bishop:	52
2. Genuine Jurisdiction required for security.	53
3. Koinonia	55
4. Continuing the Agenda	55
B. Reaction to DEPO from the United States	57
Examples of Failed DEPO.	57
C. Harassment of a Bishop by a Province	58
Website resources	62
Anglican Mainstream	63
Church of England Evangelical Council (CEEC).	64

FOREWORD

*The Most Reverend Drexel Gomez
Archbishop of the West Indies*

I am happy to commend this thorough assessment of the Windsor Report because it combines a call for decisive action with space for adequate reflection in a skilful way.

This assessment has a measured tone and treats the Report as a whole, taking careful note of some of its own very careful and precise wording. It has the virtue of being essentially sympathetic to the prescribed purposes of the Windsor Report whilst not being afraid to offer appropriate criticisms of it. And, when it does offer such criticisms, it does so by appealing either to further evidence (of which the Commission may have been unaware) or to certain inconsistencies within the Report itself (drawing out more fully the implications of that which the Report has earlier stated). In so doing, it reveals well the real purpose of the Report and the overall direction of its recommendations—something which bodes well for those who combine a love of orthodox Christian teaching with a deep concern for the unity of the body of Christ.

I commend this assessment most warmly to my fellow Primates as we seek to reflect on the Windsor Report within our provinces, and to all bishops and others within the Anglican Communion as we seek to give an informed, thoughtful and prayerful response.



+Drexel Bahamas
Advent 2004

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

We share with the authors of the Windsor Report a vision of a worldwide Anglican Communion committed to mission and unity.

We offer in this booklet a succinct summary and assessment of the Windsor Report. In the light of this we call for certain actions by the Primates when they meet in February in order that the “tear in the fabric” of the Communion may be repaired – an outcome we strongly desire.

We identify a great deal in the Report which is to be warmly welcomed—especially in its positive and unambiguous vision of Anglicanism—not as a culturally-determined liberal Protestant sect, but as both evangelical and catholic in the best senses of those terms.

In particular, we commend the report’s:

- Linking of unity and communion to both mission and holiness
- Emphasis on the supreme authority of Scripture
- Critique of views of autonomy in terms of independence and its emphasis instead on interdependence and mutuality
- Understanding that the Archbishop of the Canterbury does have a real authority—to call whom he wishes to councils
- Clear desire to strengthen the Communion through repairing the ‘tear in our fabric’ and renewing our commitment to one another.

We also welcome the Report’s willingness to:

- speak honestly about the seriousness of recent actions and the ensuing crisis
- attribute responsibility for it to ECUSA and New Westminster and
- find a way for us to ‘walk together’ by laying out a ‘path of reconciliation’ based on repentance and forgiveness and requiring a moratorium on further actions.

In each of these three areas, however, we have also identified some concerns that the Report is in places weakened in achieving its ends by

- some ambiguities in its wording (leading to incompatible interpretations being offered—even by members of the Commission)
- analysis that is insufficiently thorough
- and practical recommendations that are inconsistent or inadequate.

In particular, we draw attention to:

- The fact that the deeper problems underlying our current sickness stem from a departure in some form from Scripture.
- The lack of clarity about how ‘regret’ relates to ‘repentance’ and how it is to be expressed
- The reticence to provide a theological analysis in terms of sin and a remedy in terms of discipline
- The flawed analysis and critique of those who have intervened in order to protect

the orthodox in other provinces

- The uncritical acceptance of DEPO within ECUSA, which does not question the full authority within their dioceses of those very bishops whose standing in the Communion has earlier been called into question by the Commission.

We therefore call on the Primates to follow through the Report's own logic and internal dynamic in order to strengthen its recommendations.

In particular, we call on the Primates in February to:

- Welcome and affirm the vision of life in Communion set out in the Report and explore fully its proposals for the Instruments of Unity.
- Reaffirm clearly and defend the Anglican teaching on sexuality as expressed in Lambeth I.10.
- Ensure that the ongoing listening and sharing of perspectives that is necessary in all pastoral care is not seen to undermine the status of Lambeth I.10 within the Communion.
- Confirm that statements of 'regret' must signify the 'repentance' necessary for true reconciliation and so include a commitment not to repeat the actions.
- Confirm that emergency intervention to provide pastoral care and oversight of orthodox parishes and dioceses is theologically and ecclesologically justified.
- Provide a structure so that genuinely adequate episcopal oversight can be provided, one which is not dependent on those whom the majority of Anglicans believe have departed from the 'Christian faith as we have received it'.
- Assess, in a clear and limited timescale, whether the actions taken by ECUSA in response to the Report are sufficient to enable them to remain in the Communion and so be in conformity with their own Constitution and canons.
- Assess, in a clear and limited timescale, whether the actions taken by New Westminster in response to the Report are sufficient to enable them to remain in the Communion.
- Assess, in a clear and limited timescale, whether the Primates' own request for adequate episcopal oversight for loyal Anglicans in provinces or dioceses with revisionist leadership has been met.
- Identify those who remain committed to 'walking apart' and establish processes by which it is clear they have done so.
- Use their enhanced responsibility to implement sanctions against those committed to 'walking apart', including requesting the Archbishop of Canterbury not to invite them to Communion councils.
- Define and clarify the "exceptional circumstances and conditions" under which the Archbishop of Canterbury in the words of the mandate to the Lambeth Commission might exercise an "extraordinary ministry of episcopate .. with regard to the internal affairs of a province other than his own for the sake of maintaining communion."
- Recognise, support fully and seek to protect all those who clearly signal their compliance with Windsor's recommendations especially in the case of legal action against them.

INTRODUCTION

I. In the face of a Communion apparently heading for self-destruction and in a very short timeframe, the Lambeth Commission, a geographically and theologically diverse group of Anglicans, has produced a remarkable report. *The Windsor Report* (TWR) is a theologically substantial document with clear and strong judgements on the current crisis (despite the potentially misleading and subsequently misused disclaimer by Archbishop Eames in the Preface that it is “not a judgement”). TWR offers a definite and distinctive Anglican vision of Christian life and discipleship in communion; a diagnosis of the current sickness which has afflicted the Anglican Communion; and some remedies for that sickness. In this booklet we offer our assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of TWR’s analysis and central arguments and identify the actions which now need to be taken to remedy the ills which TWR has found. In our view the situation calls for urgent action and we hope this booklet will assist Anglicans around the world as they give responses in advance of February’s crucial Primates’ Meeting. It will be at that meeting that decisive action on TWR’s recommendations needs to be taken.

The Origins of the Commission

2. TWR originated at the Emergency Primates’ Meeting at Lambeth Palace on October 15th and 16th 2003. This meeting was in response to decisions in parts of the Communion since the Primates’ Meeting in May 2003: the authorization and subsequent use of a public Rite of Blessing for same-sex unions in New Westminster Diocese (Canada); and the decisions of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in America (ECUSA) both to recognise such rites as “within the bonds of our common life” and also to confirm the election as bishop of New Hampshire of Gene Robinson (a man living in such a union).

3. These developments were part of a long and hotly contested process within these two member churches of the Anglican Communion. It was in 1977 that the first openly gay or lesbian person was ordained priest in ECUSA. Several more were subsequently ordained—despite a 1979 General Convention resolution opposing such ordinations. Church services of blessing had also been increasingly reported since the early 1970s (§23). Indeed New Westminster’s Diocesan Synod had first called for authorisation of a Rite of Blessing five years earlier back in 1998 (§137).

4. Though neither sudden nor unexpected, these actions were clearly contrary to the mind of the Anglican Communion. In 1998 the Lambeth Conference reaffirmed traditional biblical teaching on sexuality in Resolution I.10.¹ The Conference’s statement “rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture” was for some a controversial late amendment to the original resolution from the study group. That amendment, however, was carried by a ratio of 2:1; and the original resolution itself had clearly stated that it “cannot advise the legitimizing or ordaining of those involved in same gender unions”. The vote on the final resolution was overwhelmingly in favour (by 526 to 70 with 45 abstentions). This resolution has subsequently been reaffirmed; indeed “the Primates unanimously upheld the resolution as the standard of Anglican teaching on the matter in their statement of October 16th, 2003” (§25).

¹ It is important to realise that, though never as clearly expressed in relation to homosexuality, earlier Lambeth Conferences (the ten-yearly gathering of bishops from across the Anglican Communion) stated traditional Christian teaching about sex and marriage.

5. The origin of TWR, therefore, *did not lie in any confusion about the actual content of Anglican teaching*. Rather, in the words of Canon Gregory Cameron (the Commission's Secretary), it arose because of the need to address such questions as this: "Given the standard of teaching adopted on human sexuality at the Lambeth Conference 1998, how could the Communion maintain the 'highest degree of communion possible' in the face of the consecration of a bishop whose lifestyle challenged that teaching?"²

6. So TWR, despite the claims of some, is *not* about establishing a framework for continuing the conversation on the issue of sexuality—as though there were no clear position on this established in the Anglican Communion. Rather, taking the current teaching of the Communion as given, it seeks to re-establish the ordered relationships of the Communion so that such a conversation can be held within the *already agreed* doctrinal and structural arrangements of the Anglican Communion. For that to happen, ECUSA and New Westminster must comply with the requirements of TWR.

The Commission's Mandate

7. In order to understand and evaluate TWR fairly it is important to be clear what the Commission *was* and *was not* asked to do. Its terms of reference (set out in the Mandate from the Archbishop of Canterbury) expressly limited TWR's scope and powers.

8. The Commission had no powers of its own to *act* in response to recent events. It was to *report* to the Archbishop with 'practical recommendations' in order to help prepare for the 'ensuing meetings of the Primates and the Anglican Consultative Council'.

9. The Commission's report was to be on "the legal and theological implications flowing from the decisions" of ECUSA and New Westminster. It was, therefore, to examine the *implications* within the life of the Communion of these decisions that had already been taken. It was not to focus attention on their legal and theological *foundations* or *validity*. It was particularly asked to examine "the canonical understandings of communion, impaired and broken communion, and the ways in which provinces of the Anglican Communion may relate to one another in situations where the ecclesiastical authorities of one province feel unable to maintain the fullness of communion with another part of the Anglican Communion".

10. The Commission's recommendations were also given a clear *goal*: "maintaining the highest degree of communion, that may be possible in the circumstances resulting from these decisions, both within and between the churches of the Anglican Communion". It was, therefore, to *make the very best it could of the difficult situation* created by the decisions taken and to 'maintain' as much as possible of existing patterns of communion. Finally, it was asked for recommendations (based on a different 1998 Lambeth Resolution) about a possible *extraordinary ministry by the Archbishop of Canterbury*.³

II. This mandate clearly meant that the Commission was *never intended* to address matters of sexual ethics. TWR emphasises this fact (e.g. §26, §43). More importantly, it presupposes that Anglican teaching has been truly expressed in Lambeth I.10. As one member has written since the publication of TWR:

The main reason the Lambeth Commission was asked to talk about communion life and structures (rather than about sex) was because there would have been no point in doing the latter. The Lambeth Conference 1998 had already reaffirmed the church's stance on the subject. ... All four Instruments of Unity had already

² 'The Jury's out' in *New Directions* (Oct 2004), 20. www.forwardinfaith.com/news/pages/nd.pdf

³ There are no explicit recommendations on this in TWR and no signs of further recommendations being planned. It is, presumably, a matter that would be addressed by the proposed Council of Advice to the Archbishop.

*spoken; what more could the Commission have said? If they do not hear Lambeth and the Primates, neither will they be convinced even if Robin Eames were to rise up and repeat it all.*⁴

The Commission's upholding of Lambeth Resolution (I.10)

12. Notwithstanding the welcome presupposition that Lambeth I.10 stands as the Communion's teaching, the fact that TWR does not explicitly state and defend that teaching is a significant weakness in TWR. For without such a statement and defence, TWR can *appear* to suggest that the fundamental disagreements and difficulties in the Communion are simply to do with matters of process and procedure. For example, TWR offers no rationale or defence of the historic Anglican teaching that has been disregarded by some provinces. And it provides no account of why this teaching (and hence the undermining of it within the Communion) is of such importance to the life, witness and mission of the Church.⁵ Indeed, the fact that Anglican teaching declares homosexual practice to be 'incompatible with Scripture' is nowhere explicitly mentioned in the main text (despite TWR's stress on the supreme authority of Scripture in Anglicanism).

13. Instead TWR's few discussions and references to the actual content of the Lambeth resolution (apart from the full text reproduced in Appendix 3.6) highlight only its important call for pastoral care and listening. Indeed, in a potentially misleading and strictly inaccurate statement, it refers to the resolution calling for 'an ongoing process of listening *and discernment*' (§146, italics added). The actual resolution only called for "listening" as one would listen to *any* group

of people. This has understandably raised concerns that TWR may be giving the *substantive content* of the resolution a much more tentative status than that declared by the Lambeth Conference and the Primates. But this, by the terms of its mandate, the Commission was not to be involved in. While listening to those most directly affected by the resolution and engaging in respectful dialogue with those who reject its reaffirmation of traditional and biblical Christian teaching, it is important that the Communion does not let the authoritative status of Lambeth I.10 be gradually eroded — all the more since there has been no substantive case made within the Communion against its theological rationale.⁶ Further, listening must be firmly linked not primarily to the theological sphere, but to the pastoral sphere. What is seriously needed is a deeper effort by all to engage in the pastoral support and care of those who struggle to understand and live in the light of orthodox moral teaching.⁷ This "family discussion" that is envisaged must be directed into such greater pastoral engagement.

*it is important that the
Communion does not let the
authoritative status of Lambeth
I.10 be gradually eroded*

⁴ Comments by Bishop Tom Wright posted on www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk/news/2004/20041023wright.cfm

⁵ One defence of the resolution, in dialogue with its critics, is Andrew Goddard and Peter Walker, *True Union in the Body?* (Grove Books, 2003), available through the web at www.anglicancommunioninstitute.org. This was commended to the Communion for study in their Pastoral Letter by the Primates Meeting in Brazil in May 2003.

⁶ The failure to offer a serious theological defence is noted by Oliver O'Donovan in relation to the St Andrew's Day Statement (www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk/docs/2004/10/20041025odonovan.pdf); similarly *True Union?* has met with no substantive response. This is acknowledged later in the Report (§135, 145).

⁷ See particularly the letter to the Canadian General Synod from those describing themselves as celibate homosexuals and ex-gays of May 14 2004 (www.anglican.tk/modules.php?name=Content&p=showpage&pid=554)

The Commission's Work

14. The Commission met three times in plenary session with its members being given specific research (and later drafting) tasks. Its seventeen members were provided with an initial reading list—mainly of official Anglican Communion documents relating to authority and communion. In the first plenary session the Commission met with a small number of theologians; in its second meeting (in the USA) it heard from both the leadership of ECUSA and of the 'Network' (organised by some of those in ECUSA opposed to its official actions and seeking to uphold Communion teaching). It also received written submissions from hundreds of individuals and concerned groups. Throughout, it sought to be open about the input it received, posting on the Commission's own website many of the major submissions (including Professor Norman Doe's highly influential study on the nature of communion and autonomy in Anglicanism).⁸

The Structure and Aims of TWR

15. The 157-paragraph report falls into four sections. It is vital that TWR is read as a whole, from beginning to end, rather than being selectively quoted or read from back to front in a bid to focus only on its recommendations.⁹ It is clear that the Commission followed its Mandate and sought to explain what was meant by 'walking together' as a Communion. On that basis it proposes the actions it thinks necessary to strengthen such a pattern of life—particularly how to enter a path of reconciliation and healing (§156).

16. Section A (on 'the purposes and benefits of communion') provides a biblical foundation for a theology of life in communion and cites examples of how this can be lived out in a healthy manner among Anglicans. It then turns to a diagnosis of the Communion's current illness, explaining both the surface and deeper symptoms. Section B gives a more systematic account of the theological and legal 'fundamental principles' of communion life, especially the bonds holding us together and the nature and limits of diversity within communion. On the basis of these opening two sections, Section C then offers proposals for 'our future life together'. These proposals recommend some changes to strengthen the Instruments of Unity (more details being given in Appendix One) and the development of a Communion Canon and Covenant (a draft of which appears as Appendix Two) which would give more explicit structure and some legal basis to Communion rights and responsibilities. Finally, Section D addresses the issues that led to the establishment of the Commission. Here we find the practical recommendations for 'the maintenance of communion'—specifically in relation to ECUSA, New Westminster and those who have intervened in their internal affairs in recent months.

17. This booklet will follow a similar structure to TWR, matching its four sections A–D. We will begin with the meaning of communion in sickness and in health, evaluating the Commission's diagnosis of our current illness, and then examining TWR's suggested building blocks for life in communion. There will then be a summary and some comments on its medium- to long-term proposals for re-forming Communion structures. Finally, the Commission's recommendations for the more immediate and pressing task of picking up the pieces and finding a way of 'walking together' will be assessed. A conclusion will offer some thoughts on the way forward over coming months in the light of TWR's findings and possible outcomes of the process.

⁸ These provide a very useful resource: www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/commissions/lambeth/index/cfm. For Norman Doe's article see www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/commissions/lambeth/documents/autonomy.pdf.

⁹ In addition there are four appendices of supporting materials and a very helpful index of key subjects discussed.

A. COMMUNION

– IN SICKNESS AND IN HEALTH

(*‘The purposes and benefits of Communion’*)

A Healthy Communion: summary of §1–§22

The Commission begins its task by offering a biblically based vision of the life and mission of the Christian church and the gift of communion we have received in Christ. It reflects on the nature of ‘communion’—the language that has become increasingly prominent in discussions (both Anglican and ecumenical) about the nature and calling of the church and the relationships which shape the church’s life and mission. This acts as an archway or entrance hall through which the whole Report is to be read. It should, however, be noted that the language of ‘communion’ itself is not particularly prominent in New Testament thinking about the Church and that the Pauline letters cited in TWR focus more on the church as ‘the body of Christ’.

