

MEMORANDUM

April 9, 2007

To: House of Bishops
From: Task Force on Property Disputes
Re: Connecting the Dots

Introduction

The House of Bishops Task Force on Property Disputes (Task Force) was formed at the Spring, 2006 meeting of the House at Kanuga. It consists of the following episcopal members: Mark Andrus, Charles Bennison, Jon Bruno, Philip Duncan, Mark Hollingsworth, John Howard, Jim Mathes, Bill Persell, Stacy Sauls, Kirk Smith, and Dean Wolfe.¹ It was originally chaired by Bill Swing and has been chaired by Stacy Sauls since Bill's retirement. The bishop members are advised by 19 lawyers, all serving as volunteers.

The March, 2006 Executive Council meeting allocated \$100,000 to fund the work of the Task Force. The Church Pension Group has contributed another \$25,000. To date, no funds have been expended, despite a considerable amount of work done by the members of the Task Force. All fees, legal expenses, meeting costs, travel costs, and telephone conference-call costs have been donated by the members and lawyers of the Task Force out of devotion to The Episcopal Church (TEC).

The Task Force has accomplished a significant amount of work. It has conducted extensive research, compiled a research bank for relevant materials, and has met on a regular basis, almost entirely by conference call. It has also met twice in person, once when it organized itself as an ad-hoc group, in December, 2005, and again with the then Presiding-Bishop Elect in July, 2006. The Task Force has furnished suggestions to the Presiding Bishop covering legal issues, pastoral concerns, and public relations matters. It has consulted regularly with the Presiding Bishop's Chancellor. It has advised, and it remains willing to advise, Bishops and others seeking to further the Task Force's goal of preventing the removal of property from TEC.

The Legal Lay of the Land

TEC is dealing with a well-thought-out, well-organized, and well-funded² strategy designed to enable and justify the removal of assets from use for the Church's mission

¹ Bishops Bennison, Bruno, Hollingsworth, Howard, Persell, Sauls, and Wolfe were appointed to the Task Force by the Presiding Bishop. Bishops Andrus, Duncan, Mathes, and Smith have volunteered their assistance.

² The Task Force has not explored funding issues as of yet. Funding, including the involvement of the Institute for Religion and Democracy, is addressed in "Following the Money" available at http://www.edow.org/follow/Following_the_money.pdf. The Task Force has prepared and proposed a plan for funding the defense of attempts to remove property.

and ministry in the world. To understand the strategy, it is necessary to have a basic understanding of the legal principles, civil and canonical, that form the backdrop for the strategy.

There are two rules for determining church property disputes in the United States, which, for the most part, are determined under state law rather than federal law.

A. Deference to Hierarchical Authority Rule—Some courts defer to hierarchical denominations, such as TEC, to determine which local faction to recognize as properly in possession of congregational property.

B. Neutral Principles of Law Rule—Some courts analyze the underlying instruments or instruments by which title was conveyed to the record owner of the congregational property, along with any documents that create a possible trust relationship with respect to such property, as well as other facts, such as the way the parties have behaved historically with respect to property ownership.

Since TEC has been recognized by courts as a hierarchical church, TEC's determinations should be dispositive in those states which defer to denominational hierarchies. On the other hand, in states that apply the neutral principles of law rule, a departing congregation would still have to overcome the Canon I.7.4 and II.6.4 of the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church (2006), which declare that all parish property is held in trust for both the relevant diocese and TEC.³

Those seeking to remove property from TEC hope to create confusion as to the nature of the hierarchy of TEC by claiming that its authority is subservient to the Anglican Communion. They hope to be able to argue that a departing faction is recognized by a competing hierarchical authority within the Anglican Communion. They either will urge the court to refrain from choosing between competing hierarchies and picking winners and losers or they will claim that they are acting under the authority of some other body that is within the Anglican Communion as a higher authority to TEC. This is why they have pointed to the Preamble to TEC's Constitution. As amended in 1967 as a compromise over the issue of whether to retain the word "Protestant" in the name of TEC, the preamble declares, in pertinent part: "The Episcopal Church . . . is a constituent member of the Anglican Communion, a Fellowship within the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces, and regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, upholding and propagating the historic Faith and Order as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer."

