

Our Current Crisis



A Primer on National Apostasy

“... a wise man built his house upon the rock.”
Jesus – Matthew 7:24

A study prepared for Fox Chapel Episcopal Church
by the Rev. C. Bradley Wilson

September 2007

For the Whole Church Catholic *Archbishop William Laud*

Gracious Father, we pray for thy holy Catholic Church.

Fill it with all truth, in all truth with all peace.

Where it is corrupt, purify it;

where it is in error, direct it;

where in any thing it is amiss, reform it.

Where it is right, strengthen it;

where it is in want, provide for it;

where it is divided, reunite it;

for the sake of Jesus Christ thy Son our Savior. *Amen.*

For the Parish *William John Butler, 1818–1894, Dean of Lincoln*

Almighty and everlasting God, who dost govern all things in heaven and earth, mercifully hear our prayers and grant to this parish all things needful for its spiritual welfare. Strengthen and confirm the faithful, visit and relive the sick, turn and soften the wicked, arouse the careless, recover the fallen and restore the penitent. Remove all hindrances to the advancement of thy Word, and bring us all to be of one heart and mind in Jesus Christ, to the honor and glory of thy Name. *Amen.*

For the Unity of the Church *Book of Common Prayer*

O almighty God, who hast built thy Church upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head cornerstone: Grant us so to be joined together in unity of spirit by their doctrine, that we may be made an holy temple acceptable unto thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

For Self-Dedication *St. Anselm, 1033–1109*

O Lord our God,

grant us grace to desire thee with our whole heart;

that so desiring thee we may seek and find thee;

and so finding thee may love thee,

and loving thee may hate those sins

from which thou hast redeemed us

for the glory of thy Name

through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

What is the purpose of this longish document?

Who is the author of this document?

What is the best way to read this document?

What I find daunting is the deluge of unfamiliar abbreviations, ecclesiastical terms, and canonical terminology.

What about the titles to describe the two contesting parties themselves? Are they neutral?

What do you hope will be accomplished by the end of this “Primer” booklet?

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

Aren’t these actions proposed in our Diocese schismatic? Why would we want to break the unity of the Church?

So who is breaking off from whom?

Okay, I follow the West Virginia analogy. But this talk of the Catholic Church confuses me. I thought that we were protestants.

So the claim is that TEC has left the Anglican Church by choosing “to walk apart”.

But isn’t a province free to practice a cultural diversity? Why can’t the larger church tolerate what you call “innovations” and “novelties.”

So you are saying that it’s both-and, unity and diversity?

But if diversity without unity is chaos, isn’t unity without diversity destructive too?

“In practice.” How can this tension work out in the life the Church in practice?

What is the “catholic principle” and how does it impinge on us in our current Crisis?

What is the Vincentian Canon and where does it come from?

How is the Vincentian Canon an expression of this?

But hasn’t the Church changed its mind over the centuries?

Arrogant?

How is the Prayer Book Preface an expression of this Catholic principle?

What is anecdotal history? And what are its strengths and weaknesses?

Are you comparing the progressives’ transgressions to the Nazis?

THE NEW PANSEXUALITY

Isn't this all about the homosexual Bishop of New Hampshire.

Are there any useful books, not on the politics, but on the ethics of homosexuality?

- Progressives—Three for the New Sexuality.
- Traditionalists—Three for the Traditional Sexuality.

THE NEW THEOLOGY

Isn't this controversy just about homosexuality?

You're kidding?

When did this change in theology happen — and how?

Stop! Too Much Information! Start over again — and make it easy. What went wrong — for beginners — and when and how?

So what are the doctrines repudiated by the Church Two?

What is the change in “the authority of the Bible as the Word of God”?

What is the change in “the person, work, and bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ”?

What is the change in “the gift of salvation by Jesus as Lord and by his Cross”?

What is the change in “the biblical teaching of sin, forgiveness, and transformation by the Holy Spirit”?

What is the change in “the Holy Spirit as sanctifier and transformer”?

What is the change in “the sanctity of marriage”?

What is the change in “the covenantal nature of the Holy Eucharist”?

THE FOUR OPTIONS

- (1) Circle the Wagons.
- (2) Launch the Lifeboats.
- (3) Prepare for the Exodus.
- (4) Surrender Unconditionally.

CONCLUSION

Having now finished this document, do you have any closing comments?

Our Current Crisis A Primer on National Apostasy

INTRODUCTION

What is the purpose of this longish document?

Over the past several years the national church (through the General Convention, the Office of the Presiding Bishop, and the Executive Council) has set forth in a pattern of decisions, pronouncements, resolutions, and actions that have led many to perceive The Episcopal Church as now being apostate. Over the last four decades this growing perception has caused a loss of 40% of our national church membership—3.7 million members in 1960s down to 2.2 million members today) and that loss has accelerated in this last decade as more and more faithful Episcopalians, steadfast priests, godly bishops, and whole parishes have departed. This perception of theological apostasy and immorality has brought many faithful and biblically orthodox Episcopalians to the point where they can no longer remain associated with the national church. They must choose.

The purpose of this document is to educate this parish on these issues and questions.

Is this perception of apostasy accurate—or exaggerated? If it is accurate, is separation the correct solution? And what kind of separation or disassociation is even possible? How does all of this affect our parish? What impact will any decisions (or indecisions) bring on our parish family, staff, property, endowments—and faith? What kind of church will our children grow up in and which god will they worship?

Who is the author of this document?

It's me, the Rector, the Rev. C. Bradley Wilson, Fr. Brad. I have served as rector here at Fox Chapel for over 11 years, as a priest for 27 years, and as a cradle Episcopalian I come with credentials of Sunday School, boys and men's choir, acolyting, and theological education in England and America. I mainly come as a sinner saved by the grace of God made known in Jesus Christ.

What is the best way to read this document?

Straight through would be best, because that would permit the intended argument to unfold in a logical order. However, some will find the length daunting; if so, then use the subtitles, set forth as questions, to locate those parts of the argument that interest you.

What I find daunting is the deluge of unfamiliar abbreviations, ecclesiastical terms, and canonical terminology.

Sorry. Every field from computers to cars has its own technical vocabulary which to the newcomer can be overwhelming. (One woman coming home from an Altar Guild training session told her husband in an exasperated tone, “They have *names* for all those things!”) The Church does have names for all that stuff—and it can be confusing. Refer to “Appendix One” for most of the terms and abbreviations used in this document.

What about the titles to describe the two contesting parties themselves? Are they neutral?

They must be as neutral as possible, for every person or group has the right to describe themselves. For reasoned debate to occur without rancor, terms (as far as possible) must be descriptive, not pejorative.

The terms we will use here are “Traditional” to describe the Biblical, orthodox, and conservative party and “Progressive” to describe the modernist, revisionist, and liberal party. The terms are admittedly imperfect, for there are Traditionalists, who while fully subscribing to orthodox Christianity, are politically liberal, even socialists, and there are Progressives who perceive themselves as biblically committed. Still each party tends to self-describe themselves with these terms and for the most part they do describe a fundamental aspect of identity.

Within this complexity the best I can hope for is an introduction to the Crisis and a framework for further thinking. Refer to “Appendix Two” for an annotated listing of magazines, books, and websites (both pro and con).

While some of us have heard a little about this Crisis, the present atmosphere has a sense of urgency. Why is this?

As Rector, I have often wrestled with the question of educating the parish on the national church Crisis. How much is enough—or too much? Some of my fellow clergy have been aggressive in regularly exposing their congregations to the problems and offenses by the revisionists. Perhaps they were right. Personally, I feel the whole thing to be mentally and spiritually debilitating. To distress people without any recourse to relieving

that distress struck me as pastorally irresponsible. In any event, it has been my own strategy to “low-key” the debate. While we have had the occasional special teaching evening, Round Table, and advertisement of websites (both pro and con), I have purposefully focused on other concerns in our common life. Whether my strategy was born out of pastoral wisdom or codependent denial, the time for “low-keying” in any event is gone. The Crisis looms.

Looms? Yes. The conversation in the Diocese among many is that some major action disassociating ourselves from the national church is in the offing and may even occur at our Diocesan Convention this November. If some readers are unaware of the gravity of the Crisis or the severity of the distress, that may simply reflect the relative health of our own diocese. The courage and faithfulness of our two bishops and the presence of Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry provide a protection from the compromising heterodoxy and pan-sexuality debilitating many dioceses and churches. We enjoy a healthy isolation with all the pros and cons that entails—not unlike the hobbits in The Shire so blissfully unaware of the destructive machinations abroad in Middle Earth (*The Lord of the Rings*). (Play with that literary analogy: it keeps unfolding with insights relevant to our Crisis.)

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

Aren't these actions proposed in our Diocese schismatic? Why would we want to break the unity of the Church?

That is an excellent question—and difficult to answer. We should seek and even strive for the unity of the Church. That unity is important for four reasons. First, because Jesus teaches us to pray and work for the unity of the Church (John 17:21, Eph 4:13). Secondly, because unity is an expression of brotherly love. Thirdly, because unity removes a stumbling block from our mandated evangelism of an unbelieving world. And fourthly, because our unity provides a more efficient base from which to do all God-commissioned mission, be it Christian Education, evangelism, or social ministry. But Church unity expresses itself in different realms of Church life.

What are the different realms of Church unity?

There are four realms of Church life and thus four realms of Church unity: organizational, moral, doctrinal, and relational. Organizational unity is attained by submission to a common legal polity; it asks, “Do I/we mutually submit to the canons and constitution?” Its highest virtue is order. Moral unity is attained by a common moral behavior; it asks, “Do I/we do the right act?” Its highest virtue is goodness. Doctrinal unity is attained by a common persuasion and submission to a body of teaching; it asks, “Do I/we believe the right teaching?” Its highest virtue is truth. Relational unity is attained by a mutual love; it asks, “Do I/we love my brother/sister as myself?” Its highest virtue is love.

Please note the complexity of the situation where unity exists in one realm but not in another. Three examples. First imagine some parishioners who are both moral in life and orthodox in belief, but gossip about or hate one another; here we pray for the unity of concord (Latin: with + heart). Secondly, imagine a Christian who is orthodox in belief but a liar, cheat or adulterer in practice; here we pray for the unity of moral life. Third, imagine a church institution which is oppressive in practice against orthodox while insisting upon conformity to the oppressive canons. This latter situation which characterized the Church of England in the 1660s, prompted Richard Baxter (1615–1692) to declare in a clear preference for the doctrinal-moral-relational unity to mere canonical unity, “It is better that men should be disorderly saved than orderly damned; and that the Church be disorderly preserved than orderly destroyed.” Two centuries later J. C. Ryle, Bishop of Liverpool, made the identical preference when he said, “Unity in the abstract is no doubt an excellent thing: but unity without truth is useless. Peace and uniformity are beautiful and valuable: but peace without the Gospel—peace based on a common Episcopacy, and not on a common faith, — is a worthless peace, not deserving of the name.” *Warnings to the Churches*, pp.165-166

So who is breaking off from whom?

Yes, this is an essential question. Is the Diocese of Pittsburgh breaking off from the Episcopal Church or is the Episcopal Church breaking off from the Anglican Communion? And if the latter, where does that leave the Diocese of Pittsburgh?

Try this analogy. On April 17, 1861 the legislature of Virginia voted to secede from the Union. The vote was substantial—but not unanimous. Twenty-five counties found themselves in an extraordinarily awkward situation: they wished to remain part of Virginia, but they also wished to remain part of America. What to do? No doubt many, possibly most, when confronted with the option of Virginia-or-America, felt cheated; choosing was not a desired or even a clear option. I suspect then that for most the unwanted choice resolved itself in a contest between two loyalties: a loyalty to America and a loyalty to Virginia. For almost a century these two loyalties had overlapped in such a way that the question, “Are you an American or are you a Virginian?” would have been met with puzzlement. “I’m both.” If a distinction were insisted upon at all, the context might have suggested the answer. “No, I’m not a Connecticut Yankee; I’m a Virginian” or “No, I’m not a French Canadian; I’m an American.” But when all was said and done this Virginian-American could easily have affirmed both.

That 1861 legislature destroyed that easy overlap. Now the inexorable choice had become either-or. The historical process of choosing was messy and confusing—but when the dust cleared 25 counties, discovering their loyalty to America to be more fundamental to their convictions, opted during May–August 1861 to become West Virginia.

So who broke off from whom—back in 1861? Did those western Virginians break off from Virginia—or did those Virginians break off from America. It depends which is deemed the more fundamental reality. A states-rights advocate, holding the individual state as the ultimate sovereignty, thereby demotes the federal government to a mere confederacy or loose association of states. Conversely, the federalist holding the federal government as ultimately sovereign over the states, thereby relegates the state to a limited sovereignty *subject to the federal government*.