Based on Ephesians, TWR helpfully links together unity, communion and ‘the radical holiness to which all Christ’s people are called’ (§3). All three are rooted in the gospel and the life and purposes of the triune God, especially his mission in and to the world. This mission is the process by which “God brings to men and women, to human societies and to the whole world, real signs and foretastes of that healing love which will one day put all things to rights”. Our communion is the “practical embodiment and fruit ... of the good news of God’s action in Jesus Christ to deal once and for all with evil and to inaugurate the new creation.” So unity and communion are ‘meaningless’ unless they issue in holiness (§3) “through which the church indicates to the world that a new way of being human, over against corrupt and dehumanizing patterns of life, has been launched upon the world.” These statements clearly indicate the challenge that the gospel, and the church as the witness to the gospel is to bring to many patterns of life found in human cultures. The major diversity that Christians need to be aware of is that between the new way of being human and dehumanizing patterns of life; Christian mission is to deal with evil, to announce the new creation, to heal that which needs putting to rights. Therefore a failure in holiness undermines the whole of the mission with which the church is charged. Failure in holiness must therefore be addressed for the sake of unity and communion—and for the mission which these are meant to serve. So, in 1 Corinthians, even among those set apart and loved by God, the apostle does not hold back “from administering severe discipline in the case of scandalous behaviour” (§4).

‘Communion’, therefore is given a clearly stated goal—“the furtherance of God’s mission within the world” (§5). TWR illustrates this by highlighting the value of a healthy and flourishing Anglican Communion in which different churches across the world live in “mutual interdependence and responsibility in the Body of Christ” (§8) and emphasizing the major practical beneficial consequences for the life and mission of the Church (§9).

TWR then addresses what lies at the centre of its task—mutual discernment: how do we learn together what is the mind of Christ for his body, the Church? There is a particular challenge here facing Anglicans. As a worldwide Communion in diverse cultures we have no hierarchical structure of authority such as the Roman Catholic Church: “In acknowledging Jesus Christ as our one and only Head, we are aware that at no point have we found the need to clarify the ways in which, through particular ministries, that Headship is brought to expression within the local and international leadership of the Communion” (§11).

Although no formal procedures have been established, the handling of the contentious issue of the ordination of women (first to the priesthood, then to the episcopate) illustrates how discernment has been done in practice. TWR outlines this history, clearly drawing the contrast between that earlier debate and the present one. One decisive difference between them was that, with regard to women’s ordination, “action was only taken with the co-operation of the Instruments of Unity” (§15) within the Communion.¹⁰ Thus “provincial autonomy was framed by Anglican interdependence on matters of deep theological concern to the whole Communion”. This gives us hope by demonstrating that Communion decision-making “has been, and can be, carried out without division, despite a measure of impairment” (§21).

The lesson drawn from this concerning recent actions is crucial: “The precedent that could have been set by this procedure has not, unfortunately, been followed in the matters currently before the Communion. *This, we conclude, lies at the heart of the problems we currently face*” (§22, italics added).

A Healthy Communion: Comments

Holiness and Inter-dependence within the Body

18. This opening analysis offers a biblically based and historically fair account of the Anglican vision of life in communion. In particular, its framing the discussion in the context of mission is particularly welcome. It highlights that actions which infringe holiness immediately damage the church’s mission in very profound ways and also damage communion. Its focus on the three-fold bond of unity, communion and

holiness is particularly important, although sadly its own focus is subsequently more on unity and communion. TWR would have been strengthened if it had drawn out the implications of its important statement about unity and communion being ‘meaningless’ apart from holiness and related this to the Lambeth Resolution on sexuality. This is vital for a proper understanding of the current situation, where parts of the church have abandoned the wider church’s understanding of the pattern of holiness.

19. The focus on the interdependence of the Communion (§9) emphasizes pragmatic activities, mainly emanating from the Anglican Communion Office, and mainly focused on

those suffering in one way or another and significantly dependent on financial resources. However, the churches in the North are themselves in desperate need of the interdependence of the Communion. The interdependence of Christian churches is theologically and missiologically based in scripture more than is expressed in TWR.

20. TWR speaks of us being in communion with the persons of the Holy Trinity and that this communion with God determines our relation with one another. (§5). However as Colin Gunton points out:

¹⁰ The Instruments of Unity (the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), and the Primates’ Meeting) are discussed further in section D below.

TWR would have been strengthened if it had drawn out the implications of its important statement about unity and communion being ‘meaningless’ apart from holiness

It should scarcely require repetition that communion depends upon atonement: upon the reconciliation of relations lost at the Fall. That is one reason why both christology and pneumatology are essential to an understanding of communion. Where community is breached, it cannot be restored without the healing or extirpation of that which occasioned the breach. That is why Christ dies under the law, on the altar and in conflict with the demons. Communion, the will of the creator for his people, is the shape of their being in relation, but of a being that apart from redemption is destined for the relationlessness that is death.¹¹

It is a wrong kind of Trinitarian theology to argue that the three persons get on well, so people in the church should get on well and to make that a foundation for the notion of plurality in the Church. A trinitarian basis for understanding communion requires the possibility of mutual exhortation to obedient holiness, repentance and forgiveness based on the cross.

21. As regards the horizontal relations in communion, Paul continually urged that these were dependent on and created by God's action in Christ on the cross: that different parts of the body need each other; that, in particular, Jewish and Gentile Christians need to learn from each other (the Gentiles' apprehension of salvation by faith alone, and the Jews' apprehension of God's work throughout history); and that the Church is the sign to the principalities and powers, clearly demonstrating that through the cross God has broken down those barriers of race, gender and class that keep peoples apart. So for Paul communion is an expression of the life in the Spirit in transforming human social relationships. It is empowered by the Spirit. It is a first fruit and an earnest of our inheritance in the final kingdom of God (Eph. 2-3). Thus the interdependence of the Communion is not just to serve the pragmatic needs of the deprived. No, it is a statement that we do not reach our human and social potential in Christ, and may even miss God's call to us in Christ, unless we are growing in cross-cultural interdependence. It is not possible to grow to maturity in Christian discipleship in a mono-cultural situation.¹²

22. Further, the discussion of Communion in TWR omits the whole notion of the apostolic tradition and succession, marked by faithfulness to the teaching of the apostles, passed down through successive generations, whereby Communion is not solely synchronic (with other contemporary Anglicans) but also diachronic (with the catholic church throughout history).

23. And finally there is no discussion of the ecumenical dimension of Christian fellowship with other churches. TWR reads at times as though the boundaries of the whole Christian world are the boundaries of the Anglican Communion. For example its appeal to bishops in the time of Nicaea predates by millennia the fact of denominational differences and thus *de facto* overlapping Christian jurisdictions. The Anglican Communion is also a church in fellowship with a whole range of other Christian Communions.

a trinitarian basis for understanding communion requires the possibility of mutual exhortation to obedient holiness, repentance and forgiveness based on the cross

¹¹ The One, The Three, and The Many (The 1992 Bampton Lectures). We are indebted to Professor Christopher Seitz for drawing attention to this source.

¹² See further: Chris Sugden, 'What is the Anglican Communion for?', posted on the Lambeth Commission website (papers submitted to its February 2004 meeting). www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/commissions/lambeth/documents/200402whatitisfor.pdf.

breaches not just of ‘bonds of affection’ or ties of history, but of the very nature of being part of one body in Christ throughout time and space

24. Once seen in this biblical, historical and ecumenical perspective, the failures of ECUSA and Canada to respect the mind of the Communion as commonly declared (by regarding their actions as merely of local significance and trampling on the consciences of those gravely offended by their proposed actions) appear in their true light—as breaches not just of ‘bonds of affection’ or ties of history, but of the very nature of being part of one body in Christ throughout time and space.

25. It is also debatable whether TWR has quite got to the heart of the problem in its analysis of mutual discernment. Although its statement on this is vitally important, there is an even deeper problem. Recent actions did not just *fail to follow* the proper path of interdependent consultation. In fact, dioceses and provinces *consciously rejected and acted contrary* to the considered judgment of the Communion—including the clear and strong statement that homosexual conduct is “contrary to Scripture”.¹³

Symptoms of the Communion’s Current Illness: Summary of §23–§30.

Turning to the presenting issues, TWR’s summary of Anglican discussions is, of necessity, very brief and set in the context of an emphasis on the urgent need for further Communion-wide discussion. Its central argument is clear: while each church must respond to its own culture, “no part of the church can ignore its life in communion with the rest”. Truly, “what is done in one place can and does affect all” (§23). ECUSA’s own report (in 2003) highlighted this point; this then “undercuts any argument that such decisions are purely local” (§24).

So the actions in ECUSA and New Westminster are “against both the letter and the spirit” (§27) of the Lambeth resolution and the Primates’ Meeting. The consecration proceeded despite the Primates’ warning that it might “tear the fabric of our Communion at its deepest level”. The consequences are clear: “the overwhelming response from other Christians both inside and outside the Anglican family has been to regard these developments as *departures from genuine apostolic Christian faith*” (§28, italics added).

However, those who have responded to ECUSA’s actions in various strong ways (going beyond statements of mere disagreement) are also “now part of the problem we face” (§29). First, declarations of impaired or broken communion, although they may be “conscientious reactions to abnormal circumstances”, have had the consequence of creating confusion as to who is in communion with whom. Indeed their legitimacy is sometimes unclear and “for many, they represent an exercise in unilateralism counter to the communion principle of interdependence”. Secondly, the decisions by some parishes to distance themselves from their jurisdictions has led in many cases to “bewilderment and uncertainty as to the present and future Anglican status of those who dissent to the innovations”. Thirdly, external intervention by Archbishops offering episcopal ministry without the consent of the diocesan bishop goes against traditional Anglican practice and “some of the longest-standing regulations of the early undivided church”. Some of these actions are not simply reactions but “build on earlier attempts at

¹³ In contrast, the Lambeth Conference prior to women’s ordination had simply declared theological arguments on the matter “inconclusive”. Further details on this contrast can be found in *Claiming Our Anglican Identity*, Appdx 3 and Communion and Discipline, pp. 13-21 (available online at www.anglicancommunioninstitute.org).

unilateral action” such as the Anglican Mission in America (AMiA). In the light of this, the Commission categorises the current situation as a “tit-for-tat stand-off”, comparing this to other world conflicts.

Symptoms of the Communion’s Current Illness: Comments

‘Dissension’ in the face of schismatic acts

26. We welcome the frankness and honesty of this initial diagnosis. It clearly states the facts and offers an interpretation that many have rejected. For example, it implicitly dismisses a widely reported claim of Presiding Bishop Griswold that he thought the consecration of Gene Robinson was simply a ‘local’ matter.¹⁴

27. Sadly, however, it has a major defect. Although it cites the Primates’ statement about ‘tearing the fabric’, this is never given the prominence it deserves in the Commission’s analysis. Following the November 2003 consecration, the fabric of the Communion is *now* torn. This language of ‘tearing’ points to the meaning of the Greek word behind our word ‘schism’. Yet the significance of this is never fully explored in TWR. The crucial questions to be asked are: *Who has truly performed the ‘schismatic’ actions? Who first ‘tore the fabric’? Who are the real schismatics here?*

*the fabric of the
Communion is now torn*

28. In keeping with its mandate TWR is right to focus, not only on the initial disruptive actions of ECUSA and New Westminster, but also on ‘orthodox’ responses to those actions and on the problems which those responses have caused. These were not precipitate. The difficulties that orthodox Episcopalians had been having with innovations in ECUSA stretch back into the 1970s. We need to ask whether the innovators have over the last twenty five years engaged in the listening they expect of others. TWR also fails to view the responses in appropriate proportion to the initiating disruption. So it has produced an account that is not totally fair and rather broad-brush.¹⁵

29. Specifically, TWR fails to recognize that the Primates’ October Statement had *already* warned that, if the consecration proceeded, “many provinces are likely to consider themselves to be out of Communion with the Episcopal Church (USA)”. It is significant that the Primates did *not* state that such declarations of impaired communion fell into the same category as the precipitate actions which they were warning against.

30. Furthermore, while some difficulties may indeed result from the responses of the ‘orthodox’, it confuses the issues mightily to classify those taking such action as ‘dissenters’—especially given that TWR *itself* has just stated that the overwhelming response of Christians is to view the innovations as “departures from the Christian faith”. In fact, in the face of such a consensus, it could be argued that the requirement for catholic order imposes a duty for congregations to distance themselves from those leading people astray and to find an orthodox bishop.¹⁶ This reflects Paul’s admonition in 1 Corinthians 5.9-13 to withdraw from fellowship with such moral disobedience. ‘Dissent’ is hardly the right category for this dutiful response.

¹⁴ Interview in the *Guardian*, Mar 6th 2004 http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,,1163402,00.html

¹⁵ Bishop Tom Wright has admitted that “the Commission was aware of a wide spectrum of cross-boundary activity and wasn’t about to engage in detailed analysis of different movements and actions” www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk/news/2004/20041023wright.cfm.

¹⁶ The dilemma that this has placed faithful Anglicans in is movingly described in the Appendix in the submission from the Anglican Network in Canada.

the requirement for catholic order imposes a duty for congregations to distance themselves from those leading people astray and to find an orthodox bishop

31. Similarly, though the interventions by other bishops may be, strictly, in opposition to Lambeth resolutions and the October Primates' Statement, they draw upon historical precedent in defence of catholic orthodoxy. Such actions were, for example, not uncommon in the disturbed situation of the church in the decades preceding the council of Nicaea—that is, until that council satisfactorily resolved the underlying

theological problem. Thus many would view them as a *necessary emergency action* in the face of *disregard for Christian teaching* by certain bishops. Yes, not ideal and indeed out of place in a healthy Communion, but sadly quite necessary in a sick one. As Commission member, Archbishop Josiah Iduwo-Fearon has said, “Within the same family, if one of your children is drowning, you don't seek permission to save their lives”.¹⁷

32. Overall, this early discussion in TWR of those who have responded to ECUSA and New Westminster is one of its weakest points of

analysis. As a result, the foundations laid here for its subsequent recommendations in this area are much less solid than those laid in relation to ECUSA and New Westminster. To be sure, the analogy with other ‘tit-for-tat’ conflicts sadly has some truth in it; such a mindset needs to be overcome and such a cycle broken wherever it exists. However, there is a risk that, even if unintended, TWR might be taken to imply a *moral equivalence* or even a ‘level playing field’ between the ‘innovators’ and the ‘orthodox responders’.¹⁸ That would be a huge distortion of the reality.

Deeper Diagnosis of the Communion's Illness: Summary of §31-§42

TWR proceeds to identify six underlying features of our common life central to understanding the current impasse (§31). In the first four it is clear the actions, perceptions and assumptions of ECUSA and New Westminster led to the present crisis. Each of these six features are only briefly identified here as ‘deeper symptoms’ but they will shape the discussion of ‘fundamental principles’ in Section B.

First, there is general agreement that *theological development* is necessary, but some proposals “do not develop the Christian faith, but distort or even destroy it” (§32). “Christians are not at liberty to simplify these matters either by claiming the Spirit's justification for every proposed innovation or by claiming long-standing tradition as the reason for rejecting all such proposals” (§32). There must be corporate discernment. But innovating provinces are widely viewed as having failed to make “a serious attempt to offer an explanation to, or consult meaningfully with, the Communion as a whole” about their significant developments (§33).

Secondly, discernment about developments require *ecclesiastical procedures*. These exist within Anglicanism and appeals have been made to use them (§34). Yet ECUSA and New Westminster failed to do so (§35).

Thirdly, part of the discernment process is distinguishing core doctrines from *adiaphora* (areas where disagreement can be tolerated and diversity permitted). “Ethics, liturgy and pastoral practice, if authentically Christian, are all rooted in theology and doctrine” (§36). So it cannot be assumed such matters are indeed ‘matters indifferent’. In fact, in

¹⁷ Quoted in CEN (October 22nd, 2004), p. 21. Bishop Tom Wright has also written: ‘Josiah's image about someone breaking into a neighbour's house to rescue their children from a fire was used, and though the Commission as a whole didn't sign up to that there was a lot of sympathy for it’ (on Fulcrum website, op.cit.).

¹⁸ See further below at §72ff.

relation to sexuality, large numbers of Anglicans around the world do not see certain matters as areas of legitimate disagreement (§37).

Fourthly, there is the principle of *subsidiarity*. This is a matter of determining the level at which decisions should be made, on a spectrum from global to local. This should correlate with the spectrum from ‘core doctrine’ to ‘matter of indifference’: the more significant the matter under discussion, the broader the level of agreement needed.

Fifthly, undergirding all such procedures and discernment must be a *relationship of trust* in the context of mutual responsibility. The character of much recent debate (and the effect of wider global and cultural divisions on Communion life) is a cause for great concern. There should be more charitable listening and—using a favoured image model for the Communion—“a proper family discussion” (§41).

The sixth factor which ‘might hold the key’ is that of *authority*. Here Anglicanism is clearly distinct from Roman Catholicism: “The Anglican Communion has always declared that its supreme authority is scripture” (§42). The challenge is that this requires “appropriately sensitive and fine-tuned systems of decision-making”. Recent events show that ‘fresh thought and action’ are now necessary in this area.

Deeper Diagnosis of the Communion’s Illness: Comments

An under-prescription for a partial diagnosis?

33. Overall, the diagnosis offered here is good as far as it goes. Given the limited time and remit of the Commission, it was perhaps unrealistic to expect it to go further. These six factors neatly capture major issues at stake in the current crisis. In particular, the first four (although here focused on sexuality and North American decisions) illustrate the wider significance of issues raised in the current situation. There are, however, three areas where the analysis could and should be strengthened.

34. First, even the ‘deeper symptoms’ focus on structural and procedural symptoms. Many argue this fails to recognize that the substantive theological problems in ECUSA go much deeper. The divergence from the Communion over matters of sexuality is, in many instances, simply the tip of the iceberg. Much more serious signs of illness can be discerned: in rejections of the uniqueness and finality of Christ and the inclusion of diverse forms of ‘spirituality’ leading to patterns of Christian worship that have little or no connection with classical Christian orthodoxy and at times amount to paganism.¹⁹

35. This is important, because some of those objecting to Gene Robinson’s consecration have been accused of using this event as an excuse and a cover because they would be ‘jumping ship’ anyway. If there is any truth in this accusation it is surely due in large part to the long history of ECUSA’s increased detachment from orthodox Christianity (symbolized in such bishops as Bishop Pike in the 1960s and Bishops Spong and Bennison in the 1990s).²⁰ TWR gives no sense of this deeper doctrinal malaise or the history behind the current crisis. For some Gene Robinson’s consecration was simply the ‘last straw’.