The history of this change in the Preamble makes it clear that it was not intended to make TEC subject to any other Anglican decision-making body. There is also no doubt that the Preamble was intended to be descriptive rather than prescriptive. In addition, it is well recognized in constitutional law that prefatory materials, such as a preamble, are not authoritative law. Still, those seeking to undermine the rights of TEC to local church

³ The Diocese of Pittsburgh passed a resolution in 2003 purporting to nullify Canons I.6.4 and II.7.4.

property have shown that they intend to use the Preamble's language in future litigation over church property.⁴

Therefore, in those states that defer to the hierarchical denominations, the court will have to determine the identity of highest decision-making body in the denomination.⁵ Those seeking to undermine TEC, will contend that it is not the General Convention, but some structure within the Anglican Communion whether it is the Primates Meeting, the Anglican Consultative Council, the Lambeth Conference, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or perhaps something else. They might also debate what authority represents the top of Anglican hierarchy in the United States (*e.g.*, Is it the one represented by the General Convention, and the Primate of which is Katharine Jefferts Schori, or is it the one that we now know as the Anglican Communion Network?).⁶

Connecting the Dots of the Strategy to Remove Property

The strategy with which we are confronted is well-documented. It was, conceptually, formed very soon after the close of the 2003 General Convention and contemporaneously with the formation of the Anglican Communion Network.

A. The *Pittsburgh Tribune Review* Interview—October 7, 2003 (Appendix A)

Newspaper report entitled “Episcopal Meeting Tackles Controversy” quoting Bishop Duncan regarding the Anglican Communion Network as the *bona fide* Episcopal Church.

B. The Mainstream Meeting—November 20, 2003 (Appendix B)

We do not know what Bishops attended this meeting except that the notation at the top of the minutes is in Bishop Duncan's handwriting, but the typed minutes from this meeting pledge the participants to:

- “Tell +Rowan that if he will not recognize the Network [the Global South Primates] will separate from him,”
- “Declare that in the present crisis the issue of boundaries is suspended,”
- Form a “Network of Confessing Dioceses and Parishes . . . established in good faith with our Constitution . . . [with] Bob Duncan, Bishop of Pittsburgh, as Moderator Bishop,” and
- Commit to wage the “guerilla warfare of the next year.”

⁴The provision in TEC's Preamble is rare in the constitutions of Anglican Provinces (Norman Doe, *Canon Law in the Anglican Communion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) p. 341). A similar provision was recently removed from the Constitution of the Anglican Church of Nigeria.

⁵Action by some dioceses, including Quincy (predating 2003), Pittsburgh, Dallas, Ft. Worth, and San Joaquin, to remove the accession clause required by the Constitution of TEC (Art. V, Sec.1) might be advanced to obscure the hierarchical nature of TEC.

⁶The Anglican Communion Network asserts that it is intended to operate only within the Constitution and Canons of TEC, a claim which takes on a considerably different meaning if the Network should claim actually to be TEC, exclusive of non-Network parishes and dioceses.

C. The Blankingship E-Mail—December 9, 2003 (Appendix C)

This email from Hugo Blankingship, the Chancellor of the Network, to Bishop Duncan, the Moderator of the Network, reports on a meeting between Blankingship and John Rees, the Archbishop of Canterbury's legal advisor (equivalent to a Chancellor in TEC), and reports that Rees "simply won't listen to anything but our staying in ECUSA."

D. The Chapman Memo—December 28, 2003 (Appendix D)

The Chapman Memo has been well-publicized and has never been repudiated by the Anglican Communion Network. It provides details of a strategy that was virtually completely formed by this point.⁷ At the outset, it declares: "Our ultimate goal is a realignment of Anglicanism on North American soil," which "[w]e believe in the end should be a 'replacement' jurisdiction with confessional standards." Chapman notes that "[w]e seek to retain ownership of our property as we move into this realignment." According to the memo, the realignment is to be accomplished through a two-stage strategy.