We orthodox folk find ourselves in a position similar to those western Virginia counties. We did not ask for this choice (Anglican-or-Episcopalian); it was thrust upon us. We resent accusations of disloyalty and schism; we changed no doctrines and no morals. Reluctantly forced, we choose the catholic (that is, universal) loyalty, over a sectarian (that is, America-only) loyalty, as taught by the Creeds, the Vincentian Canon, and Church history. Despite the aberrant actions of TEC, we choose to not “walk apart”;

we choose to remain a branch of the Catholic Church. If the Episcopal Church elects (oh, so to be regretted) to choose schism over unity, or in the words of the Windsor Report “to walk apart”, we will not follow it. Our love and good will shall follow them, but we shall not follow them out of the Catholic Church.

Okay, I follow the West Virginia analogy. But this talk of the Catholic Church confuses me. I thought that we were protestants.

Yes, we are: catholic protestants and protestant catholics. The difficulty lies in confusing or mingling different definitions of “catholic”. The secondary definition denotes the Church of Rome, under the authority of the Roman hierarchy with the Pope as head. So when one asks, “Are you a Catholic?” one usually means “Are you a Roman Catholic?” —as opposed to, say, Presbyterian or Baptist. However, the primary definition of catholic denotes what is called “the Church universal” or the whole Church in submission to a received tradition of biblical truth (“the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints”, Jude 3b). This is what Anglicans mean in the Creed when we profess to believe “one, holy, *catholic*, and apostolic church” (emphasis added).

The word *catholic* appears nowhere in the Bible. It was first used by St. Irenaeus of Lyons, who contended with eccentric and even weird groups professing to be Christian but offering strange and novel teachings. These teachings, he urged in his magisterial work *Adversus Haereses (Against Heresies)*, were newfangled (they cannot be found in the Bible, which itself is grounded in Jesus and the prophets and the apostles), they were novel (they do not flow from those sources in an apostolic succession of teaching), and they were local (they do not represent the teaching according to the whole church). The word *catholic* then means: “according to the whole”, (Greek: *kata*, according to + *holos*, the whole). The devastation that Irenaeus visited upon the Gnostics and other revisionists of his time was that their novel theologies were worked out and concocted in a small corner of the world out of sync with the vast majority of the Church universal. Those weird innovations were local, not universal, not according to the whole.

So the opposite of catholic (in its primary and original sense) is not protestant, but sectarian. The catholic impulse is to not walk apart from the whole, but rather affirm what the whole church affirms. So The Episcopal Church (TEC) has become a sect.

So the claim is that TEC has left the Anglican Church by choosing “to walk apart”.

Yes—and has thereby rejected its Anglican heritage as a branch of the catholic church. TEC has broken the unity of the Church by introducing theological and moral novelties and thereby entered into schism. This is the verdict of the Windsor Report and of the hundreds of thousands of faithful Episcopalians who have departed TEC since the 1970s when these innovations began to come to the fore.

But isn't a province free to practice a cultural diversity? Why can't the larger church tolerate what you call “innovations” and “novelties”?

An excellent question—and one which brings us to the central tension of the controversy: the tension between unity and diversity. All institutions, organizations and sociological groups exist within a tension between these two principles. The Unity Principle is that which defines our essence (from the Latin *esse*, to be); it points to a core which is absolute and central. The Diversity Principle is that which defines our freedoms (from the Latin, *di-vertere*, to turn aside); it points to the variations apart from and away from the core.

A quick example will illustrate that all communities, however defined, exist with *both* of these tensions at work. Consider the community of American motorists. The Unity Principle is seen in a universal obedience to standardized traffic laws and agreed-upon road signage. The Diversity Principle is seen at work when some choose the fast lane and others the slow lane, some drive big gas guzzlers and others small economy cars, some play loud rap music and others quiet classical pieces—and still others have no music at all. Freedom and Conformity. Diversity and Unity.

Lest that word “conformity” sound too oppressive, reflect briefly on a daily downtown commute with *no* conformity—it’s all so-called “freedom” on the road: left lane *or* right. 100 mph *or* 5 mph, highway *or* sidewalk. Pure “freedom” becomes complete chaos. Freedom needs order to be free. Reflect on the phrase from the *Collect for Peace* that “[God’s] service is perfect freedom” (BCP, p.57).

So you are saying that it's both-and, unity and diversity?

Yes, absolutely! Everywhere! Always! By everyone! The fatal flaw of the Progressives is that they imagine a Church which can be all diversity and no unity. Such an organization

cannot exist; it will fly apart. William Butler Yeats spoke of western civilization in these crisis terms of disintegration:

Things fall apart; the center cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned....

But if diversity without unity is chaos, isn't unity without diversity destructive too?

Again—yes, absolutely! And the word we want here is “oppressive.”

Perhaps this paradigm of both-and rather than either-or can be clarified by an illustration from our solar system. The planets travel around the sun in a perfect balance of two opposing forces. There is the centripetal force, which is the gravitational *pull in*: the Unity Principle. There is also the centrifugal force, which is the *pull out*: the Diversity Principle. And, interestingly, the word “centrifugal” means literally “to flee from the center.” Imagine the nightmare to Planet Earth if either force completely dominated the other. Centripetal force (the Unity Principle) would drag the planet into a fiery death of a solar holocaust. Centrifugal force (the Diversity Principle) would hurdle the planet into a frozen death in the absolute zero of outer space. Certain death is found in the either-or; life in the both-and.

And just so in the Church. Life is found in the life-protecting balance of *both* unity *and* diversity. As it turns out in practice these opposing forces work together paradoxically for the health of each opposing force. A study of Church history would demonstrate that unity (unexpectedly) guarantees diversity, whereas diversity alone devolves into a chaos in which diversity is lost. (Let the interested reader pursue this in Paul Johnson's *A History of Christianity* (Simon and Schuster, 1976).

“In practice.” How can this tension work out in the life the Church in practice?

By clearly distinguishing which bits and pieces belong to which force. In other words, is this particular point at issue an “essential” teaching of the Church which cannot be compromised or is it a “non-essential” teaching, an optional thing, on which any and all Christians are free to differ with no harm to the central core. A table listing the various

ways we speak of these tensions may help show how common this approach is and introduce the various terms used to describe it.

Principles of Tension	Unity Principle	Diversity Principle
Solar System analogy	Centripetal Force	Centrifugal Force
Standard articulation	Core Doctrine	<i>adiaphora</i> / indifferent
	essentials	non-essentials
Hermann-Baxter proverb	things necessary	things not necessary
<i>Preface, BCP. p.9</i>	Doctrine	Discipline

Jump into Church history at any point and this tension is a work—for good or ill. Three decades ago I cut my teeth in this subject reading the tumultuous Reformation history where the Unity Principle oppressively dominated the tension and crushed the whole Church. From that debate came the brilliant aphorism articulated by a Bp. Hermann of Cologne in the pre-Reformation period and later re-articulated for the English-speaking Church by the English Puritan and Anglican Richard Baxter at the end of that sad struggle.

In necessariis unitas.

In non necessariis libertas.

In omnia caritas.

In all things necessary unity.

In all things not necessary liberty.

In all things charity.

The wise reader will note that this aphorism does not solve the debate, but it does usefully set the correct terms for the debate. Is this teaching at dispute a “thing necessary” for the Church to be the Church or is it optional, culturally conditioned, a “thing not necessary”? (The Reformation debate often used the Greek word *adiaphora* to describe a teaching or belief or ritual or rite or devotional act to be a thing indifferent or unnecessary; any such a teaching *et al* might be good or useful, but it was not essential; for example, making the sign of the cross or choosing celibacy.)

Consider which items in the list below you think belong in the category of “things necessary” (essential) and which items belong in the category of “things not necessary” (indifferent). (The answer will come as a post-script following this section; but try to determine each and all of this list first.)

- 1) There is only one God. It's traditional.
- 2) The Prayer Book should be in a red binding. It's traditional.
- 3) The Holy Scriptures are uniquely inspired by the Holy Spirit.
- 4) The Holy Eucharist must be celebrated every Sunday.
- 5) Baptism is initiation into the Church.
- 6) Christians must fast every Good Friday.
- 7) Jesus is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.
- 8) Clergy are to be identified by a special dress.
- 9) Christians are forbidden to murder anyone.
- 10) Despite their pagan origins, the Yule log or Christmas tree can be useful symbols.
- 11) Jesus Christ is fully God and fully man.
- 12) Clergy must abstain from marriage, i.e., practice celibacy.
- 13) Christians must abstain from adultery.
- 14) Being a pagan custom the wedding ring must never be used in Christian marriage.

What is the Vincentian Canon and where does it come from?

St. Vincent of Lérins (died about 450 A.D.) lived in the frustrating and frightening twilight following the fall of the Roman Empire (376), that period called the Dark Ages. The disappearance of government left people and institutions, including the Church, vulnerable to vicious criminals within and rapacious raiders without. Things seemed to be flying out of control. That social chaos touched the Church. It was in this context that Bishop Vincent looked for some authoritative force (authoritative, because commonsensical, most other authorities being gone) to recall the Church to essential Christian teaching.

The Vincentian Canon is commonsensical and that is why it has become traditional. It carries the weighty wisdom of the ages. Again a picture is worth a thousand words.

[My wife says this next section too wordy and not worth reading. She urges that I simply cut out the illustration and go for the clear conclusion stripped of needless verbosity. If you agree with her, please skip to the last paragraph in this section; if not, plow on.]

Imagine that the Rector decides that a generous sprinkling of flying hand-angels would wonderfully beautify his office. All the elementary school children are invited to imprint a colorful handprint upon the office walls (in various rich colors); each flying hand-angel is outlined in a black paint clarifying that these really are angels, not smudges; and for good show each child's name is inscribed beneath the flying hand-angel. Voilà!

The general sentiment may be that *It looks like blazes* and *Let's call it "Explosion in a Paint Factory."* But like it or not, the bottom line question is the political one ("Who decides?"), not the aesthetical one ("Do we like it?"). It's his office; he is entitled to make the decision with or without advisement.

Let's bump that scenario up a notch. Now the proposal is to paint the Nursery with flying hand-angels. Again who decides? Well, first the Nursery Committee needs to be on-board—and so also the Assistant Rector, who is in charge of Christian Education, not to mention the Buildings and Grounds Committee. It might be prudent to also consult nursery parents *not* on the Nursery Committee and the sitters too. (The more people affected by the decision, the more people need to be involved in the decision.)

Let's bump that scenario up another notch. The Rector thinks this such a stunning addition to the Nursery Room aesthetics that he proposes a glorious host of flying hand-angels adorn the Foyer stairs ("like Jacob's ladder they are ascending and descending") and even the Chancel too ("Gives us a strong visual when we pray 'therefore with angels and archangels'"). To the B&G Committee must be added the Christian Ed and Worship Committees for involvement, but the Vestry too will need to have a say (doncha think!) since the entire parish will want to make its opinion known of flying hand-angels. (The Rector may be on a roll with flying hand-angels, but (remember) the more people affected by the decision, the more people need to be involved in the decision.)

Let's bump it up still another notch. The Rector wants to commission a noted sculptor to craft gold-plated flying hand-angels to grace the roofs of every parish church in the diocese—and to finance this he elects to sell off the bottom seven acres of the church property. In addition to the Christian Ed and B&G Committees, the Youth Committee and Vestry will want their say—not to mention the Country Day School, who uses the

soccer field there daily. And here we hit the first canonical obstacle: the diocesan Board of Trustees too must approve any selling of parish property. (Bishop too?) And won't each of those parishes expect to decide for themselves (with their Vestries, committees and such) whether or not to erect the flying hand-angels. Again, the principle of "the more people affected by the decision, then the more people need to be involved in the decision" is in order here.

Let's bump this one last (ridiculous) notch. The Rector through the diocesan convention offers a resolution to change the Book of Common Prayer to include the phrase (below in italics): "Therefore with angels and archangels *and flying hand-angels* and all the company of heaven...." Here the national church canons require two successive General Conventions to change the American Prayer Book. And on the international front both the Lambeth Conference and the gathering of the 38 primates (archbishops) will want to know upon what warrant TEC is adding flying hand-angels to the Biblically revealed order of angels. A claim that we Americans have the money and the power, so we can do whatever we want, will be unconvincing to an international communion being asked to accept this novel addition to the Faith. Here the principle of what-effects-all-must-be-decided-by-all takes on an international dimension.

I hope that this silly scenario graphically demonstrates the commonsense of the catholic principle. The catholic principle is not some arbitrary rule imposed by a narrow band of dead, white, European males long ago and far away. It is a time-tested expression of commonsense and fairness.