36. Secondly, the pattern of symptoms diagnosed are not new. They have been evident *within* the provinces themselves for some time in relation to teaching and practice on sexuality. The decision of New Westminster clearly disregarded the Canadian House of Bishops’ policy. Or again, as far back as 1979 a number of ECUSA

¹⁹ The recent case of the women’s eucharist posted on the Episcopal Church’s website www.episcopalchurch.org and reported in *Christianity Today* (www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2004/143/41.0.html) is simply one of the most extreme examples of departure from Christian faith and practice.

bishops publicly refused to accept General Convention's restatement of the need for those being ordained to live by traditional sexual ethics (a refusal later supported by the current Presiding Bishop Frank Griswold, when Bishop of Chicago). Those seeking to reinterpret Christian teaching have in the past often refused to respect the authority of General Convention decisions and the mind of the House of Bishops. *Their current disregard for the Instruments of Unity is not accidental*: it is simply the continuation of a mindset that believes (in an almost fundamentalist manner) that their preference for 'inclusiveness' over catholicity is right, just and prophetic; they (and only they) are being 'led by the Spirit' and so can disregard Christian tradition, the official statements of provincial authorities, and any appeals to consider Christian unity. 'Being led by the Spirit' can never be evidenced by being led into a position that is contrary to Scripture since God cannot contradict himself.

37. Thirdly, TWR itself describes what it is offering as only an account of 'symptoms'. However, attempting to treat symptoms without understanding the underlying disease is unlikely to succeed. Even if one disregards the additional symptoms, TWR's own account cries out for some explanation as to why these dioceses and provinces have behaved in this way. To answer that it would be necessary to address more substantive theological and philosophical issues. These would include:

- the dominance of theological liberalism and radicalism within the hierarchy and training institutions of ECUSA;
- the apparently uncritical embrace of post-modern and relativist understandings of truth;
- the underlying commitment to a form of expressive individualism, where everyone should be free to explore their own path of self-fulfilment;
- a belief that whatever is not explicitly forbidden by legal or canonical authority must be permissible.
- and privileging uncritically the claims of inclusiveness over the requirements of catholic order.

38. None of these matters are noted by TWR. But they have to be addressed, if the real nature of current disagreements is to be recognized and the strength of disagreements over sexuality seen in proper proportion to the presenting issue.

39. It is perhaps understandable that the Commission drew back from opening this whole 'can of worms'. Yet its failure to do so threatens to undermine its analysis of the current crisis and render its recommendations for remedying it insufficient. We may be unable to continue to "walk together" not only because (as initial responses have suggested) ECUSA refuses to comply with proposals so alien to its worldview but also because the medicine of TWR is an under-prescription for the critical illness which the Commission has only partly diagnosed.

²⁰ For an account of ECUSA's recent history and its progressive departure from mainstream Christian orthodoxy, see Philip Turner, 'The Episcopal Preference' in *First Things* www.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft0311/articles/turner.html. Bishop Charles Bennisson of Pennsylvania is quoted as saying at the Rector's Forum at the Good Samaritan Church, Paoli, Penn on December 9 1997 "We wrote the Bible, we can rewrite the Bible" (www.toknowChrist.org/recentchronology.html).

B. BUILDING BLOCKS FOR LIFE IN COMMUNION (‘Fundamental Principles’)

The Nature and Bonds of Communion: Summary of §43–§70

In speaking of ‘communion’ TWR regularly uses the language of ‘bonds of affection’ (§45). These bonds unite us to all our brothers and sisters in Christ but some bonds result from our shared history and identity as Anglicans. They enable us to engage in mission in mutual interdependence and remind us of “a responsibility, not only to our contemporaries within the Communion, but to those with whom we share in the Communion of Saints” (§47). They show us that communion is all about mutual relationships (§49) between both churches and individual Christians. In this light, the language of ‘impaired’ or ‘fractured’ communion signals that ‘Communion is now “less full than it was”’ (§50). This may be expressed in various ways but overall, such a situation is confused and Anglicans lack a clear sense of how to identify or remedy situations of impairment.²¹

Life in communion creates both rights and obligations for all and, although often more implicit than explicit, these are significant. For instance, “the divine foundation of communion should oblige each church to avoid unilateral action on contentious issues which may result in broken communion” (§51). This obligation is vital. It is summarized in “an ancient canonical principle that what touches all should be decided by all” and the basic rule that each church is “to act interdependently, not independently” (§51).

But what are the bonds that hold us together? There are *three* “aspects of our common life, which, as well as fulfilling the primary purpose of enabling the Church to fulfil its gospel mission in and for the world, serve to draw us together and hold us in fellowship” (§52).

First, and central, is Scripture: “within Anglicanism, scripture has always been recognized as the Church’s supreme authority, and as such ought to be seen as a focus and means of unity” (§53). ‘The authority of Scripture’ is shorthand for “the authority of the triune God, *exercised through* Scripture” (§54). This authority is understood in terms of God’s rule. So Scripture’s authority is “not just to prescribe in matters of belief and conduct” (§55). Rather, “Scripture is part of the means by which God directs the Church in its mission, energises it for that task, and shapes and unites it...” (§55). Or again, the reading of Scripture in worship, “rather than a quasi-legal process of ‘appeal’, is the primary and dynamic context within which the shorthand phrase ‘authority of scripture’ finds its deepest meaning” (§56).²²

Setting Scripture within the life of the church leads to an appeal for “the whole Church to engage with the Bible together” and for “each individual Christian...[to] study it and learn from it” (§57). And in the calling of Christian leaders—particularly bishops—their role “as *teachers of scripture* can hardly be overemphasized” (§58, *italics original*). Thus, importantly, the authority of bishops “cannot reside solely or primarily in legal structures” (§58).

Giving prominence to the teaching and study of the Bible raises issues of interpretation. New readings must be weighed by the church (§60). The current crisis is a call to “re-evaluate the ways in which we have read, heard, studied and digested scripture” (§61). We should expect the Bible to be a means of unity, not division and

²¹ TWR notes that in a situation of impaired communion, the constitutional position of some members of the Communion may be called into question: for their own legal self-definitions may be cast in terms of their “communion with Canterbury” or “all those in communion with the see of Canterbury” (which, for example, is the Church of Nigeria’s constitutional position).

²² This section of TWR is clearly shaped by the ideas of Bishop Tom Wright. This interpretation of ‘the authority of Scripture’ is more fully explored in his forthcoming *Scripture and the ‘Authority’ of God* (SPCK, 2005).

“our shared reading of scripture across boundaries of culture, region and tradition ought to be the central feature of our common life” (§62).

Secondly, “the unity of the Communion is both expressed and put into effect among other things through the *episcopate*” (§63). “It has always been maintained within Anglicanism that a bishop is more than simply the local chief pastor... Bishops represent the universal Church to the local and *vice versa*” (§64). As a result, if a bishop is not generally acceptable in the church, then the episcopate ceases to be one of the bonds of unity and “quickly becomes an occasion and focus of disunity” (§64).

There is an important parallel drawn here between the bishop and the Instruments of Unity: “the work, and symbolic unifying value, of the local episcopate is matched at the transprovincial level by the four Instruments of Unity,...and especially by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself as the chief pastor of the entire Communion” (§65). Attention is also drawn to the “enhanced responsibility for the unity of the Communion” that Lambeth Conferences have urged the Primates to shoulder. So “the churches of the Anglican Communion, if that Communion is to mean anything at all, are obliged to move together, to walk together in *synodality*. It is by listening to, and interacting with, voices from as many different parts of the family as possible that the Church discovers what its unity and communion really mean.” (§66).

Thirdly, as we give attention to Scripture we have the common and unifying task of *discernment in communion*. This is one of the benefits and also challenges of communion across different cultures as we “discern the limits of appropriate inculturation” (§67). Failure to listen and to learn from one another has led to division: “it is by reading scripture too little, not by reading it too much, that we have allowed ourselves to drift apart” (§67).

One way of maintaining unity is to apply a test of reception. When using this model, there is formal action (after theological debate and discussion) which is then subject to further consultation and ‘a shared discernment of God’s truth’ in a time of ‘experiment and uncertainty’ (§68). Undoubtedly some hoped and expected recent innovations on sexuality would enter such a time of reception. TWR clearly and emphatically rejects this way of approaching this question:

We should note, however, that the doctrine of reception only makes sense if the proposals concern matters on which the Church has not so far made up its mind. It cannot be applied in the case of actions which are explicitly against the current teaching of the Anglican Communion as a whole, and/or of individual provinces. No province, diocese or parish has the right to introduce a novelty which goes against such teaching and excuse it on the grounds that it has simply been put forward for reception. In such a case, if change is desired, it must be sought through the appropriate channels. (§69).²³

The Nature and Bonds of Communion: Comments

The Authority of Scripture, and of Bishops

40. This section opens with a helpful brief summary of long-standing Anglican and ecumenical discussions of the nature of life in communion. Its importance lies in its bearing on the interpretation of the current situation. Long-accepted principles of the nature of communion make quite clear that ECUSA and New Westminster have not only failed to follow certain procedures. They have, more seriously, *failed to act in a manner consistent with the obligations of life in communion*.

41. In relation to the bonds of communion, the emphasis on Scripture’s supreme

²³ A fuller argument in support of this conclusion is offered in *Communion and Discipline*, the submission to the Commission by the Anglican Communion Institute (www.anglicancommunioninstitute.org).

authority is one of TWR's most welcome and important statements. Its discussion of the meaning of 'authority' and interpretation is necessarily brief and may leave many dissatisfied—particularly concerning its very limited recognition that we read Scripture within the communion of saints and guided by Tradition. Of course, as TWR's summary of Anglican history makes clear, the emphasis on Scripture should not be a surprise. Nevertheless, given the climate of opinion in some parts of the Communion, where there is a tendency to label any focus on Scripture as 'fundamentalist' (or narrowly 'evangelical' in a limited party sense), it is sadly a necessary corrective to much current thinking. Furthermore, some elements in contemporary Anglicanism claim that a focus on Scripture only leads to division; so they place much greater emphasis on sharing and learning from each other's experience. Here again TWR gives a timely reminder that Scripture is the foundation of Christian identity and mainstream Anglicanism is to be recognized by its focus on the Bible's unique authority as the Word of God.

42. In its account of episcopacy, TWR shows how traditional Anglican thinking results in a damning indictment of the decision to proceed with the consecration of Gene Robinson despite global protests.²⁴ However, more could usefully have been said in response to those who view the role of the bishop as primarily a 'prophetic' one. Clearly this is part of a Christian leader's calling. The problem arises, however, when *prophecy* is confused with *innovation* and interpreted to mean propagating novel ideas that challenge or even contradict received Christian teaching. True prophecy instead draws on received Christian teaching to challenge the church's accommodation to the world and its departures from Scripture and Tradition. True prophecy offers a new way of being human, the way *already revealed* in Christ, a way which stands as a critique and rebuke to the cultures and societies in which we live.

43. The important analysis of the Instruments of Unity is explored in the TWR's next two sections. It would have been good if more could have been said here about what exactly is meant by walking together 'in synodality'; and there might have been fuller exploration of the similarities and dis-similarities between the role of bishops and the Instruments of Unity.

44. Finally, it is very surprising and unfortunate that the foundational bonds of classic Anglican unity (the creeds, the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer) do not merit discussion. Notwithstanding the severe time constraints on the Commission and its limited focus on current crises, this omission is a serious defect.

45. Overall, TWR's account of the nature and bonds of communion has much of value in its vision of life in communion. In relation to all three bonds, the Commission is implicitly critical of recent actions as inconsistent with maintaining the unity of the Communion. The strong emphasis on the supreme authority of Scripture (so that

*a timely reminder that
Scripture is the foundation of
Christian identity and
mainstream Anglicanism is to
be recognized by its focus on
the Bible's unique authority as
the Word of God*

²⁴ The theological underpinnings of this part of TWR are found in the important IARCCUM submission to the Commission on the web at www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/documents/200406iarccum.pdf

*the root cause of
Anglican disunity and
dis-ease is to be found in
departure in some form
from Scripture*

bishops are described as teachers of Scripture, and the common discernment is to be based on Scripture not on our contemporary experience) is particularly welcome. Indeed, TWR highlights the distinctiveness of Anglicanism's bonds that, perhaps even in a diffuse way, nevertheless serve to "give supreme authority...to Scripture as the locus and means of God's word, energizing the Church for its mission and sustaining it in its unity" (§70). It follows from this analysis that the root cause of Anglican disunity and dis-ease is to be found in departure in some form from Scripture.

Unity in Diversity: Summary of §71-§96

Section B of TWR concludes by addressing the contentious issue of 'diversity'. Our unity includes rich diversity and 'diversity is a great strength'. However, "without care...it can also be a source of great tension and division". As a result, "within the Communion we have developed theological and practical ways of working at this problem and of distinguishing acceptable and unacceptable forms of diversity" (§71). Two central concepts in thinking through diversity and its limits are *autonomy* and *adiaphora*.

Autonomy

Perhaps the most frequent justification offered for recent unilateral actions has been an appeal to provincial autonomy. Autonomy encourages diversity within Anglicanism and is 'fundamental to Anglican polity' (§72). This autonomy has been much-heralded as the basis for non-interference by others in the affairs of the American church. Yet this is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of what is meant by 'autonomy'.

Autonomy "represents within Anglican discourse a far more limited form of independent government than is popularly understood by many today" (§75). Autonomy is "not the same thing as sovereignty or independence" (§75).²⁵ In fact, "autonomy exists in a relation with a wider community". To be autonomous implies 'not an isolated individualism', but rather "the idea of being free to determine one's own life within a wider obligation to others" (§76). It is 'freedom-in-relation' (§80).

Autonomy within Anglicanism is therefore a form of limited authority and to be related to the principle of subsidiarity. Unfettered provincial freedom only exists in relation to exclusively internal affairs. However, some affairs are of external or common concern. In these cases a church should only make decisions "fully compatible with the interests, standards, unity and good order of the wider community of which the autonomous body forms part" (§79). When decisions fail to do this, they may be legally valid but "they will impose strains not only upon that church's wider relationship with other churches, but on the church's inner self-understanding as part of 'the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church' in relation to some of its own members" (§79).

Thus autonomy, when properly understood, rather than providing *carte blanche* for provinces to do whatever they decide is right, "obliges each church to have regard to the common good of the global Anglican community and the Church universal" (§80). This fits with other Christian traditions and the understanding of the 'autonomy' of parishes and dioceses. It means there are 'legitimate limits (both substantive and procedural)' on the exercise of autonomy. Indeed "communion is, in fact, the fundamental limit to

²⁵ TWR is here drawing on the important work of Professor Norman Doe on 'Communion and Autonomy in Anglicanism – Nature and Maintenance' at www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/commissions/lambeth/documents/autonomy.pdf.

autonomy” (§82). In the light of this, key factors are listed in the exercise of provincial autonomy which, had they been understood and applied, would have prevented recent ‘autonomous’ actions in ECUSA and Canada.²⁶

In short, autonomy and communion go together to ensure “the greatest possible liberty which is compatible with the unity and good order of the Anglican Communion” (§84). This, in turn, aids mission, by allowing inculturation of the gospel and hence diversity in the life of the Communion. This is the well-known problem of ‘Christ and Culture’, of “how to communicate the gospel effectively in widely differing cultural situations” (§85). What is needed, however, is a framework for discerning the limits to diversity—namely ‘truth and charity’ (§86). These must be used as tests when considering any new development in the life of the Communion.

Adiaphora

Another important tool in discerning which issues may be left to provinces is the concept of *adiaphora* (i.e. matters regarded as non-essential or ‘indifferent’). Indeed, “this notion lies at the heart of many current disputes” (§87). The biblical basis for this concept is Paul’s discussions of food offered to idols (Rom. 14 and 15 and 1 Cor. 8-10). Just because Christians disagree over some matter, however, is not conclusive proof that the issue is to be placed in this category. “It has never been enough to say that we must celebrate or at least respect ‘difference’ without further ado. Not all ‘differences’ can be tolerated. (We would not say, “some of us are racists, some of us are not, so let’s celebrate our diversity”).” (§89). Paul is quite clear here: “some types of behaviour are incompatible with inheriting God’s coming kingdom, and must not therefore be tolerated within the Church” (§89). The difficulty is deciding which issues fall into this category. At the very least we must forbid action that “embodies the dehumanizing turning-away-from-God” (§90). No human culture is ‘neutral’, so the church will always need great discernment.

Moreover, even if something has been agreed to be ‘*adiaphora*’, this is *not* sufficient to justify unilateral provincial action. Paul does not countenance this in his discussion of how the ‘strong’ should treat the ‘weak’. Instead there must be patience and Christian love shown by those pressing for changes.

There are thus two clear tests for any claim that it is acceptable to proceed with unilateral action that introduces greater diversity:

- Are we sure it doesn’t touch on something vital?
- If it is ‘non-essential’, will ‘a sufficient number of other Christians’ find it ‘scandalous and offensive’ such that they will act against their own consciences or “be forced, for conscience’s sake, to break fellowship with those who go ahead?” (§93). Faced with these consequences “the biblical guidelines insist that those who have no scruples about the proposed action should nevertheless refrain from going ahead” (§93).

Finally, decisions about the significance of an issue connect to the principle of subsidiarity—the more central an issue, the wider must be the consultation. Here the ‘who decides?’ question is not as difficult as many suggest: when there is sufficient controversy, reference to the wider church is clearly necessary (§94).

Unity in Diversity: Comments

Autonomy limited by love; not matters indifferent

46. It is difficult to over-emphasise the significance of this discussion of autonomy and *adiaphora*—both for the analysis of recent events and the vision of the sort of Communion we should be seeking for the future. There are a number of places where further elaboration would have been helpful—especially drawing out the implications

²⁶ That these principles should have been understood and applied is made clear by TWR’s quotation of the earlier Virginia Report and Eames Commission (§83) both of which make clear that these are not new and novel understandings.

that among the practices not to be tolerated (in 1 Corinthians 6) are sexual sins including homosexual practices (§89). This is particularly the case in relation to the crucial issues surrounding Christ and culture and determining what is *adiaphora*. Even so, TWR's brief comments undermine claims by the American church that their action was a missionary requirement in a culture that is open about (and increasingly accepting of) homosexuality. At the same time, they also remind Africans that, simply because homosexuality is 'un-African', this is not sufficient reason for rejecting it or refusing to discuss it seriously within the Christian church. TWR does not, however, offer much in terms of positive advice to help this crucial task of discernment.