"Stage 1 will feature 'spiritual realignment' while remaining within the letter of current canons," and will allow those participating "to keep clear use of their buildings for the foreseeable future."

The memo says that it would be during Stage 2, which was to be launched "at some yet to be determined moment, probably in 2004," that the Network or those associated with it would "seek, under the guidance of the Primates, negotiated settlements in matters of property, jurisdiction, pastoral succession and communion," adding, however: "If adequate settlements are not within reach, a faithful disobedience of canon law on a widespread basis may be necessary."

The Chapman Memo goes into considerable detail in discussing the development and implementation of the strategy to use "offshore" bishops and a variety of practical, political, and financial issues for implementing the strategy.

E. The Barfoot Memorandum—March 3, 2004 (Appendix E)

This memorandum, which followed the Chapman Memo by just slightly more than two months, sets forth a proposed "process and protocol for establishing Overseas AEO as an interim stage on the way towards the realignment of Anglicanism in North America

⁷ It bears noting that at the very time the Chapman Memo was circulated in secret, the assistant to Geoff Chapman, its author, was a man named David Brannen, a priest who had interviewed, signed a contract to purchase a house, and accepted a call from by St. John's Church in Versailles, Kentucky without the Bishop's knowledge, and who at first refused to be interviewed by the Bishop. When the Bishop eventually declined to approve the call, three events followed in rapid succession: half the congregation of St. Johns left to form St. Andrew's Anglican Church; Bishop Duncan transferred David Brannen to the Province of Uganda; and David Brannen accepted a call to be the Rector of the new Ugandan congregation, exactly as the Chapman Memo suggests should happen. The same strategy has subsequently been followed in several other dioceses.

and the reestablishment of biblically orthodox faith as normative in North American Anglicanism.”

It lays out a three-phase strategy to be followed in seeking and obtaining, “offshore” oversight, beginning with steps to be undertaken in selecting an offshore diocese with the assistance of the Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa (CAPA). Various contingencies are discussed, including what actions in response might be expected from TEC, how recommended courses of action would differ depending upon whether the parish owns property, etc.

It details a plan to remove priests to the oversight of foreign bishops and primates as a matter of formality while substantive oversight would be delegated to the Network.

F. The *Living Church* Interview—April 27, 2005 (Appendix F)

This interview of Bishop Duncan includes his summary of the strategy to become a replacement jurisdiction by claiming “to be, constitutionally, The Episcopal Church.”

G. The Request to the Global South Primates for Alternative Primate Oversight—November 6, 2006 (Appendix G)

This document was released publicly two days prior to a requirement to produce it pursuant to court order in *Calvary Episcopal Church v. Duncan*, Prothonotary Court for Allegheny County, Pa. (GD03020941). It is the Diocese of Pittsburgh’s request to the Global South primates for Alternative Primate Oversight and explicitly seeks assistance in property disputes under a section entitled “Cover” while a separate ecclesiastical structure is formed. In addition, the document details what duties of the Presiding Bishop should be delegated to a Primate Vicar under any such pastoral scheme.

H. The Bishop’s Address to the 47th Annual Convention of the Diocese of San Joaquin—December 1, 2006 (Appendix H)

This document is listed out of chronological order because it is necessary to identify the Westfields Response, discussed below. Bishop Schofield describes a Global South Steering Committee consisting of “John Chew,⁸ Archbishop of Singapore; Drexel Gomez⁹ of the West Indies and the Caribbean; Gregory Venables, Primate of the Southern Cone, South America, and a [*sic*] three Archbishops from Africa, including Peter Akinola of Nigeria as Chairman.” Bishop Schofield also asserts that representatives of 10 American dioceses met in Virginia and submitted to the authority of the Steering Committee.