How is the Vincentian Canon an expression of this?

The standard phrasing of the Vincentian Canon is *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*, which translates as "What has been believed everywhere, and always and by all is to be believed."

It lays out the threefold dimensions of space (*ubique*; in all places), time (*semper*; at all times), and agents (*ab omnibus*; by all persons) within which and by which the core of Christian belief is defined. By this Canon novelties opposing essential core beliefs would be resisted—and have been resisted. For example, when Gnostics, ancient or

contemporary, propose adding *The Gospel of Thomas* to the Bible, catholic Christians using the Vincentian Canon respond that this writing was never *ubique* (it was limited to a small backwaters community in Egypt), nor *semper* (it was never recognized by any church father from Ignatius and Clement to Athanasius and Basil), nor *ab omnibus* (it lacks any historical pedigree). Of this third criterion G. K. Chesterton notes that tradition is democracy of the dead, since it extends the democratic franchise to the departed. They get to vote too.

But hasn't the Church changed its mind over the centuries?

Not really. A doctrine (i.e., teaching) may evolve over time as thinkers question and probe for clarifications and further insight. But any later articulation is understood to be rooted in the Biblical witness, “built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone” (Eph. 2:20). No novelties are permitted. Tradition (from the Latin *tradere*, to hand over or pass down) means to receive that original apostolic Faith and pass it on *without* additions. (See I Cor. 11:21; II Tim. 2:2; Jude 3b.) A clarification is *not* an addition. New terminologies and new symbols may be brought into the conversation of the “great tradition” to unpack biblical concepts and apostolic teaching for new insights and new applications, but they are an unpacking of what is already there—not something new. It is not unlike a flower growing and unfolding with unexpected petals and unanticipated scents; but all that was inherent in the small flower one received; nothing foreign or new has been grafted in. Bishop Lancelot Andrewes said of the English Church reforms of his own seventeenth-century, “We are renovators, not innovators” (*Works*). Renovators express the traditional faith in new and fresh ways; innovators concoct new teachings.

The role of the Church was never to create or add something new, but to protect and hand on (*tradere*) what had been received. “The Church to teach and the Bible to prove” was always the watchword.

As an instance of this tradition principle at work take the doctrine of the Trinity. With the Nicene Creed (325 A.D.) and the Chalcedonian Definition (451 A.D.) the Trinitarian teaching comes into fullest articulation four centuries after the completion of the biblical witness. Both proclamations use technical terminology found nowhere in the Bible:

person, being, of one substance, and Trinity. Those early Church Fathers used contemporary terminology to explain Biblical truth. But nowhere do they labor to add “a new truth”. The most striking impression when one actually reads the Church Fathers is how biblically grounded they are. Indeed they understood themselves primarily to be commentators on the Bible. So their agenda was modest: to explain into their own time and culture what the Biblical witness was saying in its time and culture. And our Anglican tradition confirms this approval to the unfolding of that Biblical witness. The Creeds are no novelties or new things, as affirmed in Article VIII of our 39 Articles (see the BCP, p.869), but simple Bible teaching.

VIII. Of the Creeds.

The Nicene Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

As a counter example of the Progressives' anti-catholic novelties, I offer the new words which they arrogantly put into the mouth of Jesus. Alternative or trial liturgies approved and used by warrant of General Convention (and at General Convention!) have “Jesus” saying this: “This is my blood which is shed for you *and for all*” (emphasis added).

Where do these words come from?!

Read for yourselves the four New Testament accounts of the institution of the Holy Eucharist (Matt 26:28, Mark 14:24, Luke 22:20, I Cor. 11:25). Not only do these words appear in no canonical gospel, they appear in no *spurious* or *disputed* gospel. As best I can determine the Progressives simply did not like what Jesus said and so they made up these words. In a court of law that would be deemed falsification of evidence. It is a libelous misrepresentation of Jesus the Cornerstone. And it fails, the test of the Vincentian Canon on all three counts. Like all their revisions of Christian faith and morality, it is stunningly arrogant.

Arrogant?

Yes. The word “arrogant” speaks with a heavily weighted pejorative tone. But it derives from the neutral verb “to arrogate” meaning to take to one's self an authority which is another's.

For example, if the Governor of Iowa were to declare war on Peru, that declaration would be arrogant in the most precise sense. Personally, I have no opinion about war with Peru being wholly ignorant on all matters Peruvian. But, deserved or not, the act would be deemed arrogant inasmuch as the authority to declare war lies with the U. S. Congress, not with the Governor of Iowa; he doesn't have the authority.

In an identical fashion the national church simply has no authority to make the theological and moral innovations it has made. None of this is in accord with the "catholic principle," especially as articulated in the Vincentian Canon or the *Preface* to the BCP, to cite only two traditional guides.

How is the Prayer Book Preface an expression of this Catholic principle?

Please read the "Preface" in its entirety found in the Prayer Book, pp. 9–10.

When the American Episcopal Church organized following the Revolutionary War, our forebears sought to explain the grounds upon which they were making certain changes, especially to the Prayer Book. The essential Core, which they termed *Doctrine*, must "be kept entire", while the non-essentials, which they termed *Discipline* "may be altered, abridged, enlarged", etc. Here is the first paragraph.

It is a most invaluable part of that blessed "liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free," that in this worship different forms and usages may without offence be allowed, ***provided the substance of the Faith be kept entire***; and that, in every Church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to Doctrine must be referred to Discipline; and therefore, by common consent and authority, may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, "according to the various exigency of times and occasions." (emphasis added)

It is an eloquent and classic expression of the principle which Progressives forget, refuse or resist: that local churches and provinces are free to change some optional or indifferent aspects of church life as long as they cohere to the essential core of the whole.

This departure from the essential core will be set forth below by a handful of anecdotes illustrating a standard pattern of apostasy and gross immorality. But I warn the reader that this anecdotal history by itself is simply inadequate. For a fuller picture of our sad

state I commend the various resources listed in “Appendix Two” and a review of the Timeline in “Appendix Three”.

What is anecdotal history? And what are its strengths and weaknesses?

History is not merely a recounting of past events; that is what chronicles and annals are. History rather tells of those events in such a manner that one discovers a pattern or shape. Behind and above the individual stories is a larger story. For example, from the seventeenth-century one might compare the rule of the Stuart monarchs, James I and Charles I, to that of Oliver Cromwell. The two Stuarts, one might argue, for all their talk of freedom and justice, were absolute despots, who by statute and tax oppressed the economy and people, stripped the English of time-honored freedoms, and engaged in disastrous foreign policies. Oliver Cromwell, while holding absolute authority as Lord Protector and eventually dismissing Parliament, nevertheless restored the economy, enlarged English liberties, saved England from foolish foreign entanglements, and set the stage for huge political constitutional reforms toward democracy and freedom.

Yet many histories are written which argue the opposite conclusions—with Charles as a kind of George Washington and Cromwell as a kind of puritan Hitler.

As in all judgments, historical and otherwise, the evidence comes first and then the judgment. Yet it is often impossible in a brief span to marshal the voluminous evidence. Space permits only a few anecdotes: this act of mercy, that legislating for economic improvement, these costly commitments to justice, those bold face lies exposed, this betrayal in foreign policy. The execution speeches of King Charles and Archbishop Laud move the reader with their breath-taking eloquence and pathos. But the latter was viciously spiteful and unforgiving cruel and the former was a shallow opportunist and fair-weather coward, who betrayed to death many allies for his regal convenience.

My point is not to praise or vilify either King or Archbishop or Lord Protector, though clearly I have made my judgments there, but rather to highlight the complexity of moving from evidentiary anecdotes to sound judgments. A handful of anecdotes is woefully inadequate to a judicious or fair assessment of any person, policy, or institution. A whole book is necessary—which this booklet cannot become.

Purposefully I chose a seventeenth-century controversy because few readers have any emotional investment in the conclusions. But what if my protagonists were Hillary and Obama verses George and Rudy? Your own family histories and partisan loyalties would quickly cloud the conversation and muddle fair assessments. Suddenly anecdotes come under a critical microscope. *I'm not so sure that's the whole story* and *That event may be true, but it's hardly typical*. This is why histories of recent events are so difficult to write.

What follows includes some anecdotes suggestive of TEC's apostasy and immorality. As a historian I am deeply aware of the inadequacy of these scattered stories to make a full and convincing case. What to do?

You have a choice: complacently do nothing or diligently research the matter. The Do-Nothing choice has its appeal. First, you're busy, too busy. Secondly, you are already comfortable with your conclusions. Thirdly, you trust your sources—we 'in the know'. The Research-the-Matter choice has its appeal too. First and most importantly, the stakes of the issue have risen pretty high. Secondly, you're unsure whether your comfortable conclusions might in fact be prejudices. Thirdly, much doubt is being cast on your sources.

Imagine this as a case in point in the Do-Nothing vs. Research-the-Matter question. You hear of a man who was wrongfully terminated in his job. You think, *Too bad, but maybe there's more to the story; but maybe he might have deserved it*. Later you hear that this man and another like him were terminated and lost their bank accounts as well as their jobs, but again wrongfully. You think, *Too bad again; but it's a crummy world. But even if it's true, (and it may not be), it's an exception*. Then you learn that this is happening in your own community in such a manner that its truth becomes undeniable. You think, *Well, sometimes the world is horribly unfair and isn't that a shame. But these offenses are not normative*. You don't storm city hall or torch the courthouse because of a handful of obvious abuses. *And besides I haven't the time or other expertise to look into it. I certainly don't want people thinking I'm a fanatic*. Then you hear that these men and their families are being rounded up for work camps—without trial or due process. You think, *I know my country. I grew up here. I know these things cannot be happening. The stories cannot be true*. Then you hear that they are being exterminated—men, women and children. You think—what? What do you think?

When does the mass of rumors, anecdotes, gossip, stories, and complaints rise to the level that you say, *I must find out for myself if these things are really true.*

Are you comparing the progressives' transgressions to the Nazis?

No, I am not. Rather I am only pointing to the social dynamic of denial common to both 1930s Germans and 2000s Episcopalians. The vast majority of both simply cannot believe that things have become this horrid. Impossible! It must be an exaggeration. The German song of denial was *Such a thing could never happen in the land of Beethoven, Brahms and Goethe* and it is echoed in our *Such a thing could never happen in the Church of Cramner, Donne, Herbert, and C. S. Lewis.*

One sociologist of history has asserted that a determined minority of only 17% can set the agenda (morally, socially, politically) for any institution or community. The early Nazis are certainly an instance of this dynamic at work. The majority of Germans were simply asleep while the greatest crisis of their lifetime unfolded. They too wanted "Peace in our time." But the judgment of history (and their children and grandchildren's judgment) latches onto one single accusation: Why did you do nothing?!

So our choice is: Do-nothing or Research-the-Matter. The labor of the faithful church member is now the same as the work of the historian. Seek for the evidence. Find the evidence. Question the evidence. Probe the evidence. Discern the evidence. Conclude from the evidence.

A Post-Script. The 14 issues listed above for your consideration were organized in such a way that the odd-number issues belong to the category of "things necessary" (essential) and the even-numbered items belong in the category of "things not necessary" (indifferent). Interestingly however, at some point in Church history each of the even-numbered items (except #2, the Prayer Book in red) has been insisted upon by someone.

THE NEW PANSEXUALITY

Isn't this all about the homosexual Bishop of New Hampshire.

The larger debate is about changes in theology and ethics. But as a gay bishop Vicki Gene Robinson has become, for both traditionalists and progressives, a poster child of these changes. What he represents is the acceptance by TEC of a new sexual ethics. And this includes more than just the same-sex marriage (SSM), but also issues of fidelity within a marriage and chastity before marriage.

Are there any useful books, not on the politics, but on the ethics of homosexuality?

The scholarship over the past three decades is too vast and complex to try to summarize here—both side have been very busy with ink and pen. In addition to your explorations in cyberspace, let me offer an annotated list of three references from both sides to start your thinking and engage you with the implications. This list moves from short-and-simple to medium—and-solid to long-and-demanding.

Progressives—Three for the New Sexuality.

(1) *A Letter to Louise: A Biblical Affirmation of Homosexuality*, by Bruce W. Lowe.

<http://www.GodMadeMeGay.com>

In a friendly, gentle, even avuncular style Pastor Lowe pens a 36-page *Letter to Louise*, whose homosexual brother is troubled by the Church's "condemnation of him." In a crisp series of nine theses, this gentle pastor offers counsel to Louise and sets out to refute of the traditional view. Warmly irenic, informed, caring, and well-organized.