47. The claim that this is a missionary requirement in North America is doubtful at best. In the United States, most orthodox Churches have been generally gaining in membership while ECUSA has consistently declined in membership except in orthodox parishes. Furthermore the United States Presidential election has demonstrated the American public rejects the legitimization of same sex-relationships by decisive margins even in the most liberal states. The margin of rejection by Christians of every kind was much greater than that of the American public as a whole.

48. We should note at this point that 'revisionists'²⁷ as well as orthodox Anglicans argue that these matters are far from being *adiaphora*. The very fact that revisionists have been prepared to take these actions in defiance of the whole Communion and bring it to this current pass, shows that they regard the issues of justice and human rights that they claim are embedded in these issues as anything but *adiaphora*.

49. These are, however, relatively minor weaknesses. Prior to TWR, many had argued that at the heart of Anglicanism there were principles of autonomy and diversity. Without denying the importance of these principles, this Section sets these in the context of the bonds of communion and under the authority of Scripture. In so doing it has given, first, an account of 'autonomy' which is far removed from that often espoused (though rarely justified)—the account that says in effect, 'we make our own decisions and that's fine, so long as we do not break any of our own laws'. Secondly, it has made clear that 'difference' is not something to be valued in itself; even matters agreed to be 'non-essential' cannot always be acted upon unilaterally by a province or diocese—because of the demands of Christian love.

50. It must be noted that the claim that ECUSA acted lawfully within its own canons is questionable. ECUSA's constitution forbids ECUSA to take actions contrary to Scripture. Its bishops' own theological commission recommended that such actions should not be taken²⁸. Furthermore it broke a series of repeated promises to the Communion and its ecumenical dialogue partners that it would not take such actions unilaterally.

51. TWR thoroughly and cogently rejects these two core arguments frequently advanced by those justifying recent actions. Those arguments, as we have become painfully aware, push us to the verge of anarchy where everyone 'does what is right in their own eyes'. In so doing, TWR shows that those actions do not just reject one Lambeth resolution on sexuality. In fact, they also *contravene fundamental biblical and theological principles of communion as we have lived them within Anglicanism* and so are destructive of our common life together in Christ.

²⁷ We recognise that this is an imprecise term. We use it in preference to the term 'liberal' because we are aware that a number who describe themselves as liberal do not support many of the innovations which have given rise to the current crisis in the Communion.

²⁸ The Report of the Theology Committee of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church 18 March 2003 (<http://arc.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/pdf/theology/comreport.pdf>.)

C. RE-FORMING THE STRUCTURES

(‘Our Future Life Together’)

Our Future Life Together: Summary of §97–§120

In the light of these fundamental principles, what can be done to better express these in future? This is necessary because all too clearly “the views of the Instruments of Unity have been ignored or sidelined by sections of the Communion” (§97), thereby revealing the inherent weaknesses within the Anglican pattern of dispersed authority.

The mechanisms by which the churches ‘take common counsel’ (§98) are the Communion’s ‘core structures’ known as the Instruments of Unity. The Archbishop of Canterbury “has been the pivotal instrument and focus of unity” (§99). The Lambeth Conference, though an advisory body, has gathered authority and “proved to be a powerful vehicle for the expression of a concept central to Anglican ecclesiology, the collegiality of bishops” (§102). The Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), established in 1968, gives a voice to lay people (§103). The Primates’ Meeting, also having a consultative and advisory authority, has been encouraged to take ‘enhanced responsibility’ on doctrinal, moral and pastoral matters (§104).

The moral authority of the Instruments needs to be more clearly articulated. The Archbishop should “be regarded as the focus of unity” and other bodies be viewed as ‘Instruments of Communion’ (§105). There are many questions in this area, showing the need for substantial more work on the relationship between these instruments. One possibility is that the Primates’ Meeting should be known in future as the ‘Primates’ Conference – The Lambeth Standing Committee’ (§106).²⁹

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop plays a ‘pivotal’ role as “the central focus of both unity and mission within the Communion” (§109). His teaching role is emphasized: “the Communion looks to the office of the Archbishop to articulate the mind of the Communion especially in areas of controversy” (§109). In line with its rejection of certain views of autonomy, it also encourages the Communion to look to him “to speak directly to any provincial situation on behalf of the Communion where this is deemed advisable” (§109).

Noting the dependence of the Lambeth Conference and Primates’ Meeting on the Archbishop, it is clear that “the Archbishop has the right to call or not to call to those gatherings whomsoever he believes is appropriate, in order to safeguard, and take counsel for, the well-being of the Anglican Communion” (§110).³⁰ So he should invite participants to the Lambeth Conference “on restricted terms at his sole discretion if circumstances exist where full voting membership of the Conference is perceived to be an undesirable status, or would militate against the greater unity of the Communion” (§110).

Given his lack of formal legal authority, to help the Archbishop in “seeking clarity about the occasions when he might have authority to take an initiative in attempting to exercise authority on behalf of the entire Communion”, a Council of Advice should be established. This “would considerably enhance the foundation of any authority on which the Archbishop might feel truly enabled to act” (§111) and “assist him in discerning when and how it might be appropriate for him to exercise a ministry of unity

²⁹ Acknowledging the limits of its remit, the Commission confines further detailed thoughts to Appendix One where it identifies a range of important issues that require further attention. There are important proposals here that must not get lost in a focus on the current crisis:

- that there should be more ties between the ACC and the Primates
- that the moral authority of Lambeth resolutions should mean ‘provinces of the Communion should not proceed with controversial developments in the face of teaching to the contrary from all the bishops gathered together in Lambeth Conference’ (p78)
- that different categories of Lambeth resolutions should be distinguished
- that the importance of the Primates’ Meeting should be increased and the running of its agenda improved
- and that the role and work of the Anglican Communion Office should be reappraised.

on behalf of the whole Communion” (§112). This might be composed in various ways, but preferably from a small group drawing on the Primates of the Communion and considering the specific expertise required.

Canon Law and Covenant

There is important work to be completed as soon as possible on “principles of canon law common to the churches within the Anglican Communion” (§113). The canon law of each province should “reflect and promote global communion” (§115).³¹ This contrasts with the current situation where canonical systems are, at best, ambivalent or neutral to global communion. Consideration must be given “as to how to make the principles of inter-Anglican relations more effective at the local ecclesial level” (§117)—for example, by adopting a brief ‘communion law’. The Primates should consider “the adoption by the churches of the Communion of a common Anglican Covenant which would make explicit and forceful the loyalty and bonds of affection which govern the relationship between the churches of the Communion” (§118). A draft covenant is offered (in Appendix Two) along with a proposed process of implementation (§118).

There are six ‘overwhelming’ arguments in favour of such a covenant:

- it could avoid repetition of recent conflicts,
- it could draw on covenants in ecumenical relations,
- it would give a visible foundation to Anglicanism,
- it would represent an international obligation and a means of witness,
- it could help in disputes with national governments,
- it would have means of development built into it (§119).

Indeed, while “the paramount model must remain that of the voluntary association of churches...it may be that the ACC could encourage full participation in the Covenant project by each church by constructing an understanding of communion membership which is expressed by the readiness of a province to maintain its bonds with Canterbury, and which includes a reference to the Covenant” (§120).

Our Future Life Together: Comments

Instruments of Unity: the Covenant

52. The proposals in relation to the Archbishop of Canterbury are significant and could be relatively rapidly implemented. Without granting formal legal powers to the Archbishop, they provide a means by which he can exercise a much-needed ministry of unity on behalf of the Communion with greatly enhanced moral authority. We are faced with a situation where (not least because of global communications such as the Internet) actions in one part of the Communion rapidly impact (for good and for ill) on other parts of the Communion. This proposal creates structures that could facilitate consultation and counsel. These would enable the Archbishop to exercise a truly representative and authoritative ministry on behalf of the whole Communion.

53. The Council of Advice would, one presumes, properly reflect the diversity of the Communion. It would not be as dominated by the wealthier but declining Western churches—as are some existing Communion institutions (which were created before the ‘Two Thirds World’ or ‘Global South’ expressed its voice effectively in Communion councils). Of course, important questions remain concerning how it would relate to the Primates’ Meeting (especially if *that* also takes ‘enhanced

³⁰ This vitally important point (concerning the Archbishop’s implicit authority ‘to gather or not to gather’) was the central argument of *To Mend the Net - Anglican Faith and Order in Renewed Mission*, edited by Drexel W. Gomez and Maurice W. Sinclair, and published January 2001 by The Ekklesia Society, 1415 Halsey Way, Carrollton, Texas 75007, and a number of submissions to the Commission.

³¹ These propositions were put before the Primates’ Meeting in 2001.

responsibility’) and the ACC. However, both these bodies are clearly too large to perform this function of advice and too costly to convene rapidly in times of crisis. Such authority as the instruments of unity might have comes when they are together in agreement and consonant with the Scripture.³²

54. Not least because of a (not wholly accurate) leak prior to publication, the proposal of a covenant has aroused much comment. TWR clearly advocates the actual adoption of such a covenant, suggesting even “a legal authorization by each church for signing and a solemn signing by the Primates in a liturgical context” (§118). This is much more than an educational device. It is therefore very much a medium to long term solution. The question of the covenant’s length, content and wording will undoubtedly prove a major challenge. Though it would be simply expressing in words the unwritten conventions which TWR has begun to articulate, certain provinces will likely resist a more formal articulation of the true nature of communion.

55. Nevertheless, the proposal holds out the possibility of a truly international Anglicanism. It builds on the tradition of national churches but adapts this in a manner necessary for our contemporary world of globalization. It maintains a pattern of life which, though in some ways moving closer to the Eastern Orthodox model, is theologically and practically distinctively Anglican. Some, no doubt, will see the need for written covenants (and legally binding canons relating to communion life) as a sign of failure to live in the freedom of the Spirit. However, recent events have shown that some have used their freedom in a manner that is close to licence. Some formal declaration, which clarifies the meaning of communion and encourages mutual accountability and interdependence, therefore appears necessary—as becomes immediately obvious when the Commission turns to consider what it can recommend in response to recent events.

such authority as the instruments of unity might have comes when they are together in agreement and consonant with the Scripture

³² The Articles of Religion 21 (Of the Authority of General Councils) reads: “General Councils may not be gathered without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and the Word of God), they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.”

D. PICKING UP THE PIECES

(‘The Maintenance of Communion’)

Introduction

56. The final section of TWR is where the rubber hits the road in terms of describing and responding to the presenting crisis. There is a real risk that the proposals in Section C will never be implemented because the Communion will not survive long enough to put them into practice.

The Maintenance of Communion: Summary of §121–§123

This crisis has come about because of the failure to give due weight to interdependence. In particular, ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada failed to consider fully “the impact of their decisions on other parts of the Communion” which “in turn has promoted reactions...which offend our understanding of communion in significant ways” (§121). After considering the actions of ECUSA, New Westminster, Canada’s General Synod and “various primates who (without consultation with their fellow primates) have accommodated clergy who are at odds with their own bishop”, it is clear that “all have acted in ways incompatible with the Communion principle of interdependence, and our fellowship together has suffered immensely as a result of these developments” (§122). The fact that appeals for a period of ‘calm’ were ignored and declarations made of impaired or broken communion are also deeply to be regretted. “The Commission regrets” five particular actions that have taken place “without attaching sufficient importance to the interests of the wider Communion” (§123); the first four of these relate to the synodical actions of ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada, the fifth to those who “have taken it upon themselves to intervene in the affairs of other provinces of the Communion” (§123).

These interventions are evidently ‘reactions’ which have been ‘prompted by’ the prior actions of ECUSA and New Westminster. However, they have a common feature with that to which they respond—because they took place “without consultation with their fellow primates” (§122) and because primates have “taken it upon themselves” (§123) to intervene. Such actions do not fit within the vision of an interdependent Communion offered earlier.

there is a real risk that the proposals in Section C will never be implemented because the Communion will not survive long enough to put them into practice

The Maintenance of Communion: Comments

57. We do not, however, live in an idealised version of an interdependent Communion, but in a situation of crisis—an emergency which necessitated the calling of an extraordinary meeting of Primates and the setting up of the Commission itself. The important question, therefore, has become: what responses are appropriate when actions have been taken that ‘tear the fabric of the Communion’ at the deepest level? Were the responses taken both necessary and proportionate in the situation which the Primates and the Archbishop of Canterbury had already recognised as an emergency? These are questions which TWR fails to address and this failure significantly weakens its analysis here and its subsequent recommendations.

Elections to the Episcopate: Summary of §124–§135

Bishops should be acceptable to the wider church, because “a bishop is more than simply the chief pastor to a local church” (§124). There are contentious areas (for example, concerning remarried divorcees and women bishops, §§125–6), but the Communion has “made its collective position clear on the issue of ordaining those who are involved in same gender unions” (§127). As a result, the actions of ECUSA have “caused deep offence to many faithful Anglican Christians both in its own church and in other parts of the Communion” (§127).

Those electing Robinson or consenting to his election are not ‘entirely or exclusively blameworthy’ because “not everyone involved in the processes will necessarily have been fully acquainted with the contents of the resolutions we have quoted” (§128). However, after the Primates’ Meeting in October 2003, bishops “acted in the full knowledge that very many people in the Anglican Communion could neither recognize nor receive the ministry as a bishop in the Church of God of a person in an openly acknowledged same gender union” (§129). This raises the question of “their commitment to ECUSA’s interdependence as a member of the Anglican Communion to which its own Constitution and Canons make reference” (§129).

In the wider Communion and in ecumenical relations, “the consecration has had very prejudicial consequences” and the Commission believes those involved “did not pay due regard...to the wider implications of the decisions they were making and the actions they were taking” (§130). Although the implications of this for episcopal appointments do not demand a new formal process, there must be “a change of outlook on the part of those involved in the process of appointment to take account of our bonds of affection and interdependence” (§132). The Commission accepts the Archbishop of Canterbury’s position in relation to the ministry in England of ‘the current incumbent of the See of New Hampshire’, urges his acceptability to be kept under review, and warns the Archbishop “to exercise very considerable caution in inviting or admitting him to the councils of the Communion” (§133). Three recommendations are then given in relation to ECUSA on this issue (§134):

First, ECUSA is invited ‘to express its regret’. This regret is two-fold. It encompasses both “that the proper constraints of the bonds of affection were breached” in relation to the election and consecration and also “for the consequences which followed”. It then describes such regret as representing “the desire of ECUSA to remain within the Communion”.

Secondly, pending such statements, those involved in the consecration are invited “to consider in all conscience whether they should withdraw themselves from representative functions in the Anglican Communion...in order to create the space necessary to enable the healing of our Communion”. In forming their consciences, they are advised to “consider the common good of the Anglican Communion” and seek advice. Other Communion members are urged “to accord appropriate respect to such conscientious decisions”.

Third, ECUSA is invited to effect a moratorium on electing and consenting to the consecration of any similar candidate “until some new consensus in the Anglican Communion emerges”.

Finally, practical ways must be found to take forward the ‘listening’ called for at Lambeth 1998. In particular ECUSA is requested to contribute something “which explains, from within the sources of authority that we as Anglicans have received in scripture, the apostolic tradition and reasoned reflection, how a person living in a same gender union may be considered eligible to lead the flock of Christ” (§135). The Commission also refers to the work of the House of Bishops in ECUSA and England.³³

Elections to the Episcopate: Comments

Repenting and Regretting

58. What are we to make of these proposals? First, much has been made of the use of language of ‘regret’ rather than ‘repent’. Whilst TWR’s key paragraph prefaces its calls by speaking of ‘the imperatives of communion – the repentance, forgiveness and reconciliation enjoined on us by Christ’ (§134), its subsequent language of regret leads to an apparent uniformity of response with seemingly everyone saying ‘regrets all round’. Thus the Commission can itself regret the actions of others (§123); those who authorised same-sex blessings are also to regret (§144); and those who have intervened in other dioceses can be invited to regret the consequences of their actions (§155). This identity of terminology obscures the fact that the force of ‘regret’ is quite different in these three contexts. Regret concerning the actions of *others* or concerning the *consequences* of one’s own actions is a different moral, spiritual and psychological response from regret that “the proper constraints of the bonds of affection were breached”. That form of regret is, or should be, *regret for one’s own actions* (not just their consequences), which actions are categorized as a violation of the Christian call to love. In such cases ‘regret’ and ‘repentance’ may carry similar force.

59. It may be argued that the specific language of ‘repentance’ is best kept as the overarching context for such ‘regret’. TWR is clear that the consecration did indeed breach the constraints of the bonds of affection (as we have seen, they have mounted a powerful if at times subtle argument to demonstrate this). What is now required is that those who consecrated should recognize that this was indeed what they did and that they should have been aware of this given the Primates’ Statement. Although it has been suggested that it may not be appropriate to ask institutions, as distinct from individuals, to repent, nevertheless there is biblical warrant for calling on a body of God’s people (Ezra 9-10), cities (Matthew 11.20 and Matthew 23.27), and a local church (Revelation 2-3) to repent.

60. The weakness of TWR’s general approach, however, is that it focuses on the consequences of those actions for relationships *within the Communion* rather than on their consequences for *relationships with God*. The actions were not only functionally unloving and unhelpful; they were also, and more seriously, wrong in the sight of God.

61. Nevertheless, should ECUSA or any bishops within ECUSA refuse to express regret in the terms that TWR has requested, that refusal could only represent one of two judgments:

- *either* an acceptance of TWR’s analysis but no regret that ECUSA has breached the constraints of the bonds of affection;
- *or* a wholesale rejection of the vision of communion and of the analysis of recent events offered in the main body of this unanimous Report.

There is no alternative. Whichever of these two rationales applies, ECUSA’s refusal to express regret would represent a further act of contempt towards the Anglican Communion. *By thus reaffirming its decision not to ‘walk together’ with the Communion, ECUSA would be rejecting the path of reconciliation clearly laid out by the Commission for the health of the Communion and determining to ‘walk apart’.*

³³ Significantly, both of these offer more conservative and cautious judgments on this matter: see “Some Issues in Human Sexuality” issued by the Church of England House of Bishops, and the Report of the Theology Committee of the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church 18 March 2003 (<http://arc.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/pdf/theology/comreport.pdf>).

62. More problematic would be how to interpret an expression of ‘regret’ which, either explicitly or implicitly, fell short of the repentance which is an essential condition of reconciliation: a commitment to undo the wrong that had been done. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that such a minimal expression of regret would fail to demonstrate the will to repair the tear in the fabric of our common life and resume walking together.