Speaking at a deanery meeting on November 21, 2006, Bishop Schofield further described the commitment to the Global South Steering Committee in these words:

⁸ Archbishop Chew is a member of the Covenant Design Group for the Anglican Communion.

⁹ Archbishop Gomez is the chair of the Covenant Design Group for the Anglican Communion.

And then we were asked whether or not we would sign a document submitting to the authority of the Primates and we had to give serious consideration as to what that might be. And everyone present at the conference, which included Bishops, presidents of standing committees, chancellors, and other counselors—all signed that document.

I. The Westfields Response—November 16, 2006 (Appendix I)

This appears to be the document (perhaps incomplete) described by Bishop Schofield. The copy attached as Appendix I is signed by Bishop Duncan, Robert G. Devlin (Chancellor of the Diocese of Pittsburgh), and John M. Heidengren (President of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Pittsburgh). There is significant blank space between the signatures.

J. Bishop Duncan's Pastoral Letter—March 9, 2007 (Appendix J)

This pastoral letter was sent to “all who are part of the Anglican Communion Network or are allies in its welfare” with the request that it be read to congregations by all Network priests on March 11 but not published until March 12, 2007. It describes the Network's understanding of the Dar es Salaam communiqué as creating an ecclesiastical structure not accountable to TEC.

Conclusion

The Task Force has obtained and reviewed a broad array of other significant documents that relate to the strategy for removing property from TEC and that, in some cases, explicitly describe, often in considerable detail, elements of and reasons for that strategy. Those mentioned here are sufficient to clearly establish the essential nature of the strategy being followed.

As a concluding note, it has occurred to many in the Task Force that it may have been misnamed. In truth, the matters that the Task Force has found it necessary to address are much larger than mere property disputes. Experience has shown that, at the root of every property issue, there is an issue of identity and integrity, and not merely an issue of polity.

In reality, it is the church “homes” of countless loyal Episcopalians, the legacy of countless Episcopalians, past and present, and the spiritual well-being of those who always have found immeasurable comfort in their church homes, that are at issue as well as the nature of TEC and Anglicanism. The strategy at play must be revealed and understood if we are to protect the faithful from having their places of worship, and the assets accumulated by generations of Episcopalians, removed from them and removed from their use in the mission of TEC.



Click here for advertising information || List all Advertisers



Apply Now or Call 724-360-2666

Lower your Rate
Consolidate your Bills
Buy a new Home

**Tribune-Review
ONLINE**
Home | Helpdesk
Contact Us | Subscribe
Site Map | Search

PittsburghLIVE News Sports Entertainment Discussion Classifieds Shopping Local Guide

Monday, October 13, 2003 || [Contact Us](#) || [Terms of Service](#)

Site Sponsors

dollarbank.com

Business

Computing

Education

Fanfare

Living

MiddleEast Reports

News Headlines

Obituaries

Opinion

Photo Gallery

Sunday Extras

SEARCH NEWS

Search today's news

Search archives

Special Reports

Helpdesk

Search News

last 7 days

Search

(Advanced Search)

Pghlive.com Index:

Apartments

AutoLIVE

Business

Classifieds

Crosswords

Cultural Guide

Education Guide

Employment

Events

Fanfare

Free E-mail

Forums

Grocery Coupons

Local Guide

Lottery

MiddleEast Reports

Movies

NIE

Obituaries

Opinion

PenguinsLIVE

PiratesLIVE

Postcards

Real Estate

PITTSBURGH Tribune-Review

[Back to headlines](#)

Episcopal meeting tackles controversy

By staff and wire reports

Tuesday, October 7, 2003

Bishop Robert Duncan of the Pittsburgh Episcopal Diocese will be among the contingent of conservative church leaders meeting in Dallas this week in the hope of steering the national church away from its increasing acceptance of gay relationships.

As many as 2,600 Episcopal clergy and lay members from every state are expected to attend the gathering, which opens today.

At the center of the controversy that has embroiled the church are two actions the denomination took at its general convention in Minneapolis this summer that have angered conservatives enough to consider breaking with the church.