(2) *Permanent, Faithful, Stable: Christian Same-Sex Partnerships*, Jeffery Johns (£3.50)

Available at Affirming Catholicism—<http://www.affirmingcatholicism.org.uk/pages/shop.asp>

Dean Jeffrey Johns, who serves as Dean of St. Albans, England, has written a learned and passionate book which has become recognized as one of the most powerful arguments for the acceptance and blessing of homosexual relationships by the Church, provided that the quality and commitment of the relationship are the same as those expected of a Christian marriage.

But is this view scriptural? Is it moral? Is it achievable? Jeffrey John argues that it is. The Church should offer homosexual couples a positive theological understanding of their relationship as well as practical acceptance and support. A same-sex partnership, based on the same commitment as heterosexual marriage, is no less sacramental, no less a way of holiness, and no less worthy of the Church's blessing.

(3) *Dirt, Greed, and Sex*, by William Countryman (Fortress, 1990)

Parts of this book are available online at

<http://books.google.com/books?id=zv62iDvjBi8C&dq=william+countryman&printsec=frontcover&source=web&ots=u3hGXvNsEW&sig=LjMa4K0ezB4NIIVSbiCkmrvbPp8#PPA12,M1>

Like its counterpart by Robert Gagnon, it is impossible to summarize this huge tome. In essence Countryman, who is Professor in Biblical Studies at the (Episcopal) Church Divinity School of the Pacific in Berkeley, CA, argues that the OT commandments on sexual behavior belongs to the realm of "purity laws". The purpose of these laws, like abstaining from non-kosher food, was to create a strong sense of a separate identity as "a people apart". Having accomplished that, the Church can now drop that part of the OT obedience just as we have dropped abstaining from OT non-kosher laws. Neither OT dietary laws or OT sexual commandments apply to the NT believer.

Traditionalists—Three for the Traditional Sexuality.

(1) *Involvement: Social and Sexual Relationships in the Modern World*, Chapter Eight, "Homosexual Partnerships", by John R. W. Stott. (Revell, 1984) pages 215-244.

This has also been published as an IVP booklet (now out-of-print). Although the premier Anglican writer-scholar of the 20th century Dr. Stott chiefly writes as a pastor. "First, we are all human beings. There is no such phenomenon as 'a homosexual.' There are only people, human persons, made in the image and likeness of God, yet fallen, with all the glory and tragedy which that paradox implies, including sexual potential and sexual problems." Within the limitations of space, he judiciously addresses the seven explicit Scriptural passages and then sets the debate within the larger context of a life-affirming Biblical sexuality. He listens closely to the pro-homosexual argument of the American Episcopalian Norman Pittenger, who argued against the biblical view. He concludes as he began—with a deep pastoral love for homosexual persons. (Both short pieces by Pastor Bruce W. Lowe and Dr. John Stott are available in the parish library.)

(2) ***Straight or Narrow, Compassion & Clarity in the Homosexuality Debate,***

Thomas E. Schmidt, (InterVarsity Press, 1995) 240 pages

Dr. Schmidt, who teaches NT and Greek at Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA, covers the same ground as Stott plus a review of medical and sociological statistics available at that time. Although a brilliant scholar Schmidt's style is accessible, clear, and even graceful. Stepping out from behind the teacher's podium, he opens his heart to the reader as a pastor and friend of a homosexual person who died from AIDS.

(3) ***The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics,*** by Robert Gagnon,

(Abingdon Press, 2001) 520 pages.

Like its counterpart by Countryman, it is impossible to summarize this tome. I would have subtitled it: *Everything Anyone Could Ask about Homosexuality But Never Dreamed of Asking*. Gagnon addresses everything! He is thorough—and relentless! Gagnon is a scholar who has read everything and stays at a question until every angle has been explored. Robert Gagnon's website (in-depth on sexual issues in Bible) is <http://www.robagnon.net/>

THE NEW THEOLOGY

Isn't this controversy just about homosexuality?

No. The media knows that sex sells well in the public press, especially when mixed with the exotic catalysis of religion. But, no, it's not about homosexuality; it's about a new religion. We the reading public are as much to blame. Few among us would rally around these news flashes: *East Coast Bishop Abandons Arianism for Panentheism* or *Non-reaffirmation of Foundational Documents by the House of Bishops Renders Hermeneutics Irrelevant*. The sex headlines glitter while these fall flat. But the first headline announces, truly, that an Episcopal bishop has moved from the already heretical position that Jesus was like God but not God (Arianism) to the proposition that God doesn't really exist as anything other than a sort of *esprit de corp* or team spirit of planet earth. In short, this man as a bishop of the Church announces that Jesus did not bodily rise from the dead, that Jesus is not God incarnate, and that God does not exist. And our House of Bishop cannot muster a collective cough. The second headline reports the fact that at GC2003 the House of Bishops defeated a resolution (B-001) reaffirming the Bible as the Word of God and therefore normative for all matters on theology and ethics. In short our House of Bishops no longer affirms that Jesus is God incarnate or that the Bible is the Word of God.

You're kidding?

I wish I were. We might entitle this entire section *The Mysterious Case of the Gradually Disappearing Gospel*.

When did this change in theology happen — and how?

"How" first. The Church is always *in* the world. Jesus prayed for his disciples that they (we) would be "*in* the world, but not *of* the world" (John 17:16; emphasis added).

To be *of* the world means to draw our worldview from the world: the world's values, assumptions, presuppositions, goals, perspectives, etc. Christians are instead to be of the Kingdom of God (not the world): with God's values, assumptions, presuppositions, goals, perspectives, etc. The Christian inevitably has a foot in both realities: in the world and in the Kingdom of God. This paradoxical living can be confusing; and without careful and intentional focus on Kingdom-living, institutional Christians can easily slide into the world's values, assumptions, presuppositions, goals, perspectives, etc. (That's why we

gather as Church every Sunday: to reaffirm that Kingdom-living!)

The six villains in this part of the mystery beginning over two centuries ago are George Hegel (1770–1831), Frederick Schleiermacher (1768–1834), optimistic nineteenth-century liberalism, post-WWII existentialism, Freudianism, and the 1960s sexual revolution. Hegel set the stage by undermining truth with his theory of thesis-antithesis-synthesis; so nothing is finally true, but merely contingent in an endless and pointless evolutionary meander. Schleiermacher furthered that notion within the Church by asserting that words cannot and need not have any fixed meanings; thereby all Christian words are voided of traditional meaning and filled with new but only contemporary meaning. Nineteenth-century Liberalism's demolition job was nicely summarized by H. Richard Niebuhr, "A God without wrath brought men without sin into a kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a cross." Freudianism reset the diagnosis of human distress as alienation, not sin, and thus therapy as our mode of salvation, not faith, repentance, and reconciliation. Existentialism moved the locus of attention from us (how do we get along?) to self (how do I authenticate myself?). The sexual revolution of the '60s, armed with all of these cultural forces, strode forward to deconstruct the cultured work of centuries that controlled and guided and protected the sexual impulse: courtesy, chastity, self-control, modesty, deference, nobility, truth.

The old Christian worldview which brought in its train a host of Christian and humane virtues had been eviscerated. The new worldview had arrived with its new "virtues". Sixty years ago C. S. Lewis urged us to recognize that a new worldview will always bring with it a new ethic. "And all the time—such is the tragic-comedy of our situation—we continue to clamor for those very qualities we are rendering impossible.... In a sort of ghastly simplicity we remove the organ and demand the function. We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful." (*The Abolition of Man*, page 35).

Stop! Too Much Information! Start over again—and make it easy. What went wrong—for beginners—and when and how?

Sorry. Let's begin again. From a popular perspective we might identify the first clear announcement of the Crisis as the publication of an article in *The Living Church*, [1991?],

by Bishop John MacNaughton, Bishop of West Texas, “Two Churches Under One Roof”. Following the GC1991 at Phoenix, the Bishop raised the flag portending our present distress. “There are two religions in the Episcopal Church. The one believes in the revealed truth of Holy Scripture and the other believes that truth is relative and unfolding.”

Bp. MacNaughton described these two distinct churches as Church One and Church Two. Both churches use the same Prayer Book, worship in the same buildings, pray the same prayers—but they each mean utterly different things from one another. Church One subscribes to (1) a Spirit inspired Bible as the authoritative Word of God, (2) a personal God revealed as a Trinity of Persons in one Godhead, (3) the Second Person of the Trinity (the *Logos*) incarnate among humanity as Jesus of Nazareth, (4) salvation by his saving death on the Cross, (5) entrance into God’s Kingdom by faith, repentance, conversion, and baptism, (6) the transforming, sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, (7) the sanctity of marriage, and (8) the covenantal nature of the Holy Eucharist.

Church Two subscribes to (1) a Bible as historical artifact which is useful but flawed, (2) a God who may or may not be personal but is no longer trinitarian, (3) Jesus of Nazareth, who while a great teacher and example is also sinful, flawed, and limited, (4) salvation devoid of a Cross or sacrificial death, (5) an entrance into God’s Kingdom effected by nothing more than mere existence, (6) the work of the Holy Spirit as affirming who we already are, (7) any variant sexual expression sanctified by good intentions and mutual respect, and (8) the hospitality of the Holy Eucharist offered to believers and unbelievers alike.

At some point it must be recognized that these two churches, having nothing of substance in common, are, in fact, different religions.

So what are the doctrines repudiated by the Church Two?

There are primarily eight of them (as above):

- The authority of the Bible as the Word of God.
- The doctrine of the Trinity.
- The person, work, and bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ.
- The gift of salvation by Jesus as Lord and by his Cross.

- The biblical teaching of sin, forgiveness, and transformation by the Holy Spirit.
- The Holy Spirit as sanctifier and transformer.
- The sanctity of marriage.
- The covenantal nature of the Holy Eucharist.

What follows is necessarily brief, but typical. Each of these repudiations of Christian belief have been explored elsewhere and could fill volumes. For reasons of space the following usually mentions only two examples with one or two affirmations of the Christian Faith.

What is the change in “the authority of the Bible as the Word of God”?

The erosion of confidence in the Bible has been the work of over two centuries.

That story is wonderfully and colorfully told by Charlotte Allen in *The Human Christ* (Simon & Schuster, 1989) in a rigorous but playful research. The Bible is a complex and challenging book that requires, nay, demands our best scholarship. Unfortunately, sham research appears proving that “the Bible has now been refuted,” like Bp. Spong’s revealingly named *The Sins of the Scriptures*, subtitled *Exposing the Bible’s Texts of Hate to Reveal the God of Love*, a god, incidentally who looks very much like, well, Bp. Spong. The meticulous labor of the writers who expose the mistaken, confused, and even bogus scholarship of such “scholars” sadly lacks the same popular appeal of a media savvy bishop. (See, among others, Timothy Luke Johnson, Ben Witherington, Craig A. Evans, and N. T. Wright.) Sadder too is the fact that such scholarship has become the standard in seminaries for the last 30 years—with the obvious results. You reap what you sow.

Two signposts. At GC2003 Bp Keith L. Ackerman of Quincy offered Resolution B-001 on the authority of the Scriptures. It called upon General Convention to reaffirm that the Bible is the Word of God and normative in all matters concerning Faith and morals. (A more God-Mother-and-Apple Pie resolution cannot be imagined.) However, the House of Bishop defeated it 84 No, to 66 Yes, with 8 Abstained. Three years later at GC2006 in Columbus Resolution C-001 was offered to explore the improvement of all liturgies used by the Church by eliminating any racially offensive parts. No one could oppose such a resolution, although anyone might dispute whether this or that phrase is in fact

anti-semitic. However, a professor of ethics stood to propose an amendment that the field to be explored and corrected include the Scriptures as well as the liturgies of the Church. A friend of mine stood to urge a recognition of what this meant: that the Episcopal Church was creating a committee to improve the Bible by qualifying the offensive parts. The amendment and resolution passed overwhelmingly. (A personal note: I was present for this debate. Upon passage I rose and left the convention hall returning to Pittsburgh. I wept in my car. At that exact moment I concluded that the Episcopal Church with dead beyond saving.) A similar sign of the arrogance of many current leaders in the Church is the stunning assertion by Bishop Bennison to a parish in Paoli, PA, where he declaimed, "Because we wrote the Bible, we can rewrite it. We have rewritten the Bible many times."

What is the change in "the doctrine of the Trinity"?

The language of the Trinity is tied up in the current debate on the language of God in general. Most of this is driven by feminist concerns to find a non-patriarchal terminology, thus avoiding terms like *Lord*, *Father*, and *King*. Sometimes the substitutes succeed and even enhance. Sometimes they are moving and touching, e.g., Jesus as *Friend*, *Guide*, *Companion*. But sometimes they are goofy and weird. And sometimes they deliver a new and different god. Regarding language for the Trinity, there is simply no substitution for *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. The most common ("God creator, redeemer, and sanctifier") seems at first glance to work but is what the theologians call functional or modalistic monarchianism. It wrongly suggests that God the Father creates, God the Son redeems, and God the Spirit sanctifies. However, all three Persons of the Trinity are involved in each of those works: Father, Son, and Spirit act in creation (Gen. 1:2; John 1:3; Col. 1:16); God the Father was in Christ reconciling the world to himself (2 Cor. 5:19); and sanctification is the work of each Person of the Trinity. Difficult as this biblical language is, any substituted terminology involves a reduction of the work and the wonder of our Triune God.