63. A further problem is that TWR leaves unclear exactly how and in what form this ‘regret’ must be expressed. Presumably, since it is asked of ECUSA as a whole, it must be given by some representative body (whether the House of Bishops or a specially convened General Convention). Given that, until it is forthcoming, the desire of ECUSA to remain within the Communion is ambiguous, *this must be clarified with great urgency*. In the meantime, constituent members of ECUSA (ie parish vestries, clergy, bishops, diocesan synods, provincial House of Bishops etc) should be encouraged to signal their own desire to remain in the Communion on the terms of TWR.³⁴

Consenters and Consecrators

64. The decision to address this call to ECUSA and then a personal call to consecrators represents a slightly different way forward from that called for by many submissions to the Commission.³⁵ These saw the break with the Communion as

*healing of the Communion
could not proceed if there were
a corporate statement of regret
from which consecrators
dissented*

having occurred *at General Convention* and therefore distinguished between those bishops who consented to Robinson’s election and those who were ‘non-consenters’. TWR’s rationale for rejecting this (§128) is implausible: “not everyone involved in the processes”, it suggests, “will necessarily have been fully acquainted with the contents of the resolutions we have quoted”. It would be interesting to know how many consenting bishops at General Convention (having received enormous

amounts of material on this subject³⁶ and heard the relevant Lambeth resolution referred to in debates) would admit to levels of ignorance as great as the Commission assumes! The Commission here exercises excessive generosity concerning culpability, presumably in order to limit the personal focus to as few individuals as possible.

65. However, it cannot be so charitable to the *consecrators* (including ECUSA’s Presiding Bishop and Michael Ingham as well as bishops from other provinces). They are called to actions even more akin to repentance: conscientious reflection on their actions, seeking spiritual counsel, and withdrawal from participation in those Instruments of the Communion that they have disregarded. This clearly represents an acknowledgment that they themselves have done wrong: but to whom? To fellow members of the Communion, or to Christ himself, the Lord of his Church?

66. Moreover, the recommendation’s wording is unsatisfactory as its meaning is

³⁴ This was called for in the Oxford Declaration (www.anglican-mainstream.net/news205.asp); a Call For Compliance with a proposed form of compliance can be found on the ACI website (www.anglicancommunioninstitute.org)

³⁵ See for example the submissions to the Commission from the Anglican Communion Institute, the Church of England Evangelical Council, and “Drawing the Line”, on the Lambeth Commission website for the final Windsor meetings of the Commission. (www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/commissions/lambeth/windsor2/index/cfm)

³⁶ For example the Letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Primates, July 23, 2003, speaking of “waiting for one another” (www.stpaulsspark.org/genconvention03/abpc03.23.html); copies of *True Union in the Body?* which contains specific references to Lambeth I.10 were sent to every General Convention member.

unclear. It calls for such actions “pending such expressions of regret from ECUSA”. Does this require both a corporate statement of regret and more particular actions asked of the consecrators? What if one occurs (corporate regret) but not the other (withdrawal by the consecrators)? Healing of the Communion could not proceed if there were a corporate statement of regret from which consecrators dissented. It needs to be made clear now that such an eventuality would not meet the Commission’s recommendations and so the consecrators could not re-enter Communion councils.

ordinations (and not just consecrations) of candidates in such unions represent breaches in the constraints of the bonds of affection and therefore should cease

Consecration and Ordinations

67. On another matter, TWR explicitly rejects the argument that, because it lacked a proper ‘catholic intention’, the consecration of Gene Robinson was invalid. The manner of the rejection (it is without explanation) suggests the Commission failed fully to grasp the argument.³⁷ The location of this note (§128 at n.71 in relation to the legalities of General Convention’s actions) shows the Commission has not understood the argument: for ‘failure of intention’ could only occur *after* the Primates’ Meeting and the unanimous statement signed by the Presiding Bishop (an event not discussed until §129). Moreover, the ‘failure of intention’ does not depend on any *legal* inadequacy, but solely on a *theological* understanding of ‘intention’ and ‘invalidity’. TWR itself actually grants this theological premise to the invalidity argument when it notes that the consecrators “acted in the full knowledge that very many people in the Anglican Communion could neither recognize nor receive the ministry [of Gene Robinson] as a bishop in the Church of God” (§129). If that was so (and the consecrators *knew* it to be so), then a strong case can be made on the basis of an Anglican theology of orders that the consecrators—whatever the provincial legalities and whatever their psychological desires—simply *could not validly consecrate* the bishop-elect as a bishop in the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church.³⁸

68. Finally, there is the Commission’s call for a moratorium. Although the call is limited to the *consecration* of “any candidate to the episcopate who is living in a same gender union” (presumably due to the particular action to which these recommendations respond), the logic of TWR requires a moratorium, not just on consecration to the episcopate, but on *ordinations* of such candidates to the presbyterate/priesthood as well. This is because the moratorium is “until some new consensus in the Anglican Communion emerges” (§134). But the Communion has already “made its collective position clear on the issue of ordaining those who are involved in same gender unions...” (§127). The implicit conclusion of TWR is therefore that ordinations (and not just consecrations) of candidates in such unions represent breaches in the constraints of the bonds of affection and therefore should

³⁷ See the Paper from the Nassau Consultation, ‘The Current Crisis in the Anglican Communion: What are the Ecclesiological Issues Involved?’ on the Lambeth Commission website (for the Kanuga Meetings in June 2004). (www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/commissions/lambeth/documents/200406dgedcelesiology.pdf)

³⁸ See Oliver O’Donovan, “The Only Poker Game in Town” on www.fulcrum-anglican.org “I am sorry that it did not take up the suggestion that the consecration of Gene Robinson was defective, given the obvious lack of intention on the part of the consecrating bishops to make a Bishop of New Hampshire acceptable to the universal church”, and the submission from the Nassau Consultation to the Kanuga meetings of the Lambeth Commission referenced above.

cease. The Primates therefore need to make explicit this implication of life in the Communion and provinces need to heed their call.

Public Rites of Blessing: Summary of §136-§146

Focusing on the actions of New Westminster, it is noted that despite diocesan discussions “there is no record of any formal attempt to consult the wider province or Communion”; criticisms are also made of the theological, procedural and liturgical judgments reached (§§137-8). More widely in Canada, although the decision of the General Synod to affirm the ‘integrity and sanctity’ of committed same sex relationships is regrettable (§123), it interprets the main thrust of the Synod to be “to defer decisions until 2007 until due consultation can take place” (§139).³⁹

ECUSA’s General Convention is viewed less sympathetically, not least because “without formal theological justification or consultation in the Communion” (§140) they also ignored their own House of Bishops’ Theology Committee.

Given “the clear and repeated statements of the Instruments of Unity” advising against developing and approving such rites, actions “to move towards the authorization of such rites in the face of opposition from the wider Anglican Communion constitutes a denial of the bonds of Communion” (§141). Those bonds require those proposing such actions “as a beginning, to demonstrate to the rest of the Communion why their proposal meets the criteria of scripture, tradition and reason...to demonstrate how public Rites of Blessing for same sex unions would constitute growth in harmony with the apostolic tradition as it has been received” (§141).⁴⁰ Although ‘the beginning of such demonstration’ is noted (§142) it is clearly insufficient:

We believe that to proceed unilaterally with the authorisation of public Rites of Blessing for same sex unions at this time goes against the formally expressed opinions of the Instruments of Unity and therefore constitutes action in breach of the legitimate application of the Christian faith as the churches of the Anglican Communion have received it, and of bonds of affection in the life of the Communion, especially the principle of interdependence. For the sake of our common life, we call upon all bishops of the Anglican Communion to honour the Primates’ Pastoral Letter of May 2003, by not proceeding to authorise public Rites of Blessing for same sex unions (§143).

Bishops who have authorized such rites are “invited to express their regret that the proper constraints of the bonds of affection were breached by such authorisation”. Pending such regret they are urged “to consider in all conscience whether they should withdraw themselves from representative functions in the Anglican Communion” (§144). Provinces should “take responsibility for endeavouring to ensure commitment on the part of their bishops to the common life of the Communion on this matter” (§144).⁴¹ Those provinces engaged in discernment in this area are urged to engage the Communion in studying biblical and theological arguments and to clarify the relationship of such unions to marriage. Even so, “this call for continuing study does not imply approval of such proposals” (§145).

Finally attention is drawn to the call in Lambeth Resolution I.10’s for ongoing listening. The Communion must “establish processes and structures to facilitate ongoing discussion” (§146) because “debate on this issue cannot be closed whilst sincerely but radically different positions continue to be held across the Communion” (§146). In particular, “any demonizing of homosexual persons, or their ill treatment, is totally against Christian charity and basic principles of pastoral care”, in keeping with the 1988 Lambeth Resolution concerning human rights and attitude towards persons of homosexual orientation.

³⁹ TWR avoids commenting on the dismissive attitude shown to the instruments of Unity by the acting Primate of Canada at the General Synod: (www.anglican.tk/modules.php?name=Content&pa=showpage&pid=568)

⁴⁰ For an argument against such proposed Rites but which seeks to encourage those in their favour to develop responses such as those called for here, see True Union in the Body? Op.cit. see fn 5.

⁴¹ This is a clear rejection of the increasingly popular strategy of ‘local option’.

Public Rites of Blessing: Comments

Maintaining the Faith

69. Here the Commission gives a clear and strong direction, making a key statement which, once analysed, also sheds light on other parts of TWR. They criticize the authorization of public rites because it “goes against the formally expressed opinions of the Instruments of Unity and therefore constitutes action in breach of the legitimate application of the Christian faith as the churches of the Anglican Communion have received it” (§143 italics added). The *‘therefore’* in the quotation is crucial. It clearly cannot imply that only actions against the formally expressed opinions of the Instruments are breaches in the legitimate application of the Christian faith. There are numerous possible actions that could be taken that would be such breaches but which the Instruments have not pronounced upon. Given TWR’s emphasis on the supreme authority of Scripture it is clear that breaches occur when actions are contrary to Scripture even if they are not contrary to the Instruments. However, the judgment of TWR here is clear and neither the strength of its judgment nor its rationale must be lost. TWR states that if any diocese or province acts against the formally expressed opinions of the Instruments of Unity in relation to same-sex blessings, then it follows that they are therefore “in breach of the legitimate application of the Christian faith as the churches of the Anglican Communion have received it”. The same line of reasoning must apply to the other applications of the Christian faith which the Instruments have formally opposed on the basis of the unbiblical nature of homosexual practice. Therefore, although never explicitly stated, this strong judgment must also be held to apply to ordaining or consecrating those in such unions. In short, recent actions of ECUSA and New Westminster are illegitimate and depart in practice from the Christian faith as Anglicans have received it.

given TWR’s emphasis on the supreme authority of Scripture it is clear that breaches occur when actions are contrary to Scripture even if they are not contrary to the Instruments

70. TWR acknowledges that this judgment has a certain provisionality about it, in the sense that the Instruments of Unity may express a different opinion at some time in the future. For that to happen, those pressing for change would have to do what they have so far failed to do—that is, to engage the wider Communion biblically and theologically, rather than seeking to secure their ends by political manoeuvres within particular dioceses and provinces. Given that the Lambeth Conference has explicitly stated that homosexual practice is contrary to Scripture and given TWR’s emphasis on the supreme authority of Scripture, the Instruments of Unity would need to be clearly persuaded it was necessary to overturn this considered theological judgment on Scripture’s teaching. Until that is done, actions such as those in ECUSA and New Westminster will remain breaches in the legitimate application of the Christian faith whenever and wherever they occur within the Communion and the Communion will have to respond to them in that light.

71. If such engagement is sought, great care would have to be given to how that might be structured. Engaging in serious reflection on issues relating to sexuality must not be interpreted as a means whereby Lambeth I:10 is subverted or the clearly stated mind of

the Communion is undermined. Changing the stated mind of the Communion requires the proper processes of consultation and mutual discernment, based on the supremacy of Scripture as TWR itself has set out. Subversion may occur either through non-participation (the temptation perhaps of some wearied by the prospect of endless discussion on the subject) or by participation but alongside unilateral actions (purporting to put facts on the ground) in breach of the Communion's teaching. Given the present reality and fragile state of the Communion, to take either of those stances is to turn away from the call of God to live in Communion and bear one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ.

On care of dissenting groups: Summary of §147–§155

Acknowledgement is made of the “hurt and alienation felt by individual Anglicans, parishes and dioceses” (§147) as a result of recent actions. There has also been “a long history of suspicion and division over a range of issues” which means that healing and reconciliation are necessary.

In line with Section B, it is important to uphold “the historically sanctioned role of the bishop as a core principle of Anglican ecclesiology”, while recognizing the difficulty when some “feel that the spiritual leadership of their church has been compromised” (§148). In extreme cases, when people have experienced a ‘breach of trust’, this has involved recourse to other bishops for pastoral and sacramental oversight—even without permission of the diocesan. Although these were ‘principled concerns’, “they should have been handled differently” (§149).

Provinces and dioceses must recognize that “dissenting groups in their midst are, like themselves, seeking to be faithful members of the Anglican family” (§150). All parties must “work tirelessly to rebuild the trust which has been lost” (§150). Only where there has been ‘an extreme breach of trust’ and only ‘as a last resort’ should there be ‘a conditional and temporary provision of delegated Episcopal oversight’. This “must be sufficient to provide a credible degree of security” and run alongside “a mutually agreed commitment to effecting reconciliation” (§151). In such situations, “it would be axiomatic that the incumbent bishop would delegate some of his or her functions, rights and responsibilities to the ‘incoming’ bishop” (§152).

The proposals for Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight (DEPO), set out by ECUSA's House of Bishops in 2004, are commended as “entirely reasonable, if they are approached and implemented reasonably by everyone concerned” (§152) and if they provide a sufficiently secure appeal system. The Commission believes such ‘delegated pastoral and sacramental oversight’ could be given by retired bishops in the province or by bishops from other provinces.

Turning to recent actions, the Communion should uphold “the ancient norm of the Church that all the Christians in one place should be united in their prayer, worship and the celebration of the sacraments”; “all Anglicans should strive to live out this ideal” (§154). There should be no ‘establishment of parallel jurisdiction’ (§154). Instead “those bishops who believe it is their conscientious duty to intervene in provinces, dioceses and parishes other than their own” (§155) are asked to:

- express regret for the consequences of their actions,
- affirm their desire to remain in the Communion,
- effect a moratorium on any further interventions.

Where interventions have taken place a call is made to seek an accommodation with the diocesan bishop. Where ECUSA bishops have rejected the DEPO proposals they are

called to reconsider as a refusal represents “a profoundly dismissive statement about their adherence to the polity of their own church” (§155).

On care of dissenting groups: Comments

No moral equivalence

72. Without question, this part of TWR has most disturbed the many who oppose the recent developments in North America—which developments the main body of TWR itself so strongly condemns. Particularly for those who have focussed immediately on TWR’s recommendations, it has coloured assessment of the Report as a whole. So, to put these particular recommendations in context, let us first consider how they compare to the Commission’s other recommendations.

73. Positively, the Commission

- speaks of the ‘principled concerns’ of dissenters and of their ‘conscientious duty’;
- asks for regret, not for the *actions* themselves, but for the consequences alone;
- does *not* categorise the actions as ‘breaching the proper constraints of the bonds of affection’
- does *not* ask those who intervened to consider withdrawing from Communion life
- does *not* see expression of regret as the means by which a desire to remain in the Communion will be signaled
- does *not* require them to return parishes to their diocesan bishop.

74. There is therefore no basis at all for claiming that there is a moral equivalence or a ‘level playing field’ between the actions of the revisionists and the interventionists. All the actions the Commission regrets share the common feature of being actions taken unilaterally by provinces and Primates which are against the common counsel of the Communion and have impacted detrimentally the wider life of the Communion. But beyond that, there is no parallel.

75. It is to be assumed that, if ECUSA fully complies with TWR, the proximate cause of intervention would then be removed, and the emergency fire brigade would withdraw (using the analogy of responding to calls for help if one’s neighbour’s house is on fire). But, as long as the possibilities of new fires being lit remains, they need to be on stand by for further action.

76. Similarly, in relation to protection, it acknowledges the Anglican integrity of ‘dissenters’ and implicitly rebukes those who have not done this.

It is concerned for credible security and does not dismiss the concerns of those who “feel at the mercy of a potentially hostile leadership” (§151). It treats as axiomatic that the bishop will have to delegate functions and rights, and accepts this might be to a bishop outside the province. It also sharply criticises those revisionist ECUSA bishops who reject all such proposals.

there is therefore no basis at all for claiming that there is a moral equivalence or a ‘level playing field’ between the actions of the revisionists and the interventionists

77. That said, there are, however, a number of major weaknesses in the Commission's work here. First, for many the call to orthodox parishes and dioceses to affirm a desire to remain in the Communion is patronizing and insulting. It is not they who have departed from Communion teaching; rather their actions have been taken because of their plain and clearly expressed loyalty to Communion teaching. No doubt what lies behind this recommendation is the fear that some interventions "build on earlier attempts at unilateral action against bishops" or seek "to set up would-be 'orthodox' structures or 'mission churches' for their own sake" (§29). This was clearly condemned by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primates at Oporto in 2000. There have also been fears that some provinces might unilaterally extend this pattern in response to the current crisis, which then raises questions about any commitment to the Communion and the vision of life in communion set out in TWR. But, as demonstrated earlier, it is the nature of the current crisis that extra-ordinary action has been deemed necessary to protect the catholicity and orthodoxy of parochial and diocesan life in the face of innovation and heterodoxy at diocesan and provincial level. The 'orthodox dissenters' are not the ones who have difficulty in affirming their loyalty to the Anglican inheritance of faith. This recommendation is mis-directed and not well expressed. What is required is for all parties to affirm their loyalty to the Communion teaching and practice—which is presumably the intention behind the proposed Covenant.

78. The second major weakness is that the relationship of *these* recommendations to the earlier ones relating to ECUSA and New Westminster is never clarified—despite the fact that the interventions are almost all in response to communion-breaking actions of ECUSA and New Westminster. To make a commitment to a moratorium on interventions *before* there have been any accompanying re-commitments to communion life on the part of innovating provinces is not only unrealistic but irresponsible and wrong. While, of course, there would be no need for such interventions in a healthy communion, when the communion is ill (in the manner and for the reasons the Commission describes) then such irregular, emergency actions may indeed be necessary. To use an analogy, people should not normally run on to other's property without authorization. But the law recognizes that to rescue a hurt child or an adult trapped in a burning building is proper, and not an act of trespass.