Episcopal leaders confirmed the consecration of a bishop living with a gay partner, and voted to recognize -- though not endorse or condemn -- the fact that bishops are allowing blessing ceremonies for same-sex couples.

"We believe that these decisions made are beyond the limits of Anglican diversity," Duncan said recently. "We are asking the leaders of the church to rule that those who continue to uphold the historic faith represent the legitimate, bona fide expression of Episcopalianism in the United States."

Duncan received overwhelming support last week at a diocesan convention held in Monroeville during which six resolutions in protest of the national church's actions were approved by delegates from the 77 parishes in the Pittsburgh diocese.

While the Episcopal Church won't be splitting

Print this article

E-mail this article

Subscribe to this paper



Subscribe
to your local
newspaper



54° F
P/SUNNY
Humidity 80%

- > [Get 5 day forecast](#)
- > [Traffic Reports](#)
- > [Traffic Cams](#)
- > [Lottery Results](#)

NEW Classifieds Search our new and improved classifieds site.
NEW E-News Headlines. Get daily headlines emailed to your inbox every morning.
Golf. Keep up-to-date on the latest from all major tours.
Place an ad. Place your classified ads on our website today!
News Summary. Go to this new page to scan all today's headlines from Business to Sports.



Choose your FreeMail address:

@pennstatefan.net
@blackngold.net
@pittsburghpanthers.org
@letsqopens.net
@gopittsburgh.com
@gopgh.com

[More FreeMail](#)

	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29
30	31			

- > [Deadly Secrets](#)
- > [Enterprise 2003](#)

Search Our Site

[Screensavers](#)
[Shopping](#)
[Ski Guide](#)
[Sports](#)
[SteelersLIVE](#)
[Subscriber Services](#)
[Tickets](#)
[Traffic Reports](#)
[TravelLIVE](#)
[Trib Store](#)
[Web Cams](#)
[Web Directory](#)
[Web Special Reports](#)
[Weather](#)

Our Newspapers:

[Tribune-Review](#)
[Pgh. Tribune-Review](#)
[Valley News Dispatch](#)
[Daily Courier](#)
[Valley Independent](#)
[Leader Times](#)
[The Herald](#)
[Blairsville Dispatch](#)
[KQV Radio](#)



apart this week, the meeting could begin such a process. The presence in Dallas of 45 of the church's 300 bishops underscores the gravity of the situation.

"We have two to three weeks to see the future of the Episcopal Church in America," said the Rev. David Roseberry, whose 4,000-member Christ Church in suburban Plano organized the event.

He means that everything depends on the Dallas discussions and, even more importantly, on an Oct. 15-16 emergency summit for leaders of the international Anglican Communion, of which the Episcopal Church is the U.S. branch.

That session involves the Anglicans' spiritual leader, Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams, and the 37 other heads of world Anglican branches. Presiding Bishop Frank Griswold of the Episcopal Church also is a member of that group and defends the Minneapolis decisions.

The American Anglican Council, sponsor of the Dallas meeting, says that U.S. conservatives are loyal to Anglican beliefs and the Christian tradition, and that the Episcopal Church majority has broken away into schism.

Founded in 1996, the council has emerged as the most important conservative Episcopal caucus. It reports a mailing list of 50,000 and support from about 500 congregations and 50 bishops. Spokesman Bruce Mason said "we probably represent a minority within the Episcopal Church, but are part of the vast majority worldwide."

Jim Naughton, spokesman for the Diocese of Washington, D.C., and part of that liberal majority, estimates that, at most, 14 percent of the 2.3 million Episcopalians favor traditionalist protests. Naughton is part of a team in Dallas observing what the conservatives do this week.

Any Episcopal split would presumably be the biggest in the United States since 1976, when 100,000 members quit the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The Episcopal Church also suffered 1970s walkouts, over women priests and revisions in liturgy, but they were minor by comparison.