Signposts: Most of the new liturgies authorized by TEC look very unitarian. In a 1967 book *If This Be Heresy* Bp. James Pike urged the abandonment of the doctrine of the Trinity. The then House of Bishop gave him a pass, signaling the optional nature of Christian beliefs for future bishops.

What is the change in “the person, work, and bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ”?

The earliest articulation of any creed is that quoted by St. Paul in Romans 10:9, “Jesus is Lord.” Behind that word *Lord* (*Kurios* in the Greek) is a rich texture with multiple nuances. One nuance of the word includes a respectful substitute for the four-lettered Name of God (YHWH), which is represented in most English OT translations as “LORD” in small caps. The biblical affirmation that Jesus is God incarnate is crystallized in later creeds with “God of God, . . . , very God of very God, begotten not made” and such phrases. But with the diminishment of the Bible came the diminishment of Jesus. The new and authorized liturgies of the Church mute and sometime wholly omit Jesus’s traditional titles for newer titles like *Friend, Guide, Companion*. But however fresh these sound upon first usage, they fall far short of an orthodox affirmation of Jesus as Lord, Son of God, Second Person of the Trinity, Savior of the World, and Word.

Signposts. A few months ago the Christian world was shocked when the Rev. Dr. Ann Holmes Redding revealed that she served as an Episcopal priest on Sundays but as a Muslim worshipper on Fridays. This entailed, she argued, no contradiction between Christianity and Islam, for the differences between the two are minimal. In a *Seattle Times* readers’ response (June 19, 2007) she said of Jesus, “I believe that Jesus is divine in the same way in which all humans are related to God as children of God. *Jesus is different in degree, not kind*” (emphasis added). To compound error upon error Redding’s licensing bishop, the Rt. Rev. Vincent Warner, says he accepts Redding as an Episcopal priest and a Muslim, and that he finds the interfaith possibilities exciting. Although she was eventually disciplined by her Rhode Island bishop, it is worth reflecting that this priest has a Ph.D. in theology, has been teaching this as a priest for 23 years (without reproof), and will be teaching NT this autumn at a Seattle Christian college.

What is critical to recognize is how Dr. Redding’s answer to the question “Who is Jesus?” has become the standard fare of seminaries and thus clergy. Her Islamic connection is novel; her denial of Christ’s divinity is now normative.

The same devaluation of the bodily resurrection of Jesus is also standard. Bp. Spong’s 1983 book *The Easter Moment* recapitulated the conventional denial: the resurrection of Jesus did not happen in the body of Jesus at the tomb in Jerusalem, but in the mind of

the post-crucifixion Peter while returned to his fishing in Galilee. In the 1970s my own NT professor mocked the physical resurrection before the whole class and publicly laughed at me for my insistence that it was critical to Christian believing. (Was is only coincidental that he was subsequently arrest for the distribution of child pornography?)

What is the change in “the gift of salvation by Jesus as Lord and by his Cross”?

In a various post-election interviews the new Presiding Bishop has consistently denied that Jesus is “the way, the truth, and the life” (John 14:6), only *a* way, *a* truth, and *a* life. Also she has denied that Jesus is the Savior of the world, “only my savior”. This subjectivizing of the person and work of Christ makes him merely an example, demoting him to a personally inspiring but optional example.

Signposts. One prominent woman priest received applause at a religious conference when she repudiated Jesus’s death in these terms: “I don’t need some man dripping in blood.”

While it will surprise any Episcopalian regularly partaking of Prayer Bookworship, the new liturgies are muting the Cross of Jesus. Remember Niebuhr’s description of liberalism as “a Christ without a Cross”. The new emphasis is upon what the progressives call a Creation-ethic as opposed to a Cross-ethic. Again in a post-election interview, the Presiding Bishop casually dismissed the theology of the Cross as negative and unhelpful for a theology of Creation as kinder, positive, and life-affirming.

What is the change in “the biblical teaching of sin, forgiveness, and transformation by the Holy Spirit”?

The above quotation from the PB identifies a tension between a worldview of Creation on the one hand (with its emphasis on affirmation of the person and authentication of the self) and a worldview of the Cross on the other hand (with its emphasis on renunciation of sin and transformation to Christlikeness). In the former the Holy Spirit encourages a person to embrace who they already are and it looks for guidance to God in the current culture. In the latter the Holy Spirit encourages a person to repent of sin and it looks to the Bible (not the world) to provide that guidance and direction.

In the current sexual debate the progressives emphasize the acceptance by God the Spirit,

while the traditionalists emphasize the acceptance *and* transformation by God the Spirit.

What is the change in “the Holy Spirit as sanctifier and transformer”?

[as above]

What is the change in “the sanctity of marriage”?

The concluding sexual views of the Progressives and the Traditionalists are polar opposites because the starting positions are opposites. Worldview first, ethics (inevitably!) next.

The Traditionalist starts with (1) the biblical revelation that God has created us and therefore has a claim on our obedience, (2) that sexual intimacy is meant for heterosexual, monogamous marriage, (3) that the Fall has bent and twisted our sexual identity like it has bent and twisted every other part of human life created as good, (4) that sin is destructive of life and must be repented of by a return to God and God’s revelation, (5) that by God’s Spirit working through God-ordered means of grace (like the Bible, Christian fellowship, sacraments, and public worship; Acts 2:42) a human life can be substantially restored (I Cor. 6:11), and (6) that this very hard work is assisted by clear guidance from the Bible in terms of commandment, examples, precepts, proverbs, and purpose.

The Progressive starts with a repudiation of the traditional view, which they deem hateful, oppressive, judgmental, and life-denying. The following is a counterpart to the above and it is best read as a contrasting comparison. (1) The Bible is best understood, not primarily as a revelation from God, but as a mosaic of various diverse and even contradictory testimonies to peoples’ experience of God. It is suggestive, not authoritative. (2) Sexual intimacy is a right for the individual which authenticates and affirms me. Any rules or commandments are oppressive of freedom. (3) The Fall isn’t a big deal; it is only the dark side of a personality struggling toward full expression and maturity; we all make mistakes. The fundamental reality of human life is that it is good and must be affirmed. Remember the other part of Niebuhr’s critique of optimistic liberalism: “men without sin”. The traditional doctrine of sin is replaced by a psychological model in which knowledge alone brings in the light and a sociological model in which the structure of society must be reformed and reshaped. (4) If the human dilemma of sin is no longer disobedience to God’s

explicit commandments and teaching, but instead psychological alienation and societal malformation, then repentance (don't miss this!)... then repentance is, first, dialogue toward better understanding and, secondly, political change. Dialogue and political reform, not Bible reading, prayer, and moral reform bring in God's Kingdom. (5) God's Spirit speaks from the world as much as from the so-called means of grace—perhaps more so, inasmuch as the Bible-Church-Sacraments-Liturgy foursome have been deconstructed as time-bound, limited, and oppressive. God's Spirit serves no longer to conform the believer to Scriptural holiness, but to enable one to reach one's potential in a sin-free Creation-ethic. (6) Insight from personal experience trumps biblical revelation. (Cue Debbie Boone singing, "It can't be wrong—if it feels soooo right.") Since the Bible is no more than the collective testimony of people past, our experience can be added to theirs for fuller insight. The Bible and 3,000 years of Hebrew/Christian teaching is only suggestive not definitive. Consider this amazing admission by Bp. Gene Robinson, "Just simply to say that it goes against tradition and the teaching of the church and scripture does not necessarily make it wrong. We worship a living God, and that living God leads us into truth." Voilà!

Two books in particular can usefully bring these generalities into focus. The first is the 1967 book *Situation Ethics* by Joseph Fletcher. Fletcher taught as a priest at the Episcopal Divinity School in the shadow of Harvard. He argued that the single ethical imperative is love. (Cue *All You Need Is Love* by the Beatles, released not coincidentally in the same year.) Love is central and final with all else in the Bible moving toward that single goal by that single motive. "The situationist enters into every decision-making situation fully armed with the ethical maxims of his community and its heritage, and he treats them with respect as illuminators [sic] of his problems. Just the same he is prepared in any situation to compromise them or set them aside in the situation if love seems better served by doing so" (p.26). Even the Ten Commandments or the explicit commands of Jesus may be, indeed, must be "compromised" when they conflict with love. (As a side-bar let it be noted that when Fletcher lost his Christian faith and approached the seminary to resign as a teacher, the faculty privately dissuaded him. He ceased to celebrate the Holy Communion but continued to wear the clerical collar and present himself as a faithful priest of the Church. The faculty claimed that his value to the Church as a writer of this new ethics exceeded the need to be honest about his atheism.)

The second book picked up the general argument about love as the only arbiter in moral decision-maker and applied it to sexual ethics in particular. In 1969 Norman Pittenger, a professor at General Theological Seminary, NY, published *A Time for Consent*, arguing not only for public approval for homosexual monogamous relations, and ultimately for any and all sexual acts of intimacy characterized by love. The criteria for a loving relations were six: (1) commitment (the free self-giving of each to the other), (2) mutuality in giving and receiving (a sharing in which each finds his or her self in the other), (3) tenderness (no coercion or cruelty), (4) faithfulness (the intention of a lifelong relationship), hopefulness (each serving the other's maturity, and (6) desire for union. (See John Stott, p.234.) Over time Dr. Pittenger qualified "lifelong" as sometimes oppressive to real love.

Traditionalists are constantly astonished by what seems to them the gross, flagrant, and in-your-face sexual immorality of Progressives. But after one engages the defining (albeit slippery) principles of Church Two, one discerns an interior consistency and integrity. However it no longer coheres with the biblical, catholic faith of Church One. Two churches under one roof. How long can that exist?

Signposts. A subsequent dean of Fletcher's seminary and his homosexual lover have been married, between the two of them, five times. A Native American bishop sodomizes his nephew with little consequence. My faculty at my seminary showed pornography to my fellow students in a public forum — and I mean really triple-X stuff. These things seem outrageous and inexplicable..., until one reads their books. The biblical commandments, precepts, warnings, directives, and examples are only "illuminators" to be added (or not) to other guides taken from anywhere and everywhere.

Years ago I attended a conference on "Clergy Wellness" highlighted by the then-Canon Gene Robinson, who was working on behalf of the national church. The theme he urged upon us in various sessions and addresses was for integrity in the clergy-person. Then, autobiographically, he told of falling in love with his jogging partner, omitting that it was his current homosexual lover. *Integrity* required that he leave his wife and go with his lover. Only by doing so could he have integrity before God.

A third signpost is a quote by the Rev. Dr. Carter Heyward, a professor of “Queer Theology” (I am not making this up) at Episcopal Theological Seminary, who argued against monogamy for lesbians. She asserted that she could be faithful to her lesbian partner while still engaging in sexual intimacy with other people without offending against fidelity. The very notion of monogamy is itself, she urged, a piece of patriarchal oppression. Really! While describing her theology as “generous orthodoxy”, she recognizes that orthodox Christianity will result in an ethic different from hers. Thus she announces, “God is different from and superior to the Hebrew/Christian god [sic],” and that the Trinity is a “homoerotic relationship between three males”. (Suggestion to the reader who thinks that Church One can be reconciled with Church Two: Goggle “Carter Heyward” to read the articles by her and about her; it will introduce you into a very weird Alice-in-Wonderland world.)

A fourth and last signpost points to the new pansexuality of anything goes. The Rev. Elizabeth Kaeton, a priest in the Diocese of Newark, has announced that: “Our specific charism is to help ourselves and the Church reclaim the erotic as a central part of our lives. A one-night stand may be a holy act, if the sex is honest, loving and non-abusive.” Warning: Husbands, don’t try this on your wife at home. It could be dangerous to your health.

What is the change in “the covenantal nature of the Holy Eucharist”?

A few years ago Bp. Jane Dixon standing at the high altar at the Washington Cathedral and throwing out her arms in a welcoming gesture, cried out (in words to this effect), *Welcome to the table of God. All come. It doesn’t matter if you are Episcopalian or Presbyterian, Methodist or Baptist (fine so far), Unitarian or Mormon (huh?), Jew or Muslim, (double-huh?), atheist or agnostic (triple-huh?). All are welcomed.* This poisoning of inclusivity with the Holy Communion is called the “Open Communion” or the “Open Table”. To clearly see what is at stake in the progressives’ most recent innovation, read the classic Anglican invitation to the Holy Communion (BCP, p.330).

Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways: Draw near with faith, and make your humble confession to Almighty God, devoutly kneeling.

By faith and repentance the Christian believer reorients his or her soul toward God thereby preparing for the reception of the Holy Communion in which the baptismal covenant (contract) with God is renewed and reaffirmed. The Holy Communion is by definition and by divine institution a covenantal meal: The Lord said, “This is my blood *of the new covenant*” (Matt. 26:26; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; emphasis added).

To invite any non-Christian to partake of the covenantal meal (which by its essential nature is a reaffirmation of the covenant with God through Christ) while simultaneously omitting any call to prerequisite faith and repentance (which they adamantly do not have) is to invite them to public hypocrisy—hardly an act of hospitality.

Around the Church this invitation to hypocrisy is being normalized by diocesan resolutions and seminary deans’ edicts. (See the recent controversy at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary by Dean Gary Hall’s defense of the Open Table.)

Although the Progressives’ intention is good (to broaden the offer of God’s grace and love), it inevitably voids the Holy Communion of its meaning and depth as a covenantal meal. By broadening they empty. They instead reduce the Holy Communion to a trite “happy cookie from St. Swithin’s Welcome Wagon”. This is not progress; it is loss.

THE FOUR OPTIONS

(1) Circle the Wagons.

This option involves two actions: first, an explicit reaffirmation to remain a part of TEC according to its canons and constitution, while (secondly) explicitly declaring TEC to be in serious theological and ethical crisis and danger. This second part is sometimes described as a “firewall”. This is at best only a temporary option; firewalls by definition are temporary. The real issue here is one of timing.

<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
1) still called Episcopalians.	1) no long-term resolution.
2) keep the building—on TEC’s terms.	2) continuing drain on resources.
3) buy time.	3) gradual attrition of leadership and members.
4) avoid escalation, maybe.	4) Calvary lawsuit continues.
	5) lose parishioners & finances.
	6) postponement of FCEC building project.
	7) any firewall is temporary.
	8) weakens any united action.

(2) Launch the Lifeboats.

This option is a mutually negotiated settlement between an individual parish and a diocese whereby the parish ceases to be a constituent part of the diocese. It always entails a financial buy-out payment to the diocese; cf. Psalm xx:xx. Two recent notable departures are All Saints, Woodbridge, VA, and Christ Church, Overland Park, KS, entailing millions of dollars in payment. In Pittsburgh this was last done some years ago by Orchard Hill.

<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
1) ability to retain property for parish, maybe.	1) limited nat’l history of departures: Plano, etc.
2) minimize congregation departures, maybe.	2) diocese may oppose piecemeal departures.
3) friendly diocese, no lawsuit from them.	3) might not avoid Calvary/nat’l church lawsuit
4) might avoid Calvary/nat’l church lawsuit.	4) nat’l church rumored to fight this.
	5) lose parishioners & finances.

(3) Prepare for the Exodus.

This option involves leaving TEC as a diocesan body. Being a constitutional action, this would require *two* successive diocesan conventions, conceivably the first occurring in 2007 with the second then occurring in 2008. This might entail realigning the diocese with another province. A protocol would be created whereby parishes dissenting from this direction could elect to affirm their membership in TEC, as TEC affirms its “walking apart” from the Communion; this might be described as a friendly disengagement: there would be no punitive action against any such parish.

<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
1) disassociate from negative Episcopal identity	1) lawsuit from Calvary certain
2) plug drain of excellent clergy, laity, parishes	2) lawsuit from TEC—certain!
3) help from the diocese.	3) probably lose bldg and endowments.
	4) without any legal precedent.
	5) lose parishioners & finances.
	6) currently unclear where we go to.

(4) Surrender Unconditionally.

This option, which can be effected by doing nothing, entails a complete acceptance of the theological and moral novelties so congruent with our times and culture and so incongruent with the Christian tradition and Bible, i.e., the core “essentials.” The optional heterodoxy of today will become the required orthodoxy of tomorrow.

<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
1) still be called Episcopalians.	1) equivocate then lose Christian “essentials”.
2) proceed with our building plans.	2) association with TEC counterproductive.
3) lawsuit from Calvary is dropped.	3) lose base to achieve bldg plans.
4) threats from national church disappear.	4) lose our current clergy.
	5) denomination rendered irrelevant.
	6) lose parishioners & finances.

CONCLUSION

Having now finished this document, do you have any closing comments?

The first is a deep frustration with how inadequate it is. Time precluded further research, which would have permitted more examples, pointed resolutions, telling quotations—and extensive citing of sources. While it is, alas, only an introduction, if it serves the purpose of awakening the reader to the depth of the Crisis and prompts further exploration for the love of the Church, its purpose will have been served.

On a personal note I paradoxically feel a deep sense of depression and (oddly) exhilaration. Wakefulness at 3 in the morning, lethargy of spirit, hopelessness for the institution I have served for almost 50 years debilitate my spirit. The pained admission of an Anglo-catholic priest and friend (“The Church is a whore, but she is my mother”) speaks of the shameful hurt and wounded love I feel. But in a best-of-times-worst-of-times irony I paradoxically rejoice in God and His Bride the Church. While I grieve that the Episcopal Church’s candlestick is being taken away (Rev.2:5), I simultaneously exult that the gates of death cannot prevail against the Church universal (Matt. 16:18). The writing of this “Primer” has occasioned revisiting my heroes of faith: Mary the Virgin, John and Paul, Irenaeus, Augustine of Hippo, Vincent of Lérins, the English Reformers, George Herbert, Richard Baxter, Charles Simeon, J. C. Ryle, William Temple, C. S. Lewis, John Stott, and more. Their acquaintance ennobles me and lifts me up.

What abides is the hope and the joy. God is working His purpose out. Sometimes I glimpse it; sometimes it eludes me. But God is good: all the time.

I close by commending you to Christ, who is Savior and Lord. He is the Bridegroom of the Church. He is the Logos of God. The confession (by you or me) that Jesus is “the Christ, the Son of the Living God” is the Rock upon which he founds his Church (Matt. 16:15-18). Although we live in this perilous time of pruning (John 15:2) and candlestick removing (Rev. 2:8), all those in Christ Jesus are secure on the rock. Hold onto Christ.

Appendix One

Anglican Church Terminology

Abandonment of Communion: A canonical determination that an ordained minister is no longer in relationship with The Episcopal Church. This determination is made by an Episcopal bishop and Standing Committee without any recourse to trial or even a hearing by the accused. The ordained minister in question can no longer function within The Episcopal Church and loses his or her rights to further participation in the pension fund and some benefits(?). Before 2001, this canon was generally used when an ordained minister joined another communion (such as the Roman Catholic Church), or simply disappeared having literally abandoned his pastorate. This was the purpose for which it was created. Since 2001, it has been used repeatedly against ordained ministers who have joined another province within the Anglican Communion.

Alternative Primatial Oversight (APO): A request that conservatives within The Episcopal Church be allowed an alternate, theologically more conservative, leader (called a Primate within Anglicanism). After the election of the theologically liberal (conservatives would say “heterodox”) Katharine Jefferts Schori as The Episcopal Church’s presiding bishop, seven dioceses, including Pittsburgh, appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primates of the Anglican Communion for an Alternate Primate. That appeal led to a series of meetings in the fall of 2006. A proposal unanimously put forward by the Primates of the Anglican Communion was rejected by TEC in the spring of 2007.

Anglican Communion: A worldwide body of churches related to the Church of England. There are 38 churches (called provinces) around the world and approximately 80 million Anglicans. The present debate asks: “Are the provinces ‘autonomous’ or ‘interdependent’?”

Anglican Communion Network (ACN): Organization of Anglicans and Episcopalians who are committed to building a “Biblical, Missionary and Uniting” future for Anglicanism in the United States. This group is led by the Rt. Rev. Robert Duncan, Bishop of Pittsburgh, and has its offices in Pittsburgh, PA. It represents 200,000 Episcopalians and Anglicans in 900 parishes spread over ten dioceses and six regional or affinity-based convocations. The group’s website is www.acn-us.org

Anglican Consultative Council (ACC): One of the worldwide Anglican Communion’s four “Instruments of Unity.” Representatives from every church of the Anglican Communion (bishops, clergy and laity) hold seats on the body (The Episcopal Church and The Anglican Church of Canada have voluntarily withdrawn until 2008 in response to a request that they do so by the group at large.) Their website is www.anglicancommunion.org/acc/index.cfm

Anglican Covenant: A proposed document outlining the essentials of Anglican Faith and order. Each Anglican Province would adopt the “Covenant” or cease to be regarded as a full member of the Communion. The Covenant will likely not be in place before 2010.

Anglican Mission in the Americas (AMiA): A group of more than 120 Anglican congregations in North America under the care of the Anglican Province of Rwanda. Founded in 2000, the group is focused on evangelism and church planting. The Bishop Chairman is the Rt. Rev. Chuck Murphy of Pawleys Island, SC. The group’s website is www.anglicanmissioninamerica.org

Archbishop of Canterbury (ABC): The spiritual leader of the worldwide Anglican Communion. The current Archbishop of Canterbury is the Most Rev’d. Rowan Williams. The Archbishop of Canterbury convenes the bishops of the Anglican Communion and is the primate of the Church of England and the diocesan bishop of the Diocese of Canterbury. He is *primus inter pares*, that is, “first among equals.”

BCP: Standard abbreviation for the *Book of Common Prayer*. If a particular edition is intended, the abbreviation is preceded by the year of authorization; e.g., 1928 BCP.

Canons: Church law. Just as there is state and federal law within the U.S. governmental system, both a diocese and the national church have their own canons. These canons are available on the net at http://www.churchpublishing.org/general_convention/index.cfm?fuseaction=candc

Chancel: That part of the church proper which includes the choir, organ and altar.

Convocation of Anglicans in North America (CANA): A grouping of approximately 8,000 U. S. Anglicans in 40 parishes under the care of the Anglican Province of Nigeria. The Rt. Rev. Martyn Minns, formerly rector of Truro Episcopal Church, Fairfax, VA, is their lead bishop. The group's website is www.canaconvocation.org

Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa (CAPA): This group of 19 Anglican Provinces meets regularly and speaks with one voice about affairs affecting Africa and affecting the worldwide Anglican Communion. This group represents approximately two-thirds of the world's approximately 80 million Anglicans and has consistently supported orthodox Anglicans in North America.

Common Cause Partnership: An initiative to bring together orthodox Anglicans in North America. At this time, ten bodies from the U.S. and Canada, including the Anglican Communion Network, AMiA, CANA, the Reformed Episcopal Church, the Anglican Province of America, and Forward in Faith North America, have laid the groundwork for a common theological statement and a federation. The group's first-ever council of bishops will be meeting in Pittsburgh this September.

Dar es Salaam Primates Meeting: The Primates met in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, in February 2007. They again made it clear that the Episcopal Church was out of line and requested that The Episcopal Church place moratoria on same-sex blessings and the election of bishops in same-sex relationships and provide an alternate structure within The Episcopal Church for orthodox Episcopalians to receive oversight (APO). The primates set a deadline of Sept. 30 for The Episcopal Church's response. While organizations like the Anglican Communion Network were willing to work with the proposal, the House of Bishops and the Executive Council have both rejected it. See Supplement #xx and the website at

Dennis Canon: Passed by General Convention in 1979, the Dennis Canon states that as The Episcopal Church is hierarchical in organization, all property and money of every parish is held in trust for the national church by each diocese. In many, but not all cases, secular courts have upheld the Dennis Canon when a parish has attempted to disassociate from an Episcopal diocese. No precedent exists for a diocese attempting to separate from the national church.

Diocese: A geographically designated territory overseen by a bishop consisting primarily of parish churches. Originally the American dioceses were identical with each state, but for purposes of management these were subsequently divided as dioceses grew. So, for example, the State of Pennsylvania consists today of five dioceses. The Diocese of Pittsburgh includes 11 counties.

Dromantine: Meeting of the Primates in February 2005 in Dromanine, Ireland. The meeting's final statement accepted and strengthened the Windsor Report as the way forward for the communion, expressed alarm at the undermining of the Communion's consensus on human sexuality by The Episcopal Church and The Anglican Church of Canada and called for moratoria on those activities. See Supplement #xx or on the web at http://www.anglicancommunion.org/primates/downloads/communique_english.pdf

Episcopal Church: See The Episcopal Church.

Executive Council: A body that acts on behalf of The Episcopal Church's General Convention while General Convention is not in session. As is the case with General Convention, its resolutions are only binding where they touch on its internal affairs and organization. The Executive Council's membership is elected by General Convention and The Episcopal Church's internal provinces.