79. Unless and until the leadership of innovating provinces return to Communion teaching, the best that can be realistically hoped for is a structure by which interventions in defence of loyal Anglicans by orthodox bishops may be more orderly. However, as the Archbishop of Canterbury recognized in supporting the formation of the Anglican Communion Network of Dioceses and Parishes in ECUSA⁴², the initial outrageous flouting of order by ECUSA and the diocese of New Westminster clearly requires that the overwhelming priority now is adequate pastoral care of the faithful rather than the technicalities of order. Interventions should clearly only occur after some form of consultation within the Communion. Such consultation would eliminate concern that actions are unilateral, are undermining interdependence or mutual accountability, or might be representing attempts at ecclesiastical 'empire-building'. However, consultation was *already* explicit in the Primates' mutual agreement at their Lambeth meeting in October 2003, when they recognised their

⁴² Anglican Communion News Service 24 September 2004: "Amongst those with whom the archbishop met last autumn were those dissenting from the impending consecration of Gene Robinson; those involved wished to discuss the shape that might be taken by groups dissenting from the decision of General Convention but remaining within the structures of ECUSA. The term 'network' was suggested as offering one appropriate model to provide support for those dissenting from the resolution but intending to remain within ECUSA's structures. The Archbishop felt that this might prove a suitable working concept, but no proposals as to its potential form, structure or outworking were advanced."

responsibility to ensure adequate episcopal oversight if the consecration went ahead in New Hampshire.⁴³ Of course, episcopal intervention can cease as soon as the province or diocese concerned returns to Communion teaching. Thus TWR's concern to maintain communion would be met.

DEPO: bishops' authority questioned, then retained

80. The third major weakness in this sub-section of TWR is the endorsement of ECUSA's plans for Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight. The treatment here is theoretical and naïve. TWR's own account of the actions of certain bishops shows how naïve it is to speak of proposals working if approached and implemented 'reasonably'. Given, as argued earlier, that the illness is much more serious and the problem more deep-rooted and long-standing, then this is a potentially fatal flaw in TWR. Although much at present goes unreported, there are sadly many examples where bishops are not simply disregarding Communion teaching and appeals but are actively persecuting those committed to the Communion. Some examples from Canada, USA and Latin America are given in the Appendix of this booklet. When the shepherd acts like a wolf, it is not reasonable to expect the sheep to welcome him as 'chief pastor' and it is understandable that talk in the abstract of 'reconciliation' may appear unsettling for some of the sheep.

81. In such situations, the ECUSA bishops' plans are not the 'adequate provision for Episcopal oversight' which the Primates called for in October 2003. Oversight, whether primary or alternative, *must be acceptable to those who are being overseen* and in the present context of a complete breakdown of trust and all too frequent resort to legal action, an independent element is necessary to validate that the alternative offered is acceptable to the overseen and as well as the overseer(s). When they meet in February, and are supplied with fuller information, the Primates will need to make their own judgments on the adequacy and reasonableness of the existing system—not least in the light of ECUSA's responses to TWR.

82. Fourth, the commendation of ECUSA's DEPO plan fails to acknowledge that, although developed six months after the consecration, the working premise of the plan is an interpretation of recent events that is *totally incompatible* with that offered by TWR. Instead DEPO takes a wholly provincial rather than Communion perspective on the developments in ECUSA. It quotes highly selectively from the Primates' Letter, disregarding the fact that the consecration had 'torn the fabric' of the Communion. So it is particularly odd that the Commission should commend an appeal system in which it is laid down that one of the two bishops *must* hold views in opposition to Communion teaching⁴⁴ (and may well have acted in violation of that teaching). This is hardly a way to secure the maintenance of catholic order.

83. Fifth, there is a rather unpleasant double standard in TWR asking certain bishops to consider *removing themselves* from the life of the Communion but then still presuming they have *full authority* within their own

when the shepherd acts like a wolf, it is not reasonable to expect the sheep to welcome him as 'chief pastor'

⁴³ "Whilst we reaffirm the teaching of successive Lambeth Conferences that bishops must respect the autonomy and territorial integrity of dioceses and provinces other than their own, we call on the provinces concerned to make adequate provision for episcopal oversight of dissenting minorities within their own area of pastoral care in consultation with the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Primates." (Primates' Statement, 16 October 2003: www.aco.org/acns/articles/36/25/acns3633.html).

⁴⁴ TWR Appendix Three page 104 Number 11, § 5.

diocese. If, on the basis of a flawed view of autonomy, bishops are taking actions that put their affiliation with Communion structures seriously into question (and indeed represent practical departures from the Christian faith), then they surely *cannot expect to maintain their full authority* within their diocese. In such situations, it is simply inadequate to appeal to long-standing principles of ‘non-intervention’. The Nicene canons relating to jurisdictional integrity and the authority of the bishop (and the various Anglican reaffirmations of them) cannot be abstracted in this way from other canons concerning common agreement over discipline and excommunication.⁴⁵ In order to consider these matters of ‘care’ and ‘protection’ properly, the Primates must take seriously TWR’s earlier analysis and judgments of the actions of certain bishops against Communion teaching.

84. There are similar serious difficulties with the scheme called ‘Shared Episcopal Ministry’ recently produced by the Canadian House of Bishops. Although this scheme seeks to suggest working with TWR, it actually undermines the Report’s whole framework, especially its twin requests that dioceses should both apologise if they have proceeded with same-sex blessings and undertake not to carry out more (§143-145). TWR makes a strong statement (§143) against unilaterally proceeding in this matter and recommends that provinces “take responsibility for endeavouring to ensure commitment on the part of their bishops to the common life of the Communion on this matter” (§144). In contrast, Canada seems to be saying, “We are not expecting New Westminster to comply and we are setting up systems (not very clear) to pave the way for others not to comply but to proceed.” Canada is thus embracing the view of autonomy and local option that TWR rejects and opting for a reception model which TWR explicitly rejects (§69). Thus, although the Canadian response looks like a move

forward, it must be rejected because it accepts the *status quo* and rests content with a divided house. All this applies by the same logic to DEPO in ECUSA. If the Canadian process is not acceptable then by the same logic neither is ECUSA’s scheme for DEPO, which strangely TWR accepts. To accept either ECUSA’s or Canada’s proposed process is actually to reject the commitment to the Communion for which TWR calls.

*the overwhelming priority now
is adequate pastoral care of the
faithful rather than the
technicalities of order*

Following through its own logic

85. The section on the care of dissenting groups appears to have been written without having taken on board the full implications of the analysis in the earlier part of TWR. TWR itself provides more than ample material for questioning this naïve endorsement of DEPO. One senses here the struggles of producing a unanimous report, with TWR seeking to be even-handed in its criticism; but the direction of the logic of its own earlier criticism of ECUSA must be heeded.

86. In short, having demonstrated that the crisis must be thought through in relation to life in the Anglican Communion and that both theologically and ecclesologically

⁴⁵ See the Anglican Communion Institute submission to the Lambeth Commission:
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ecumenical/commissions/lambeth/documents/ACI.html>

the innovating provinces and bishops are at fault, TWR then appears to forget this when addressing ‘care of dissenting groups’ (even the language of ‘dissent’ arguably illustrates this). Those who elsewhere are called to express regret and whose status in the Communion is seen as currently unclear are not only placed *on a par* with those faithful to the Communion and its teaching. Because of their episcopal office they are left with *all the power*—power which some of them clearly abuse. Revisionist bishops and revisionist parishes in orthodox dioceses are already using the power of the secular law to harass the orthodox. The Primates need to provide more support for the orthodox in such situations, by making clear the actions of ECUSA and New Westminster call into question their own status in the Communion. (TWR §129, §134). In describing dissenters’ concerns, the Commission thus fails to show the solidarity with them that would follow from the analysis they have offered; they also fail to extend their recommendations at the level of inter-provincial *Communion* institutions down into the life of the *provinces*.

Cat and mouse

87. Bishop Peter Lee (of the Diocese of Christ the King in South Africa) has likened the process suggested by the Commission to asking the mouse to report to the cat:

This section seems hastily drafted, inconsistent and impractical especially in light of the Commission’s own call (51) to “avoid unilateral action on contentious issues” ... Having held one faction in ECUSA responsible for the crisis in the Communion—through its insensitive pursuit of innovation and its disregard of interdependence, it seems curiously inconsistent to adopt that faction’s proposal unilaterally as a basis for pastoral care in the American Church. This is doubly so when the Report recognises (127) that “the Episcopal Church (USA) has caused deep offence to many faithful Anglican Christians ... in its own church”.

The proposal is doubly impractical. First, if the aim of the report is to reconcile those who have felt slighted by the innovations in ECUSA, these will not be persuaded by any solution which allows those within ECUSA who have resisted these innovations, to be disadvantaged. This will be perceived as a justice issue requiring a fair outcome. To be consistent with the main body of the Report, the Communion must now aim to restore mutual respect and interdependence not only in the Communion at large, but within ECUSA itself.

Secondly, while the Report speaks eloquently of a breakdown of trust (40), it fails to recognise the depth of that breakdown within ECUSA. I fully agree with the Report’s view that alternative pastoral oversight must be ultimately aimed at reconciliation, and must therefore be interim in nature. However all conflict resolution processes require ground rules agreeable to all parties at the outset. ... Because US culture is aggressively adversarial, because the prevailing model of dispute resolution is win/lose, and because litigation (condemned by the Report) is already under way, it is essential to establish a framework for alternative care agreeable to all parties if reconciliation is to be effectively pursued. ... Without it, as we would have said in the apartheid era, we are simply asking the mouse to report to the cat.

the Commission has not answered the central question as to how Communion teaching may actively be safeguarded in the face of a minority determined to overthrow it

Such a framework and process needs to be guaranteed by the Communion at large. The Report insists (109) that the Archbishop of Canterbury has an inherent right of intervention in any Province, because of the inter-dependent nature of our Communion. This needs to include the possibility of ad hoc interventions under the Archbishop's eye to address tensions which threaten the Communion – of which the Lambeth Commission is already one. This must apply to the need for healing in ECUSA, and for proper interim arrangements while that healing is pursued. Failing this, the Windsor Report will only cancel out the progress it offers.⁴⁶

The Report's Conclusion: Summary of §156–§157

All parties should “seek ways of reconciliation” and seek to “heal our divisions”. There may need to be formal discussions about the path to reconciliation, perhaps even a liturgical expression of reconciliation and recommitment. However, there is “a very real danger that we will not choose to walk together” and so need to “begin to learn to walk apart”. ‘In any human dispute’ certain courses may be followed—mediation, non-invitation and finally withdrawal from membership. Hopefully these will not prove necessary but instead every effort will be made to “maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace”, rather than turning away from one another, from the Cross and from the needy world.

The Report's Conclusion: Comments

88. No detail is given as to what might be involved if the Primates accept TWR's recommendations but they are not implemented by provinces. Given initial responses to TWR and the clear sense of urgency as the clock fast approaches midnight, TWR's understandable reticence about addressing these issues may well prove a major weakness. In February, when the Primates meet, it may be already clear that some have already decided that they must ‘walk apart’.

89. These paragraphs also reveal a conceptual and theological weakness in TWR. It has, in effect, given a clear and valuable picture of life in Communion and how the Anglican Communion may better express that. It has given a clear and largely illuminating analysis of where in recent years the Communion has failed to live out this vision, not drawing back from highlighting and seeking to remedy specific and serious failures on the part of some bishops and provinces. At the end, however, the Commission fails to take the message from its analysis and simply resorts to appeal as a remedy, classifying all other responses as in some sense a ‘walking apart’ and ‘failure’. The Commission has thus not answered the central question as to how Communion teaching may actively be safeguarded in the face of a minority determined to overthrow it. Perhaps taking cover in their own role merely as advisors, they have failed to articulate recommendations to those who might have such executive authority to act.

⁴⁶ The Windsor Report: A pastoral response (Bishop Peter John; Lee www.anglican-mainstream.net/news214.asp)

They have not sufficiently clarified the mechanisms of response that are legitimately possible within Anglicanism, should their own recommendation be refused.

90. As in any family it is not sufficient to discuss problems and make appeals without being clear that there are also appropriate actions that can be taken against those who would act contrary to family expectations. This gap becomes acutely significant when there *are* legal procedures set in place *within* a province (such as ECUSA), but there are no such procedures in place *between* provinces—that is, the wider ‘family’ of the whole Communion. This makes it possible for ECUSA, if it chooses, to act as *antinomians* abroad but as *legalists* at home. While they believe that the central organs of Anglicanism have no power over them, in their own province they retain the legal power over those who ‘dissent’ from their prior ‘dissension’ from orthodox Anglican teaching. This gap at the centre can all too cruelly be used to a province’s advantage by those who are willing to abuse their legal power at home. The situation then becomes analogous to the ‘wicked servant’ in Jesus’ parable who takes advantage of his master’s mercy to beat up those under his power (Matthew 18:23–35)

91. The exclusion of major theological themes such as sin, grace, and redemption from the discussion (because the substantive issue of homosexuality was left outside its remit) comes home to haunt TWR in its analysis of the resultant structural problems. There is a failure to draw fully on some available aspects of the medicine of the Gospel, which might then have helped us to know how to deal with sickness and sin within the Church. The tragedy of this is that TWR refuses to open up the possibility of a third category of Anglican existence namely ‘membership but under discipline’.⁴⁷ This expresses the biblical idea of restorative justice. That is to say if an individual or church falls into serious sin then there has to be a mechanism for suspending them from church fellowship until such time as they express true repentance and can be restored. (see I Corinthians 5) This course of action seems to be part of the Church’s tradition of pastoral care that has been largely forgotten but is still affirmed in Canon B 16 of the Church of England. The advantage of highlighting this is that it makes it clear that we are not just consigning ECUSA and New Westminster to “outer darkness” we will still care for them, pray for them and work for their ultimate restoration. Discipline is an act of love not rejection. This category has been used at the highest level of international politics with reference to the membership of South Africa, Pakistan and Zimbabwe in the British Commonwealth. Without “membership but under discipline”, we are left with only two alternatives: membership or departure. The choice is stark. Thus paradoxically, through perhaps hoping to ‘buy some time’ for the Communion, the Commission may actually be shortening its life-span.

92. No doubt the Commission’s hope was that

there is a failure to draw fully on some available aspects of the medicine of the Gospel, which might then have helped us to know how to deal with sickness and sin within the Church

⁴⁷ Communion and Discipline (submitted to the Commission by the Anglican Communion Institute) gives such theological themes and makes such a recommendation.

TWR's clear analysis and strong exhortation would be sufficient to engender the responses of self-discipline it calls for and a commitment to 'walk together' in the way it describes. It may be that the Commission felt that to go beyond such appeals for regret and moratoria was either outside its authority or would represent a fundamental failure of communion. TWR's vision of communion and its medium- to long- term proposals for reform of structures may in the longer term have lasting value. However, unless over the next three months we witness a dramatic change of mindset and a whole-hearted acceptance of the Commission's findings and recommendations as well as of the vision of communion found in this Report, then sadly in February the Primates will find little of immediate and practical value in the Commission's report. Effectively many in the Communion will be determined to respond to the Commission by *'calling its bluff'*: "much talk, many appeals", they may say, "but no likelihood of any real action". It would be sad indeed if this important report, through deeming certain things to be beyond its remit, was then treated in this way and robbed of its power.

CONCLUSION

93. TWR contains much excellent material. At the same time, Mainstream Anglicans⁴⁸ committed to Anglican teaching on sexuality and therefore opposed to recent actions in ECUSA and New Westminster will, as has been noted, find aspects of TWR that fall short of what is required. They will be disappointed that their appeals to interpret such events theologically and recognize the reality of human sin within the Church and so exercise some form of discipline within a clear and short time-scale was not embraced by the Commission. We warmly welcome an overall vision of life together under the supreme authority of Scripture, marked by mutuality and interdependence, holiness and a commitment to mission. On the other hand, we consider the Commission has fallen short in the task of *applying that vision* to the situation the Communion faces today and, in particular, in working out the full implications of its analysis for the action that needs to be taken to remedy the ills which have been so clearly identified.

*aspects of TWR fall
short of what is required*

94. The Communion faces not just challenges over sexuality but seismic shifts in the nature of world Christianity and mission in a globalised culture.⁴⁹ In recent decades, the Anglican family has grown and matured. For those parts of the family that have in the past seen themselves in a more 'parental' role, the need now is to face up to the changing family dynamic that the growth of the Communion has produced. Those who traditionally have held much material power can no longer define the limits of diversity or claim autonomy to innovate unilaterally without due regard to their brothers and sisters in Christ. The account offered in the first two sections offers a framework for Anglican self-understanding that can, over time, be fleshed out in ways that will benefit provinces, clarify and nurture relationships between provinces, and enhance the moral authority of the central structures of the instruments of unity. These proposed changes to Communion structures do *hold out the prospect* of making the biblical and orthodox vision of life in Communion a greater reality in the future. But the process of structural change is bound to take a considerable time. And in the current state of the Communion time is very short. Before we set out on a lengthy journey of structural change, one which will we trust prevent a repetition of unilateral actions which tear the very fabric of the Communion, we have first to remedy the deep tear which is currently threatening our very life.

95. The first necessity is an accurate diagnosis. Sadly the present reality is far from TWR's ideal picture of communion—perhaps further from it than at any time in the history of Anglicanism. TWR's analysis of the symptoms of the current sickness is welcome (especially when some are arguing that all is well and no medicine is

⁴⁸ This categorisation has been commended by Austen Ivereigh in the *National Catholic Reporter* of October 1 2004. (www.Natcath.org/NCR_Online/archives2/2004d/100104/100104k.htm) He suggests the following: **Mainstream traditional Anglicans** who believe in the primacy of scripture, the honouring of the tradition of the church and unity with the Church universal. (This is the position largely espoused by the Windsor Report - eds). **Liberal Anglo-Catholics** who place a high value on reason and tradition, but also on communion. Liberal Anglo-Catholics would like to keep the Anglican church broad and inclusive, but accept the need for a tighter juridical structure. **Liberalists (Innovators)** who believe that the Anglican church should make way for new realities and be open to Holy Spirit showing up in unexpected places. They believe the churches of the communion are bound together by bonds of affection and understanding rather than by an agreed authority.