The meeting's major action will be a petition to the London summit. It's likely to ask the world leaders to provide special bishops to minister to conservatives within liberal U.S. dioceses, instead of their regular bishops.

[Transitions](#)
[10th Anniversary](#)
[A call for 'Holy War'](#)
[A Jury of their Peers?](#)
[Potential for Disaster](#)
[More special reports](#)

Our favorite sites

The latest compilation of topical links and other tidbits from the editors of PittsburghLIVE.
[More Web Specials](#)



[What is NewsCode?](#)

apartments.com

Search for [local apartments](#) or place your rental online.



[More Screensavers](#)

Fall Home Ideas

[Fall Bridal](#)
[College & Technical School](#)
[Career Night](#)
[Pro Football](#)
[East Community Guide](#)
[North Community Guide](#)
[South / West Community Guide](#)
[Outstanding Young Citizens - North](#)
[Outstanding Young Citizens - South](#)
[Outstanding Young Citizens - East](#)
[Enterprise](#)
[10th Year Anniversary](#)
[Ticket Ads](#)
[More Shopping](#)



STAR GATE

Another idea, from conventions of the Pittsburgh and Fort Worth dioceses, would have the London summit declare the traditionalists to be the authentic U.S. branch of Anglicanism, in effect suspending or expelling the Episcopal Church.

Whatever emerges, "we need a safe place to be, safe from theological and spiritual harassment, harassment to careers, and danger to our property," said Canon David C. Anderson of Stone Mountain, Ga., AAC president. He said AAC leaders will be holding a follow-up meeting sometime after the London summit.

A split is implied in such program topics here as "Talking Points for Answering Difficult Questions" and the legalistic "Constitutions, Canons, Pensions, Properties and Jurisdictions."

Who gets church property in a split could be among the toughest problems discussed in Dallas.

The most radical position so far comes from the Pittsburgh diocese, which declared that its buildings now belong to each congregation -- a denial of the national denomination's claim to control churches under 1979 legislation.

In an interview last week, Griswold said the national church would deal with property ownership in a "respectful and pastoral" manner but declined to elaborate.

Meanwhile, Roseberry said, "we are prepared, and preparing, for what God is going to do next."

[Back to headlines](#)

[Click here for advertising information](#) || [List all Advertisers](#)

Investing in Lifetimes. 800/672-7171	 CLARION UNIVERSITY FOUNDED 1863	 Apply on-line at www.clarion.edu
---	---	--

Images and text copyright © 2003 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co.
Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from [PittsburghLIVE](#).
Have a comment about our website? [Click here](#). See a problem? [Report Bug](#)

We ask that the Global South Primates:

1. Recognize the Network as comprising those Anglicans in the United States with whom the Global South Primates are fully in Communion. We suggest using the language that the primates "applaud the suggestion of the Archbishop of Canterbury that there should be a Network of Confessing Dioceses and Parishes."
2. Go +Rowan and tell him that they have recognized the Network.
3. Remind +Rowan of his promise to recognize the Network.
4. Tell +Rowan that if he will not recognize the Network, they will separate from him.
5. Commit to accept Letters Dimissory of imperiled clergy, including both women clergy and those who will not accept the ordination of women.
6. Declare that in the present crisis, the issue of boundaries is suspended.
7. Declare that the response of the Presiding Bishop proposing "supplemental Episcopal care" is a violation of the Primates' statement and is therefore rejected.
8. Demand that no bishops who joined in the consecration of Gene Robinson be permitted to serve on any committee or commission of the Anglican Communion.
9. Approve of the Network's Moderator Bishop
10. Approve of the Moderator Bishop opening ecumenical conversations.
11. No longer recognize the ministries of those bishops who joined in the consecration of Gene Robinson.
12. Offer immediate direct spiritual oversight of beleaguered parishes.
13. Ask +Rowan, and demand that the Presiding Bishop, honor the intent of the Primates' Statement that true adequate episcopal oversight be offered and not thwarted.
14. We ask further that, because of the New Westminster situation, and because of the formation of what is now known as CONAAB (Council of North American Anglican Bishops) the Primates encourage the formation of a Network in Canada that will move in concert with and in full communion with the ECUSA network, toward a North American network.
15. We ask the Primates to be clear that they are still in communion with orthodox Episcopalians.
16. Issue a statement from this meeting, to be drafted.
17. Call for a moratorium on license suspensions and lawsuits.
18. Insist on an invitation to the Moderator whenever the ECUSA PB is invited
19. When provincial secretaries, etc meet include the equivalent person from the Network.