General Convention (GC): This triennial convention, like the U.S. Congress, is the ultimate legislative body and meets in two separate houses: the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies. It passes resolutions, which are not binding. It also is responsible for any changes to The Episcopal Church's Constitution and Canons. The Constitution and Canons are binding legal documents for The Episcopal Church. A common abbreviation is GC followed by a year; so GC2003 denotes the General Convention in the summer of 2003.

Global South: A term used to refer to Anglican provinces in Africa, Asia and South America. As a group, they account for more than two-thirds of the Anglican Communion's people and represent roughly half of the Communion's 38 provinces. They are theologically conservative and growing, sometimes vigorously.

Heresy: belief or teaching contrary to received orthodox Christian doctrine or teaching.

Heterodox: belief or teaching not clearly centered on received orthodox Christian doctrine or teaching

House of Bishops: The bishops of the Episcopal Church are invited to gather twice a year for fellowship, study and discussion as well as during GC. The group passes "Mind of the House" resolutions, but does not have further legislative authority.

House of Deputies: Each diocese sends eight delegates to General Convention: four priest and four lay folk. These eight delegates times over a 100 dioceses in TEC comprise the House of Deputies. Together with the other house (The House of Bishop) they pass all national church legislation.

Instruments of Unity: While no body has juridical authority over provinces of the Anglican Communion, there are four international "instruments of unity" intended to help guide the worldwide church. They are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primates Meeting, the Anglican Consultative Council, and the Lambeth Conference of Bishops.

Lambeth Conference: Every ten years, all Anglican bishops with jurisdiction in communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury are invited to a conference in England. In the past, the conference has made theological and moral statements. It also is intended to serve as a time for study and community building among bishops. The next Lambeth Conference is scheduled for July 2008.

Lambeth Resolution 1:10: From the Lambeth Conference of 1998. Opposed by a mere 7%.
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/appendix/p3.6.cfm>

Panel of Reference: An international body created by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 2005 at the request of the primates to provide mediation for parishes and dioceses in conflict with The Episcopal Church. Working very deliberately, the panel has responded to only a handful of cases. Its suggestions were generally not acted on by The Episcopal Church or by Episcopal dioceses in conflict with conservative parishes.

Presiding Bishop (PB): See also "Primate". For most of TEC's history the Presiding Bishop was simply whichever diocesan bishop had served longest in that capacity. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury is the local diocesan bishop.

Primate: The bishop who presides over a province; usually termed an Archbishop since he or she is the “first” bishop. In some provinces a different title is used, as in TEC where our primate is titled “The Presiding Bishop”.

Primates Meeting: Archbishops of the Anglican Communion’s 38 provinces are called “primates.” The Primates Meeting brings these leaders together from time to time to address issues that impact the entire communion. The primates have repeatedly asked The Episcopal Church to turn back from its current practice of ordaining bishops in same-sex relationships, and have asked the Anglican Church in Canada to end blessings of same-sex partnerships. Their website is

Primate Vicar: In response to the request of Pittsburgh and six other dioceses for an Alternative Primate, Presiding Bishop Katharine Jefferts Schori proposed a Primate Vicar of her choosing who would provide pastoral leadership for the dioceses in question under her authority. The dioceses who made the request for Alternative Primate Oversight did not believe this arrangement dealt with their concerns. A modified and strengthened version of the Primate Vicar proposal was approved by the Primates at their Dar es Salaam meeting in 2007. However, The House of Bishops and The Executive Council quickly rejected it.

Progressive Episcopalians of Pittsburgh (PEP): A local advocacy group formed after General Convention 2003. PEP works to promote the progressive theology and actions of The Episcopal Church within the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh and to keep The Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh within the structures and systems of The Episcopal Church. Their website is <http://progressiveepiscopalians.org/>

Province: A province is a national or regional association of dioceses that is part of the Anglican Communion. The Episcopal Church, for instance, is currently a province of the Anglican Communion. There are 38 provinces around the world. “Province” is also a term used within The Episcopal Church (and within some other Anglican Communion provinces) for geographical groupings of dioceses within the province. Until the diocese withdrew in 2006, Pittsburgh was a member of The Episcopal Church Province III. 12 dioceses in III

Province: American usage differs from the rest of the Anglican Communion. In TEC a province is a voluntary association of dioceses for the sake of more effective mission through collegial conferring. Province III consists of xx dioceses: The Dioceses of and until recently Pittsburgh.

Revisionists: Those Episcopalians who believe that the Faith needs revising in light of new ideas and perceptions, such as feminism, pan-sexualism, and post-modernism. While some accept the this description, others finding it pejorative prefer the term “progressive.”

Schism: a split or division between strongly opposed sections or parties, caused by differences in opinion or belief; also the formal separation of a church into two churches or the secession of a group owing to doctrinal and other differences.

The Episcopal Church (TEC): This became the new name of the American national church as of General Convention 2006; previously it was known as the Protestant Episcopal Church of the USA (PECUSA) or sometimes simply ECUSA. It includes a handful of small Anglican dioceses in Central America, Cuba, etc. Their website is <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/>

Via Media USA: A loose grouping of progressive advocacy groups that have sprung up in conservative Episcopal dioceses. Progressive Episcopalians of Pittsburgh is a member. Their website is <http://www.everyvoice.net/>

The Vincentian Canon: A three-fold rule or guide first articulated by Bishop Vincent of Lérins (d. about 430 A.D.) asserting that for any doctrine or teaching of the Church to be considered central or core, it must be that which is believed by the Church everywhere (not just locally), always (not just sometimes), and by all (not by just a few).

Windsor Bishops: A loose grouping of approximately 30 (of 110) diocesan bishops in The Episcopal Church who have publicly stated their intention to live within the requests of the Windsor Report. The Network Bishops have all declared themselves part of the Windsor Coalition.

Windsor Report: A report, requested by the Primates in 2003 and submitted in 2004 to the Archbishop of Canterbury. This report, which became known as the Windsor Report, reaffirmed the Communion's teaching on traditional sexual morality and suggested several ways the Communion and The Episcopal Church might heal the breach caused by The Episcopal Church's innovations. One of the most important proposals of the Windsor Report was for an Anglican Covenant. Available at <http://www.aco.org/primates/downloads/index.cfm>

For additional definitions see the excellent site on the national church's website:
http://www.episcopalchurch.org/lw_newsroom_16107_ENG_HTM.htm

Appendix Two

An Annotated Bibliography of Websites

When first getting online for the state of debate in the Episcopal Church, the newcomer may feel a bit like Rip van Winkle. He went to sleep (according to one telling) with tavern chatter about “taxation without representation” and awoke to an equally vociferous chatter about “that constitution stuff down in Philly.” The debate had moved on along with the reality. It must have been bewildering. “Cum’on, Rip, catch up.”

My best counsel is to just jump in and swim around. More than any other communication mode in history, one can enter the internet almost anywhere and it will take you everywhere. That being so I might have commended only two websites: “Stand Firm in Faith” for the traditionalist perspective and “Via Media” for the revisionist perspective (below). It’s all there: the news, the analyses, the opinions. Here are some resources too.

Magazines/Newspapers:

The first four are weekly Anglican/Episcopal publications, including news articles, devotional pieces, editorials, obits and more; all short pieces.

The Living Church – truly moderate and broad; American, Episcopal. Their website is www.livingchurch.org

Episcopal Life – decidedly revisionist bent; American, Episcopal. Once an independent diocesan paper it was taken over by the national church and represents their view; editorials by editors and guests, and a regular column by the Presiding Bishop. Their website is http://www.ecusa.anglican.org/episcopal_life.htm

The Church Times – mostly catholic and broad; occasionally revisionist or evangelical; outstanding book reviews, news, and obits; British, Anglican. Their website is <http://www.churchtimes.co.uk/index.asp?id=42877>

The Church of England Newspaper – British, Anglican, evangelical. Their website is www.churchnewspaper.com/?go=welcome

Christianity Today – founded by Billy Graham half a century ago; classical American evangelical Protestantism; outstanding! <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ctmag>

Touchstone – ecumenical magazine; generous big tent Catholicism a la C. S. Lewis. <http://www.touchstonemag.com/> comments at <http://merecomments.typepad.com/>

First Things – voice piece for Richard John Neuhaus and a generous Catholicism; wise social comment, awesome articles on theology <http://www.firstthings.com/>

Websites:

Anglican Mainstream – orthodox and Anglican www.anglican-mainstream.net/

Stand Firm in the Faith – orthodox and Anglican www.standfirminfaith.com.

The Windsor Report, which provides decent context on the issues now being faced:

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/> Pages 44-49 have recommendations on the instruments of unity. Pages 50–59 have recommendations on the issues being faced now with respect to ECUSA and Canada. In particular, paragraphs 134 and 135 on pages 53-54; paragraph 144 on page 57; and paragraph 155 on page 59 are most relevant. The following site also has extensive background and commentary on the report:

<http://www.virtueonline.org/portal/modules/paging/index.php?id=5> .

Anglican Communion Network – provides excellent updated news on events; traditionalist; recommend signing up for the bi-weekly news. <http://www.acn-us.org/updates/>

VirtueOnline – David Virtue is a feisty Episcopalian and a bit polemical but lots of news and quite current. <http://www.virtueonline.org/portal/index.php>

TitusOneNine – Canon Kendall Harmon of South Carolina is orthodox with a Ph.D. from Oxford; educated, informed, devout. <http://titusonine.classicalanglican.net/>

Classical Anglican News Network – totally non-polemic! <http://www.anglican.tk/>

Parish Toolbox – a diocesan-created resource of opinions and article both pro and con. <http://www.parishtoolbox.org/>

Progressive Episcopalians of Pittsburgh – fully revisionist but with more interest in politics than theology; local chapter of Via Media USA; valuable local interests. <http://progressiveepiscopalians.org/>

Via Media USA – theologically and politically progressive <http://viamediausa.org/>

Church Resources:

Fox Chapel Episcopal Church – <http://www.fcec.us/>

Diocese of Pittsburgh (often useful commentary) <http://www.pittsburgh.anglican.org>

Anglican Communion Home Page – outstanding reference to Primates Meetings, Lambeth Conferences, news, etc. <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/index.cfm>

Anglican Communion News Service – <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/>

Episcopal Church (has some very good church growth and demographic information) <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/>

Episcopal Church News Service <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/ens.htm>

Appendix Three

A Chronology of Events Leading to the Crisis

The Path of the Episcopal Church — The Timeline

1930 Lambeth Conference passes Resolution 15, "The Life and Witness of the Christian Community - Marriage and Sex," making Anglicans the first major Christian body to approve artificial means of birth control.

1943 Revision to daily office lectionary removed selected "difficult" readings concerning homosexual practice.

1965-1966 Heresy charges brought against Bishop James Pike, who had declared that "the Church's classical way of stating what is represented by the doctrine of the Trinity is...not essential to the Christian faith"; Bishop Pike was censured, but there was no trial for heresy because the Church believed such a trial would give it an "oppressive image"

1967 Weakening position on abortion appears to begin with 1967 General Convention Statement on Abortion.

1968 Membership in the Episcopal Church peaks. By 2005 there is a net loss of around one million members.

1973 General Convention, allowing pastoral concern to trump Scriptural teaching, replaced its annulment canon with a canon allowing remarriage after divorce, not limiting such remarriage to those cases that might be argued from Scripture

1974 Illegal ordination of women to the priesthood, the "Philadelphia 11."

1976 General Convention approved Resolution B005, making the ordination canons for the three orders of bishop, priest and deacon equally applicable to men and women.

1976 General Convention of ECUSA approved Resolutions A068 and B101 calling for study/dialogue on sexuality and ordination of homosexuals.

1976 John Spong ordained Bishop of Newark, despite his denial of essential Christian doctrines.

1976 Revised edition of the Book of Common Prayer approved (First Reading) by resolution A104.

1979 Revised edition of the Book of Common Prayer approved (Second Reading) by resolution A133.

1979 General Convention of ECUSA approved Resolution A053, reaffirming traditional teaching on sexuality and morality, stating, "we believe it is not appropriate for this Church to ordain a practicing homosexual, or any person who is engaged in heterosexual relations outside of marriage." This has never been overturned by subsequent General Conventions.

1979 Twenty revisionist bishops issued "Statement of Conscience," rejecting A053.

1985 General Convention of ECUSA approved Resolution D082 calling to "dispel myths and prejudices" against homosexuality.

1987 Panel of bishops dismisses heresy charges against Bishop Spong.

1988 General Convention of ECUSA approves Resolution D102 calling for the continuation of consultation/dialogue regarding human sexuality.