⁴⁹ See further *The Next Christendom—The Coming of Global Christianity* by Philip Jenkins (Oxford University Press 2002).

required). Yet it does not fully recognize the deeper malaise which afflicts us and therefore its proposed treatment falls short of what is required. The recommended strategy of exhortation and appeal does not deliver the necessary disciplines of repentance, forgiveness and reconciliation. The analysis of the sickness is not carried through adequately into the prescription for a remedy and cure.

96. In our view TWR's recommendations need clarifying and strengthening—especially where they fail to do justice to the analysis and judgments clearly offered in the earlier part of the Report. We urge the Primates to follow these through when they decide how to act in the light of TWR.

97. We must stress the decisive nature of the Primates' meeting. TWR itself evidently regards the Primates' Meeting as decisive: "We would much rather not speculate on actions that might need to be taken if, after acceptance by the Primates, our recommendations are not implemented" (§157). Moreover, in the Mandate (§1 page 13) it is clear that the first duty of the Commission is to report "on the ways in which provinces of the Anglican Communion may relate to one another in situations where the ecclesiastical authorities of one province feel unable to maintain the fullness of communion with another part of the Anglican Communion." This lies within the competence of the Primates. Thus, any extension of a process of consultation (e.g. to the Anglican Consultative Council and beyond) refers in the Mandate to the Commission only to an extraordinary ministry of oversight by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and (now also clearly) to the proposed Covenant, but not to all their recommendations.

98. Thus it will be for the Primates to make the chief response to TWR which they themselves commissioned at their Emergency Meeting. Yet, almost certainly, at their meeting in February the Primates will have also to determine what to do *when it is clear that some are not interested* in the 'maintenance of communion' as proposed in the TWR and *are already 'walking apart'*. The 'path of reconciliation' in TWR may sadly be spurned. The Primates will then need to take decisive action to repair the damage caused by those who have torn the Communion's fabric at the deepest level. Work will be urgently needed on the principles and processes by which the then inevitable and immediate task of re-structuring the Anglican Communion can be achieved. In our judgement the TWR provides an invaluable resource and important framework within which to set about this task. Yet in certain areas it falls short of pursuing home the logic of its own best insights.

99. We will therefore offer in conclusion some suggestions for ways in which those recommendations can be strengthened or re-cast in order to meet the urgency of the hour. We will also suggest four key ways in which the work of TWR can be taken forward. For TWR is truly a call at the 'eleventh hour'—a last recipe for peace in our time. It is our task to heed it before midnight strikes.

Call to the Primates

100. The Primates need to follow through the Report's own logic and internal dynamic in order to strengthen its recommendations.

In particular, we call on the Primates in February to:

- Welcome and affirm the vision of life in Communion set out in the Report and explore fully its proposals for the Instruments of Unity.

- Reaffirm clearly and defend the Anglican teaching on sexuality as expressed in Lambeth I.10.
- Ensure that the ongoing listening and sharing of perspectives that is necessary in all pastoral care is not seen to undermine the status of Lambeth I.10 within the Communion.
- Confirm that statements of ‘regret’ must signify the ‘repentance’ necessary for true reconciliation and so include a commitment not to repeat the actions..
- Confirm that emergency intervention to provide pastoral care and oversight of orthodox parishes and dioceses is theologically and ecclesologically justified.
- Provide a structure so that genuinely adequate episcopal oversight can be provided and which is not dependent on those whom the majority of Anglicans believe have departed from the ‘Christian faith as we have received it’.
- Assess, in a clear and limited timescale, whether the actions taken by ECUSA in response to the Report are sufficient to enable them to remain in the Communion and so be in conformity with their own Constitution and canons.
- Assess, in a clear and limited timescale, whether the actions taken by New Westminster in response to the Report are sufficient to enable them to remain in the Communion.
- Assess, in a clear and limited timescale, whether the Primates’ own request for adequate episcopal oversight for loyal Anglicans in provinces or dioceses with revisionist leadership has been met.
- Identify those who remain committed to ‘walking apart’ and establish processes by which it is clear they have done so.
- Use their enhanced responsibility to implement sanctions against those committed to ‘walking apart’, including requesting the Archbishop of Canterbury not to invite them to Communion councils.
- Define and clarify the “exceptional circumstances and conditions” under which the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the words of the mandate to the Lambeth Commission, might exercise an “extraordinary ministry of episcopate... with regard to the internal affairs of a province other than his own for the sake of maintaining communion”.
- Recognise, support fully and seek to protect all those who clearly signal their compliance with Windsor’s recommendations especially in the case of legal action against them.

the Primates will need to take decisive action to repair the damage caused by those who have torn the Communion’s fabric at the deepest level.

101. In the meantime, until the Primates meet in February to determine the future shape and direction of the Anglican Communion, there are four central tasks for those committed to upholding biblical teaching and the vision of communion offered by TWR.

First, to reflect on TWR and respond to it through the official channels instituted by the Communion in preparation for the Primates' Meeting. (see www.anglicancommunion.org and, for responses to them through the Anglican Mainstream site, www.anglican-mainstream.net).

Second, to encourage bishops and Primates committed to upholding and preserving Anglican orthodoxy and unity to work for decisive action in February that will set the Communion back on the road to health.

Third, to challenge those who, by their actions, have begun to 'walk apart' from the Communion to heed the urgent call of TWR and follow its clearly stated path of reconciliation and healing. Failure to do so will simply confirm their determination to reject walking together and to follow a different vision which persists in actions incompatible with the bonds of communion and the Christian faith as Anglicans have received it.

Fourth, to pray for the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primates. Some have already covenanted to pray for a Primate daily between now and their February meeting. We need to pray that if in February there are those determined to keep walking apart, the Primates will have wisdom, courage and grace to respond by taking the action necessary to preserve the Anglican Communion. This will mean, in the words of Resolution III.6 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference on the Instruments of the Anglican Communion, with particular reference to the Primates, "intervention in cases of exceptional emergency which are incapable of internal resolution within provinces and issuing clear guidelines on the limits of Anglican diversity in submission to the sovereign authority of Holy Scripture and in loyalty to our Anglican tradition and formularies".

APPENDIX

DELEGATED EPISCOPAL PASTORAL OVERSIGHT (DEPO)

A. Perspective on DEPO from the Anglican Network in Canada

DEPO⁵⁰ and its new Canadian alternative (Shared Episcopal Oversight) may only work in dioceses which have not proceeded with same sex unions, and where the sitting bishop is inclined to generosity. It will not work for many parishes in the diocese of New Westminster or in any other diocese where the authorities are hostile to orthodoxy.

1. Practical Considerations

The DEPO model does not cede jurisdiction from the sitting bishop. When Bishop Ingham proceeded with same sex blessings in 2002, he offered a conscience clause and an Episcopal visitor which is essentially the same as DEPO. However, as you will see from the examples which follow, the failure to cede jurisdiction leaves orthodox parishes open to abuse and oppression and eventual closure.

It is important to recognize that despite the declarations of the Windsor report that the actions of the New Westminster diocese were “one of the presenting causes for the current tensions within the Anglican Communion” (para.136), they constituted a “denial of the bonds of Communion” (para.141), went “against the formally expressed opinions of the Instruments of Unity” (para.143) and were a “breach of the legitimate application of the Christian faith as the churches of the Anglican Communion have received it” (para.143), the bishop of New Westminster has made it clear he has no intention of complying with the Commission’s call for a moratorium on further blessings. He has publicly stated he will defer such a decision to the Diocesan Synod in 2005. In addition, the Windsor Report also correctly points out that this issue has been treated by this bishop and diocese as one of *adiaphora* (as an issue that does not make a difference) when “large numbers of other Anglicans around the world” disagree with that position (para.37). Similarly, the Diocese of Niagara has just passed a motion to approve the blessing of same sex marriages without due regard to the recommendations in the Windsor Report.

Thus, it is clear that the parishes of the Anglican Communion in New Westminster (ACiNW) who have dissented from the decision of this diocese to bless same sex unions, are being asked to remain under the jurisdiction of a bishop who has shown wanton disregard for the Instruments of Unity, the Anglican Communion as a whole, and the “legitimate application of the Christian faith”. Some orthodox parishes in the Diocese of Niagara will also find themselves in a similar situation when and if the bishop gives his consent to the blessings.

The bishop in New Westminster has taken numerous actions at the local level which have eroded the number of orthodox Anglican parishes in this diocese (see examples below). The real issue on the ground is that DEPO offers absolutely no tangible protection for the remaining orthodox Anglicans in this diocese.

⁵⁰ Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight

Examples of hostile action by the Bishop:

Revocation of a priest's licence (2002)

- The bishop revoked the licence of Rev. Paul Carter (formerly a senior chaplain for the British forces in Ireland, with 20 years experience as a priest), an evangelical orthodox priest from England who was working in the diocese. Rev. Paul Carter had all his benefits cut off and he was placed on leave “without permission to officiate” anywhere in the diocese. Without a licence, he had to plant a new congregation and founded a new church, the Anglican Communion in Canada (ACiC). At the time of launching the ACiC, he received a bishop from the Anglican Mission in America (AMiA), under the oversight of four of the orthodox Primates. (A fifth Primate has since joined).

Closure of the Mission Church of Holy Cross, Abbotsford (December 2003)

- The bishop closed a mission church in Abbotsford after the congregation voted to join the ACiNW and request alternative episcopal oversight. The priest, Rev. James Wagner, had his salary summarily stopped and he was placed on leave “with permission to officiate” with the proviso that he not minister in an ongoing capacity to a congregation. Not only did the diocese cease funding the mission, they went so far as to “terminate” the mission so that it would have no legal status in law nor standing in the Anglican Church of Canada.

Forcing the majority of the orthodox congregation out of the parish (September 2003)

- In January 2003, St. Martin's North Vancouver's minister resigned in protest over the diocese's decision to bless same sex unions.
- In September, after the bishop's appointed interim minister failed to persuade the conservative congregation to accept the diocese's direction, the bishop invoked Canon 15, the equivalent of religious “martial law” which allows the bishop to take complete control over a parish despite the expressed wishes of a congregation. The locks on the buildings were changed, the finances secured, and all the orthodox staff and lay volunteers were removed from their positions.
- The conservative congregation has since left and is meeting in a community centre in North Vancouver where they are now also under the umbrella of ACiC.

Threats to Ordained and Lay Leadership of Orthodox Parishes (2002-2004)

- The diocesan chancellor, wrote individual letters to all the lay leaders of the ACiNW parishes warning them of the risks of legal proceedings with potential personal liability after the parishes voted to cease payment of the diocesan apportionment in 2002. Some of the lay leaders felt intimidated by the letters.
- While the Primates were meeting in October 2003, the chancellor of the diocese delivered ecclesiastical charges against all ACiNW rectors, charges which could lead to deposition. The real nature of those charges can be seen in the allegation in one case that it was an ecclesiastical offence to say to the Bishop in a private meeting that the approval of a rite for same-sex blessings was contrary to the tradition of the Church and the teaching of the Bible. In other words, the decision to stand with the main body of the Anglican Communion was itself treated as the very ground for coercive action.
- The ACiNW parishes have felt compelled to retain legal counsel to protect their

rectors, lay leadership and parish properties at considerable expense.

- In 2002, the diocese threatened to re-direct funds remitted to the diocese for payment of salaries and benefits for parish staff to offset diocesan apportionment payments which the congregations had refused to pay pending resolution of this crisis. In order to protect the salaries of their staff, they had to set up independent payroll systems so that the staff could be paid directly and to ensure the diocese could not confiscate those funds for itself.

Struggles to hire orthodox clergy

- In New Westminster, the bishop has a history of not cooperating in the hiring of orthodox clergy for the orthodox parishes. He has refused to permit certain applicants to be interviewed or has dismissed all the applicants and required another search to be undertaken.
- The ACiNW parishes struggled to employ orthodox priests to fill vacancies in the last round of interviews with the diocese in 2002. At least one candidate was told he would not be hired in the diocese if he associated with the Canadian Essentials group.
- Filling current clergy vacancies with orthodox clergy who understand the orthodox view of the gospel on the issue of koinonia and broken communion would in all probability be impossible. Orthodox candidates with such an understanding would not be able or willing to receive a licence from Bishop Ingham, nor would he be likely to employ someone who disagreed with his understanding of the gospel.

Much of the above happened while there was an Episcopal visitor for the diocese, Bishop William Hockin of Fredericton, although only one parish (non-ACiNW) had formally requested his services. Eventually, Bishop Hockin withdrew his participation in the scheme and recognized it was ineffective to address the situation in the diocese.

While being able to provide pastoral care under DEPO, there is no ability to stop the impediments to hiring of appropriate clergy, the threats to lay and ordained Anglicans, the closure of parishes, and removal of licences from priests viewed as “problematic” for the diocese (i.e. those who stand up for orthodoxy).

2. Genuine Jurisdiction required for security

The Windsor Report calls on bishops like Michael Ingham to consider withdrawing from representative functions in the Anglican Communion if they cannot express the regret set out in paragraph 144 and commit to the common life of the communion. Under normal circumstances this might be effective. However, such action appears to mean little to Bishop Ingham and other liberal bishops in Canada and the USA.

Liberal bishops, and particularly Bishop Ingham, speak dismissively in public about the instruments of unity, including the Archbishop of Canterbury. At the Anglican Consultative Council meeting in September 2002, Bishop Michael Ingham, publicly criticized the Archbishop of Canterbury George Carey, calling Archbishop Carey’s comments about the actions of the diocese of New Westminster “inappropriate”, an “oversimplification”, and a “great disservice to truth”. If he cannot respect and honour the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, how can one expect him to honour and respect ordained clergy and lay leaders under his jurisdiction?

The New York Times interviewed Bishop Ingham (July 5, 2003) and wrote this:

Bishop Ingham speaks in a deadpan voice, and can even sound monotonous as he mixes theology, psychology and history in his analysis. *But his critique of the religious right is passionate and pointed.*" (italics added)

The conservatives, he says, want to roll back the 18th century Enlightenment "because it brought rationalism and individualism into the Western world." He adds with a giggle, "The fact that it delivered us from superstition and church imperialism is forgotten."

Once he begins throwing darts at the right, there is no stopping. (italics added) "Conservatives say you cannot pick and choose, but that's exactly what they do because the same texts that condemn homosexuality condemn the eating of shellfish," he said. "I haven't heard any conservative churchman campaign against shellfish in the last few years."

It is unreasonable to expect that a bishop with such opinions is able to provide any measure of security for orthodox clergy and parishes as called for by the Windsor Report: "This oversight must be sufficient to provide a credible degree of security on the part of the alienated community, so that they do not feel at the mercy of a potentially hostile leadership." (§151)

The only step which can truly protect the orthodox, particularly in New Westminster, and the step which the liberal bishops have strenuously opposed, is true alternative episcopal oversight with jurisdiction ceded to another bishop. It may seem like an irregular and extreme measure, but it does have excellent historical precedent and does not come close to the moral equivalence of blessing same sex unions as acknowledged in the Windsor Report. Full jurisdiction must be granted to the bishop who makes decisions about hiring and firing of clergy and ordaining appropriate candidates. Anything less ensures the loss of orthodox clergy through failure to hire or ordain qualified orthodox candidates, attrition or forced removal.

The Vancouver Sun article (February 21, 2004) on Bishop Ingham's tenth anniversary as bishop, closed with the following:

"Ingham will need all the golf he can get in the coming years and beyond — because he believes there's another giant controversy, beyond homosexuality, coming soon within Anglicanism.

It will be over the place of other faiths and the "absoluteness" of Christianity, he says. Ingham has already got a taste of the conflict after writing *Mansions of the Spirit*, which applauds people who are good Buddhists, Muslims and Jews. "A Christian is one who believes Jesus Christ to be the way, the truth and the life. This is not to say there are no others," he says. "This issue will be the next major battleground."

Thus, he has publicly stated that there is another more important battle on the horizon which he knows will be "the next" major battleground. His agenda is clear and the orthodox parishes feel they present a threat to that agenda if they continue to exist in the diocese. Therefore, they feel there can be no security for orthodox parishes under the jurisdiction of Bishop Ingham.

From the perspective of the global communion, groups of parishes like the ACiNW and the orthodox in Niagara have been orphaned by the decisions of their dioceses. Orthodox Primates from around the world have declared broken communion with

Bishop Ingham and the New Westminster diocese and the ACiNW parishes are also in broken communion with their diocese and bishop. The role of the bishop to connect them to the communion has been evacuated. While the majority of the communion stands in fellowship with the parishes of the ACiNW, the reality is that those in the positions of power in the Canadian church do not understand the minimum security necessary to enable those parishes to exercise a mainstream orthodox Anglican Christian ministry. Without genuine jurisdiction, even temporary and within the structures of the Canadian church, parishes in New Westminster and many others across the country will not survive.

3. Koinonia

The New Testament teaches that it is impossible for believers to remain in koinonia with those who promote, practice and advocate ‘the sinful works of darkness’. As the Windsor Report (§134) argues, the imperatives of communion are repentance, forgiveness and reconciliation. Reconciliation requires repentance on both sides of the equation. In dioceses committed to unilateral decisions and actions regarding same sex unions, and who have demonstrated a complete disregard for the rest of the communion and outright disdain for the orthodox view of scripture, repentance is very unlikely.

The ACiNW has participated in several rounds of ‘reconciliation’ talks with Bishop Ingham. Their experience leads them to believe that his view of “reconciliation” means that they should capitulate to his authority and continue as though the crisis of disunity and scandal to the communion does not exist or never happened.

This has important implications. As the Archbishop of Canterbury stated, this poses a significant problem for our sacramental fellowship. Put more pointedly, how may we share the Lord’s supper with those who teach and practice porneia? How can we send money to support their ministry, particularly when the New Testament makes such a close identification between koinonia and financial support of ministry? How can we be in ‘structural fellowship’ with those who are preaching a different gospel?

There are limits to koinonia. Generosity of spirit must be directed toward others, but not toward all ideas.

4. Continuing the Agenda

Bishop Ingham has publicly expressed ‘regret’ “for the consequences of his actions” which falls short of the Windsor Report call in paragraph 144. He has not expressed regret for breaching “the bonds of affection” and he will not obey the call for a moratorium. He hides behind the decision of the synod saying they will wait for the next synod in 2005 to decide, despite the Windsor Report declaration that such decisions to authorize same sex blessings rest with Bishops (§144).

In the meantime, the Diocese of Niagara, at their Synod November 11-13, 2004, passed one motion to approve the blessing of same sex marriages and another motion to confirm that the use of the term “sanctity” in the motion passed at the Anglican Church of Canada’s General Synod 2004 meant holy and blessed by God. Although the bishop has withheld his consent, he said his personal view was with the majority and he indicated he would bring the motion back to the Synod next year. They also

tabled a motion asking for commitment to carry out the recommendations of the Windsor Report.

In Calgary, on the day the Windsor Report was released, three orthodox parishes were informed they were being “dis-established” and their two rectors were informed their licences will be revoked in the New Year (the 3rd parish did not have a rector). While the dis-establishment has been attributed by the bishop to the results of a “Diocesan Strategic Planning Task Force review”, the fact there was no prior notice given to the parish or clergy and the fact all three were orthodox parishes raises suspicion among the orthodox in Canada, and particularly in that diocese.

In Bishop Cowan’s address to the synod of the Diocese of British Columbia on October 16, 2004, after mis-stating the purposes of the Anglican Network in Canada, he went on to say: “If this, in principle, is true, (and I am willing to be corrected concerning the principles of the proposal) then I believe the action to be in contravention of the discipline of this Church as I have received it. So believing, I will take the measures which are appropriate, against any member of the clergy of this Diocese which is found, after due process, to be a member of the Network.”

Such a comment, though qualified by the brackets, has made some clergy wary of affiliating themselves with the orthodox group even though the bishop’s interpretation of its purposes is not true. The Network seeks to remain connected to and an integral part of the global Anglican Communion and to care for parishes and dioceses where their bishop and/or their synod’s actions have placed them in a state of broken or impaired communion with other members of the global Anglican Communion.

The Primate of Canada, in a public video presentation posted on the web on November 16, 2004 said “The issue here is not whether the ordination of homosexuals is right or wrong. The issue is not whether the blessing of same gender relationships is right or wrong. The issue is how the Anglican Communion worldwide, and indeed across Canada, can maintain unity in the presence of this disagreement.”

Thus, it appears that the agenda for the Anglican Church of Canada is to continue to promote the blessing of same sex unions and marriages undeterred by the Windsor Report. The issue for the Anglican Church of Canada is how we “maintain unity in the presence of this disagreement” recognizing there is no hope of a single position on this irreconcilable issue. Rather than accepting that the Anglican Communion can have a single “faith”, they seek unity of two faiths. If the Anglican Communion disagrees, there needs to be protection and episcopal oversight for those Canadian Anglicans who wish to remain in line with the global Anglican Communion and its teaching.

B. Reaction to DEPO from the United States

Voices from the Pulpits and Pews

(Compiled from emails, public statements and press accounts)

With regard to DEPO: "...we are simply asking the mouse to report to the cat."
Bishop Peter Lee of South Africa

"I cannot believe that the House of Bishops has delivered a dead plan to people in desperate need."

"The document/process is completely self serving to the bishops with little or no care given to those struggling under bad leadership. It is a horrible example of ignoring the needs of the flock."

Apparently, the House of Bishops did not solicit comments from, or listen to, a single parish or rector who would want Episcopal oversight. This plan is like a broken ladder — it only looks useful, but it can't take you anywhere.

The Rev. Canon David Roseberry

"It is obvious that this document is drafted to preserve the power and authority of the bishop. It is a political, not a pastoral document."

Examples of Failed DEPO

Diocese of New Hampshire – Church of the Redeemer sought repentance on the part of V. Gene Robinson or jurisdictional oversight. Robinson refused, and the congregations walked away from ECUSA.

Diocese of Connecticut – Several congregations asked to meet together with Bishop Smith to discuss oversight but he refused to meet with them jointly. He insisted on individual meetings with the rectors and focused on their financial contribution to the diocese while making implicit threats about the future.

Diocese of Pennsylvania – Following the release of the DEPO plan, Bishop Charles Bennison declared he would never allow DEPO in his diocese.

General Harassment - Numerous other congregations have not sought DEPO fearing retribution; other parishes are afraid to go "on the record" for the same reason. Various bishops have warned (sometimes in public pastoral letters or through personal pastoral directives clergy and congregations not to affiliate with the American Anglican Council and/or the Anglican Communion Network; one congregation in Kentucky was declared an "imperiled parish" and its property seized by the bishop; clergy have resigned due to constant harassment and numerous priests have been threatened with inhibition. The diocese of Alabama has lost some 10-15 orthodox clergy due to harassment by the bishop.

C. Harassment of a Bishop by a Province

Recife – Trial Charges Drawn Up

22nd October 2004

The evangelical Brazilian bishop Robinson Cavalcanti of the Diocese of Recife, known for his strong positions in defence of the authority of Scripture, against the legitimacy of homosexual practice and the ordination of practicing homosexuals, is the subject of a disciplinary process in the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil, under pressure from the liberal lobby. The bishop of Sao Paulo, Hiroshi Ito, the bishop of Curitiba, Naudal Gomes, plus two clergymen and two laymen signed the petition to Brazil's Primate Orlando Oliveira, denouncing Bishop Cavalcanti for "breaking ordination vows". The bishop of Recife is accused of "intolerance", "insubmission", "breaking Collegiality", and of Canonical violation for performing a Confirmation Rite in Ohio, USA, without the authorisation of the local bishop. Accepting the petition, the Primate of Brazil will appoint a "Investigative Commission", and, if a case is valid, listen to the Provincial Attorney. The majority of the clergy of the Diocese of Recife have expressed solidarity and support to their bishop, whom they see as the victim of a politically motivated unjust trial.

Bishop Robinson Cavalcanti considers himself innocent. "I am not the first bishop to suffer for defending sound doctrine in Church History" said Bishop Cavalcanti. The trial must be understood as part of the struggle that is dividing orthodox and liberals in the Anglican Communion.

Background on Recife

Latin America is a so-called "Christian" continent, inhabited mainly by nominal/syncretic Roman Catholicism that has lost membership very fast in recent decades (in Brazil, 600.000 every year). Protestantism (Historical, Pentecostal and Post(neo)Pentecostal) constitutes about 16 per cent (26 million more than 90% of whom are of evangelical persuasion) of the total Brazilian population of 172 million.

Anglicanism – besides expatriates – was the result of the missionary vision and work of four young graduates from Virginia Theological Seminary, lead by Lucien Lee Kinsolving (our first bishop), first as an independent mission under the bishop of the Falklands, then as a Missionary District of PECUSA. From 1890 to 1949, under bishops Kinsolving and Thomas, we lived a very dynamic "evangelical period", with a growing church in the southern part of the country.

From 1949 to 1961 PECUSA sent an extreme Anglo-catholic bishop, Louis Chester Melcher, imposing his ritualistic/sacramentalist views, and doubting the need of evangelization: "Why preach the Gospel if everybody is already baptized"(i.e. "saved"). He influenced the first generation of Brazilian bishops: pious, orthodox, but with a reducing emphasis on mission. In the 60's and 70's the church became stagnant.

In 1975 Brazil became an autonomous Province in the Anglican Communion. From the 1970's on, by ecumenical and PECUSA influence (missionaries, books, scholarships, etc) the church very quickly came under liberal influence (first, modern, then post-modern), and became the only declining reformed denomination in Brazil. Many congregations closed or were composed only of the elderly, vocations reduced, there was no missionary outreach, there was a lack of influence in society and an almost total dependence on foreign financial resources. The second generation of Brazilian bishops were liberal, and the evangelicals and charismatics lived as second class members,

discriminated against, and sometimes even persecuted.

Today's Provincial leadership is formed by two groups: the traditional liberals and the people who came from evangelical denominations but who aggressively attack their own past. These people try to reproduce the ECUSA way of thinking and behaving. The House of Bishops in 1997, produced a declaration on sexuality as an alternative to the Kuala Lumpur Statement, implicitly accepting different orientations as equal, and condemned only "negative behaviour" in both.

At Lambeth 1998, the majority of the Brazilian bishops voted against Resolution 1.10. In a House of Bishops meeting last year, almost the whole house took a position in favour of the normality of homosexual practice and homosexual ordinations. They only did not bless same sex unions "because the people are not yet prepared". Many wrote or spoke openly about their positions. They do not want to have the tensions of changing the Canons, and opted for "advancing by practicing". The Brazilian Primate wrote an open letter to the ECUSA Primate supporting Gene Robinson's ordination, based on Canon and Culture. In 2003, supported by ALGA (Anglican Lesbian and Gay Association), and in 2004, supported by INTEGRITY our Province sponsored two Encounters on Human Sexuality affirming the homosexual agenda, and negating the Bible's authority. This year a Provincial Theological Encounter made a clear option for the broadest understanding of "comprehensiveness": the church as a place for everybody's position or behaviour. The small Brazilian Episcopal Anglican Church, in the southern part of the country became, as a result, something odd and with no good report in the national religious scene.

The Diocese of Recife started as a "missionary diocese" in 1975, under Bishop Edmund Knox Sherril, with the support of SAMS UK. We are very far from the Provincial Headquarters (4000 km), and, since the beginning developed an evangelical/charismatic identity. Bishop Sherril stayed for 11 years, followed by the appointment by the national Synod of one Liberation Theologian, Bishop Clovis Rodrigues, a southerner, who stayed for 12 years in tension with the local leaders. But the diocese, even so grew, and became autonomous. The Diocese, that in the past included also all the huge Amazon area, today covers the Northeast region: 9 States, 40 million people (2000 km north-south, 1000 km east-west), the oldest, poorest and more culturally homogenous area of the country.

The Rt Rev Dr Robinson Cavalcanti (former Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship staff-member, a founder of the Latin American Theological Fraternity and former member of the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelisation), in 1997, was the first bishop elected by the diocese, the first native, and the first evangelical, a lonely figure in the House of Bishops. Out of 50 clergy, 45 were ordained since 1997, plus 35 lay ministers instituted. Out of 44 congregations, 34 have been organized since 1997. In 2002 we lost some upper class congregations to the North-American "Charismatic Episcopalian" and "Evangelical Episcopalian" Churches.

Bishop Robinson participated, in 1997, as bishop-elect, in the Ekklesia pre-Lambeth Dallas Consultation, was the only Brazilian Bishop to vote in favor of Resolution 1.10 of Lambeth 1998, included those principles in the diocesan canons, voted with the diocesan standing committee the "Recife Affirmation" against New Hampshire and New Westminster and led the Diocesan Convention, last December, to pass a Resolution of relationship only with orthodox branches of Anglicanism (losing the Companion status with Central Pennsylvania). The relationship between the Province and the diocese has been tense for 29 years, and has deteriorated in the last years.

Last year we discovered a small group of Gay Lesbian and Sympathisers in the diocese, supported by the Provincial leadership, that, from the theological seminary (under provincial authority) created a cell of “liberal evangelicals” on sexuality and on comprehensiveness. The Suffragan Bishop was co-opted, and led the formation of a small parallel episcopacy, under the “Special Episcopal Supervision” of the liberal bishop of Brasilia, by an authoritarian decision of the House of Bishops. All the Provincial financial resources to the diocese were transferred to the hands of the suffragan. [Bishop Robinson comments that this was on the pattern of DEPO as proposed by ECUSA without having the DEPO rules approved or agreed in Brazil. Eds.].

We are isolated and under pressure. Clergy and people do not want to be part of such a Church or be under its spiritual and moral authority. They are waiting for what is going to happen in the Anglican Communion from October to February, and for what is going to happen in our own Province. Clergy and Lay people are looking for help from the orthodox leadership in the Anglican Communion, feeling abandoned. The first option is some kind of realignment. The diocesan leadership is open to look for solutions, but if nothing happens, they can opt for extreme solutions. They want to continue to be part of the Anglican Communion. The liberal and gay lobby has disseminated untrue news.

So, what is happening in Brazil is nothing personal between an evangelical bishop and the liberal provincial leadership, but rather something historical and deep. It is a real crisis. People are paying the price of faithfulness, and cannot be disappointed.

Rev Estevao Menezes
General Secretary
Diocese of Recife

Update: November 2004. Bishop Robinson Cavalcanti and the Chair of the standing committee of the Diocese of Recife have now asked for alternative provincial oversight from the Province of the Southern Cone at their House of Bishops. This will be first case of a Diocese (rather than a parish) asking for external protection.

The Brazilian Primate has appointed a Commission to have a dialogue on the future of the relationship between the Diocese and the Province.

Website Resources

Many references in this Assessment are to material on the Internet. The following are a selection of websites which provide regular news and commentary on Anglican matters:

The Anglican Communion Official Website

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/index.cfm>

This has links to provincial and diocesan websites.

The Official Lambeth Commission on Communion Website

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/index.cfm>

Anglican Mainstream International Coalition Websites:

Anglican Mainstream - <http://www.anglican-mainstream.net/>

Anglican Mainstream South Africa - <http://www.anglican-mainstream.org.za/>

American Anglican Council - <http://www.americananglican.org/>

Anglican Communion in New Westminster -

<http://www.acinw.org/main.html>

Anglican Communion Institute -

<http://www.anglicancommunioninstitute.org/>

Anglican Essentials Canada - <http://www.anglicanessentials.org/>

Church of England Evangelical Council - <http://www.ceec.info/>

Church Society - <http://www.churchsociety.org/>

New Wine - <http://www.new-wine.org/>

Reform - <http://www.reform.org.uk/>

Other useful websites:

All Africa Bishops' Conference - <http://www.aabc-ng.org/>

Anglican Media Sydney - <http://www.anglicanmedia.com.au>

Classical Anglican Net News (CANN) - <http://www.anglican.tk/>

Ekklesia - <http://www.ekk.org/>

Fulcrum - <http://www.fulcrum-anglican.org.uk>

Network of Anglican Communion Parishes and Dioceses -

<http://anglicancommunionnetwork.org/home/>

Titusonine - Kendall Harmon's Blog -

<http://titusonine.classicalanglican.net/>**Virtue Online** -

<http://www.virtueonline.org>

ANGLICAN MAINSTREAM

Anglican Mainstream is a community within the Anglican Communion committed to promote, teach and maintain the Scriptural truths on which the Anglican Church was founded. These also guarantee its fellowship with Christians down history and throughout the world. Faithfulness to Scripture as God's Word is essential for sharing the love and purpose of God in Jesus Christ.

As a global coalition to promote the world-wide gospel ministry of the Anglican Church, Anglican Mainstream has close links (www.anglican-mainstream.net/links.asp) with other organisations and networks sharing the same objective. Only on the basis of and in obedience to the Word of God can Christian mission and service to a hurting and needy world flourish.

Website www.anglican-mainstream.net

Anglican Mainstream UK is the network of organisations within the United Kingdom who are part of Anglican Mainstream's international coalition.

Steering Committee: Dr Philip Giddings (Convenor); Rev David Banting (Reform); Bishop Wallace Benn (Lewes); Preb Richard Bewes; Rev John Coles (New Wine); Rev George Curry (Church Society); Rev Alyson Davie; Ven Dr Paul Gardner (Church of England Evangelical Council); Rev Elisabeth Goddard; Rev Nick Wynne-Jones (Church of England Evangelical Council); Canon Dr Chris Sugden

ANGLICAN MAINSTREAM INTERNATIONAL is a coalition of:

† Anglican Mainstream UK

† The American Anglican Council www.americananglican.org

† Anglican Communion in New Westminster www.acinw.org

† The Essentials Federation & Network www.anglicanessentials.org in Canada

† The Anglican Communion Institute www.anglicancommunioninstitute.org

† Anglican Mainstream South Africa www.anglican-mainstream.org.za

Primate's Adviser: The Most Rev Drexel Gomez Archbishop of the West Indies

Steering Committee of Anglican Mainstream International: Canon David Anderson (American Anglican Council USA), Bishop Wallace Benn (UK), Canon Dave Doveton (Anglican Mainstream South Africa) Dr Philip Giddings (UK), Mrs Diane Knippers (USA), Rev Charlie Masters (Essentials Federation and Network, Canada), Professor Oliver O'Donovan (Oxford, UK), Professor Christopher Seitz (Anglican Communion Institute) Revd David Short (Anglican Communion in New Westminster, Canada), Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Executive Secretary)

Office: 21 High Street Eynsham Oxford UK Tel: 44 (0) 1865-883388 44(0)780-829-7043 e-mail: office@anglican-mainstream.net

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND EVANGELICAL COUNCIL

The Church of England Evangelical Council is the representative body of evangelicals within the Church of England, including bishops, clergy and laity, elected from the Diocesan Evangelical Fellowships & Unions in both provinces; elected nominees from the Evangelical Group in General Synod, Mission Agencies and other Evangelical Bodies.

The Church of England Evangelical Council aims to provide a support and resource network for evangelicals, upholding and witnessing to evangelical convictions, in order that the Church of England may remain true to its biblical foundations and be faithful and effective in its Gospel ministry to the nation.

The Church of England Evangelical Council is the English Group member of the Evangelical Fellowship of the Anglican Communion.

Website: www.ceec.info <<http://www.ceec.info>>

Registered Charity No: 1104514 Registered Company No: 491007 Executive Officer: Frank Knaggs

Office: PO Box 93, Heaton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE6 5WL Tel/Fax: +44 (0)191 240 2084 e-mail: ceec@blueyonder.co.uk

“I am happy to commend this thorough assessment of the Windsor Report because it combines a call for decisive action with space for adequate reflection in a skilful way.”

The Most Rev Drexel Gomez, Primate of the West Indies and member of the Lambeth Commission.

“The future of the Communion is an important enough matter for us to want to discover the mind of the members as well as the leadership of the Communion on these recommendations.”

The Most Rev Peter Kwong, Primate of Hong Kong and Chairman of the Report Reference Group.

“In the current state of the Communion time is very short. Before we set out on a lengthy journey of structural change, one which will we trust prevent a repetition of unilateral actions which tear the very fabric of the Communion, we have first to remedy the deep tear which is currently threatening our very life.”

**From the ‘Assessment and Call to Action’,
Conclusion, paragraph 94**

Anglican Mainstream UK and the Church of England Evangelical Council offer this assessment of the Windsor Report with a call to the Primates meeting in February 2005 for decisive action.

ISBN 1-904889-25-5



9 781904 889250



ANGLICAN MAINSTREAM—UK
strengthening the faith



£3