1989 Panel of bishops dismisses heresy charges against Bishop Spong.

1989 Bishop John Spong, Diocese of Newark, publicly ordains first non-celibate, openly-partnered, homosexual.

1990 Bishop Walter Righter, assisting in the Diocese of Newark, ordains a non-celibate homosexual deacon.

1991 Bishop Ronald Haines, Diocese of Washington (D.C.), ordains a non-celibate homosexual priest.

1991 During General Convention, the House of Bishops rejects efforts to censure Bishop Righter and Bishop Haines for the ordinations they performed.

1994 General Convention of ECUSA approved Resolution C042 calling for preparation of a report considering rites for blessings of same-sex unions.

1994 Bishop Spong drafted the "Koinonia Statement" defining homosexuality as morally neutral and affirming support for the ordination of homosexuals in faithful sexual relationships (signed by 90 bishops and 144 deputies)

1996 The American Anglican Council is incorporated.

1996 Both counts of heresy against Bishop Righter dismissed in an ecclesiastical court, which declared there was "no clear doctrine" involved regarding the ordination a non-celibate gay man.

1997 The Kuala Lumpur Statement is released by the Second Anglican Encounter in the South, upholding traditional theology on human sexuality. At General Convention, Resolution B032 to endorse the Kuala Lumpur Statement was defeated in the House of Bishops 94 to 42.

1998 Lambeth Conference upholds Scriptural and traditional teaching on marriage and human sexuality in resolution 1.10. Showing their dissent for resolution 1.10, 65 ECUSA bishops sign a pastoral statement to lesbian and gay Anglicans.

March 2000 Primates' meeting in Oporto, Portugal, issued pastoral letter upholding the authority of Scripture.

July 2000 General Convention of ECUSA approved Resolution D039 acknowledging relationships other than marriage and existence of disagreement on the Church's teaching.

March 2001 Primates' meeting in Kanuga, N.C., issued pastoral letter acknowledging estrangement in Church due to changes in theology and practice regarding human sexuality, and calling Communion to avoid actions that might damage "credibility of mission."

April 2002 Primates' meeting at Canterbury issued a report recognizing the responsibility for all bishops to be able to articulate the fundamentals of faith so as to maintain the Church in truth.

Sept. 2002 Anglican Consultative Council Meeting in Hong Kong approved motion urging dioceses and bishops to refrain from unilateral actions/policies that would strain communion

March 2003 The Theology Committee of the House of Bishops concluded that: "Because at this time we are nowhere near consensus in the Church regarding the blessing of homosexual relationships, we cannot recommend authorizing the development of new rites for such blessings. For these reasons, we urge the greatest caution as the Church continues to seek the mind of Christ in these matters." (Note: the full report appears to have been removed from the ECUSA web site.)

May 2003 Primates' meeting in Brazil issued pastoral letter stating "The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke for us all when he said that it is through liturgy that we express what we believe, and that there is no theological consensus about same sex unions. Therefore, we as a body cannot support the authorisation

of such rites.”

July 2003 In a letter to the Primates, the Archbishop of Canterbury warns that "certain decisions" on human sexuality could have "the effect of deepening the divide between Provinces"

July 2003 A gathering of over 60 worldwide Anglican leaders warns the General Convention of the Episcopal Church of the USA that, "should the Convention decide to confirm the election of Canon Gene Robinson as bishop or approve the blessing of same-sex unions or both, then we will convene within three months to confirm our view that ECUSA has thereby placed itself outside the boundaries of the Anglican Communion and that appropriate action will follow."

August 2003 The General Convention of the Episcopal Church defeated Resolution B001, which sought to affirm the authority of Scripture.

August 2003 The General Convention of the Episcopal Church voted to confirm Gene Robinson, a non-celibate, partnered homosexual man, as bishop of New Hampshire. The Archbishop of Canterbury responds, saying, "It is my hope that the church in America and the rest of the Anglican Communion will have the opportunity to consider this development before significant and irrevocable decisions are made in response," and calls for an extraordinary meeting of the primates in London during October.

August 2003 The General Convention of the Episcopal Church approved Resolution C051 recognizing blessings of same-sex unions as "within bounds of our common life."

October 2003 Nearly 3,000 orthodox Episcopalians met in Dallas at A Place to Stand hosted by Christ Church Plano – received message of support from Cardinal Ratzinger, sent a strong message to Primates meeting.

October 2003 The statement released by the Primates of the Anglican Communion at the conclusion of their extraordinary meeting in Lambeth Palace states, in part, "If his consecration proceeds, we recognise that we have reached a crucial and critical point in the life of the Anglican Communion and we have had to conclude that the future of the Communion itself will be put in jeopardy. In this case, the ministry of this one bishop will not be recognised by most of the Anglican world, and many provinces are likely to consider themselves to be out of Communion with the Episcopal Church (USA). This will tear the fabric of our Communion at its deepest level, and may lead to further division on this and further issues as provinces have to decide in consequence whether they can remain in communion with provinces that choose not to break communion with the Episcopal Church (USA)."

November 2003 V. Gene Robinson consecrated Bishop of New Hampshire. Presiding Bishop Griswold (who signed the primates' statement in London) is chief consecrator. The Archbishop of Canterbury issues a statement.

January 2004 The Anglican Communion Network is launched.

March 2004 ECUSA House of Bishops meeting at Camp Allen issues a plan for Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight (DEPO) for "those in the church who find themselves in distress because of the actions of the 74th General Convention." AAC declares DEPO a "no-go" in its response.

March 2004 Diocese of Washington begins to develop rites for blessing same-sex unions.

April 2004 Retired Bishop Otis Charles "marries" his homosexual partner in Pasadena, Calif. (The two have five previous marriages between them.)

May 2004 Bishop of Los Angeles, J. Jon Bruno, performs blessing of same-sex union.

June 2004 Bishop of Washington, D.C., John Chane, performs blessing of same-sex union for priest and his partner.

June 2004 Diocese of Vermont issues proposed rites for blessings of same-sex unions.

THE WINDSOR REPORT AND BEYOND:

October 2004 Lambeth Commission releases the Windsor Report, reaffirming Lambeth Conference resolution 1.10 and the authority of Scripture as central to Anglican common life, and calls for moratoria on public rites of same-sex blessings as well as on the election and consent of any candidate to the episcopacy living in a same-sex union. Additional References

February 2005 Primates meet in Dromantine, Ireland, to collectively examine the Windsor Report and produce a Communiqué calling on ECUSA and Canada to “voluntarily withdraw” their representatives from the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) until Lambeth 2008. Additionally the Primates requested a hearing at the June 2005 ACC meeting in which the two suspended churches (US & Canada) are to set out their thinking behind their recent actions.

March 2005 ECUSA House of Bishops meeting at Camp Allen, Texas, responds to the Windsor Report request for a moratorium on election and consent to the episcopacy of persons living in same-sex unions, instead “pledge(s) to withhold consent to the consecration of any person elected to the episcopate after the date hereof until the General Convention of 2006,” (In other words, “If I can’t play my way, I’m not going to play at all, so there!”). See also: A word to the church.

April 2005 ECUSA Executive Council holds special meeting and, in a letter to the ACC, announces they will send their delegation to the June ACC meeting for *observation* but not *official participation*.

June 2005 At the Anglican Consultative Council meeting in Nottingham, England, ECUSA makes a presentation, “To Set Our Hope on Christ,” defending what amounts to a new gospel that is wholly incompatible with Scripture, thereby justifying, rather than repenting of, their actions. (Canada also makes a similar presentation.) The ACC meeting also upholds Lambeth 1.10 teaching on human sexuality and endorses the Primates’ request for ECUSA and Canada to withdraw their representatives from the ACC until the next Lambeth Conference.

September 2005 Church of Nigeria Synod votes to change its constitution, and “deleted all such references ... defining us with the See of Canterbury and replaced them with a new provision of Communion with all Anglican Churches, Dioceses and Provinces that hold and maintain the Historic Faith, ...”

October 2005 In its Communiqué The Third Anglican South-to-South? Encounter in Egypt issued a harsh indictment of ECUSA and Canada and called for a common “Anglican Covenant” among churches remaining true to Biblical Christianity and historic Anglicanism

February 2006 Global South Primates Steering Committee issues a communiqué reemphasizing the seriousness of the crisis within the Communion and the need for ECUSA to repent and comply with the Windsor Report.

February 2006 Susan Russell, President of Integrity USA, marries her lesbian partner, declaring beforehand that the action was “God willing and the primates notwithstanding.”

ECUSA GENERAL CONVENTION 2006:

June 2006 The General Convention of the Episcopal Church met in Columbus, Ohio. (Follow the link for details and early fallout.) The GC response to the Windsor Report amounts to rejection and repudiation; elects heterodox Presiding Bishop that is fully committed to the revisionist path chosen by the Episcopal Church on issues of sex and morality. Eight dioceses request some form of alternative primatial relationship.

BEYOND GENERAL CONVENTION:

August 2006 Martyn Minns consecrated as CANA missionary bishop.

September 2006 The Global South Primates meeting at Kilgali, Rwanda, issue a communiqué that laments, “We deeply regret that, at its most recent General Convention, The Episcopal Church gave no clear embrace of the minimal recommendations of the Windsor Report.” but “We are, however, greatly

encouraged by the continued faithfulness of the Network Dioceses and all of the other congregations and communities of faithful Anglicans in North America.” and “We are convinced that the time has now come to take initial steps towards the formation of what will be recognized as a separate ecclesiastical structure of the Anglican Communion in the USA.”

October 2006 The Presiding Bishop's chancellor, David Beers, writes letters threatening legal action against the dioceses of Fort Worth and Quincy.

November 2006 In an escalating environment of threats and persecution, Bishop Schofield of San Joaquin, pulls no punches in his response to the new Presiding Bishop, saying, in part, “The Episcopal Church, as an institution, is walking a path of apostasy and those faithful to God’s Word are forced to make painful choices.”

December 2006 Nine Virginia congregations, including Truro and the Falls Church, vote to leave the Episcopal Church. Eight join CANA, the ninth accepting oversight from a global south primate. This brings the total number of congregations that have left the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia to 13, with another two having congregational votes coming up in January.

December 2006 In a letter to the Primates, the Archbishop of Canterbury explains his rationale for not withholding an invitation for the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church to the Primates Meeting scheduled for February 14-19 in Tanzania, saying “I am also proposing to invite two or three other contributors from that Province for a session to take place before the rest of our formal business, in which the situation may be reviewed, and I am currently consulting as to how this is best organised.”

January 2007 Diocese of Virginia press release announces lawsuits against 11 of the 15 departing congregations, continuing the *scorched earth* policy against dissidents apparently being orchestrated by the national church's New York headquarters.

February 2007 At the Primates Meeting in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, 14-19 February, the "Report of the Communion Sub-Group (on TEC's response to the Windsor Report)" was released on 15 February. The Report is a travesty that on clear reading states that TEC's response to the Windsor report meets the requirement. A comprehensive commentary on the Report was released on 17 February on Stand Firm in Faith.

Very late **on 2/19, a communiqué was released** from the primates of the Anglican Communion.

The thrust of the communiqué is that it provides a short deadline, till September 30, 2007, for The Episcopal Church's House of Bishops confirm back to the Primates, that "the bishops will not authorise any Rite of Blessing for same-sex unions in their dioceses or through General Convention," and "that the passing of Resolution B033 of the 75th General Convention means that a candidate for episcopal orders living in a same-sex union shall not receive the necessary consent."

"If the reassurances requested of the House of Bishops cannot in good conscience be given, the relationship between The Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion as a whole remains damaged at best, and this has consequences for the full participation of the Church in the life of the Communion."

Also, to "respond pastorally and provide for those groups alienated by recent developments in the Episcopal Church," "the Primates will establish a Pastoral Council to act on behalf of the Primates in consultation with The Episcopal Church. This Council shall consist of up to five members: two nominated by the Primates, two by the Presiding Bishop, and a Primate of a Province of the Anglican Communion nominated by the Archbishop of Canterbury to chair the Council."

Details of these and other important recommendations are found in the communiqué and the accompanying schedule, named *The Key Recommendations of the Primates*.

For notable **reactions** and **interpretations** of the communiqué, and **additional details**,.

March 2007 The House of Bishops of The Episcopal Church reject the Dar es Salaam communiqué - request urgent meeting with the Archbishop of Canterbury/Primates Standing Committee.

Meeting at Camp Allen, Navasota, Texas, March 16-21, at the end of their deliberations on March 20, the House of Bishops issued strong rejections of the requests contained in the communiqué in a *Mind of the House Resolution addressed to the Executive Council*, a *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury and members of the Primates Standing Committee*, and a *Public Statement from the House of Bishops*.