We, as bishops in North America:

- a. Through a memorandum of understanding, approve today the formation of a Network of Confessing Dioceses and Parishes. This Network is being established in good faith with our Constitution. We designate Bob Duncan, Bishop of Pittsburgh, as Moderator Bishop.
- b. We will bring the establishment of the Network before our Standing Committees and dioceses
- c. We will direct AAC and FiFNA to organize road shows to expain and promote the Network.
- d. We intend to cross the US/Canada boundaries.
- e. We will no longer be at the Table with those who consecrated Gene Robinson.
- f. We commit to the guerrilla warfare of the next year.
- g. We will produce a catalog of the present intimidations against those orthodox Episcopalians

Contz, Melanie

From: Duncan, Bob
 Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2003 10:54 AM
 To: Contz, Melanie
 Subject: FW: Report from Meeting?

Gloria, he might want to see this. N.

-----Original Message-----

From: A. Hugo Blankingship Jr. [mailto:AHBlankingshipJr@blankeith.com]
 Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2003 10:51 AM
 To: Duncan, Bob
 Subject: RE: Report from Meeting?

Mon. 10:30 Bishop Bob: I got stuck in London until yesterday. My read is close to yours. John Rees simply won't listen to anything but our staying in ECUSA, apparently believing that 815 will accept yhe Network in some status such as Church Army, etc. We didnot feel it wise to warn him how close ABC may be coming to losing the Communion, especially if a number of Primates or Provinces recognize the Network. I personally don't see much chance that ABC will recognize the Network at this time. Perhaps that changes if pressure within the Communion builds up.

We did get one flicker of cooperation from Rees. "Perhaps" he or someone else on behalf of ABC could serve as a mediator between the Network and ABC.

The redraft of the Charter makes it look more like another American Anglican Council than a group ready to become a separate church if necessary.

Could you share the message from thePB? We learned that the statement by ABC right after the consecration to the effect that the consecrators in New Hampshire were acting in good faith and within constitutional etc, actually came from Bp. Peter Lee. Is there anything to the rumor that he has invited +Robin Eames to be present at the Council od Dioc. of Va. in January?

I will be back in the office around 3:00 PM. Can be reached on my cell ph. 703-622-3960. Blessings, Hugo

-----Original Message-----

From: Duncan, Bob [mailto:DUNCAN@pgh.anglican.org]
 Sent: Sunday, December 07, 2003 3:00 PM
 To: A. Hugo Blankingship Jr.; mjwoodruff@aol.com
 Cc: Anderson, David
 Subject: Report from Meeting?

Dear Hugo and Mike,

Is there anything you can report from your time across the water? Our sense is that Canterbury, if anything, is moving away from us. We have had a fairly disastrous letter from +FG quoting +RW. I have attempted to communicate with Rowan about these matters, but as yet there is only silence.

We have our weekly AAC Bishops call tomorrow at 4pm EST, and it would be helpful to know what you would share prior to that.

Advent Blessings.

In Christ, +Bob

December 28th, 2003

Dear Friends,

I am Geoff Chapman, Rector of St Stephens Church in Sewickley, Pa. (Diocese of Pittsburgh). I am responding to you on behalf of the American Anglican Council and their Bishops' Committee on Adequate Episcopal Oversight (AEO). Thanks for contacting us; we very much want to network with you in these difficult times and be of real help to you.

The AAC Strategy Committee has been working for months on AEO. In consultation with a wide circle of friends - inside this country and beyond - we have clarified our strategy and are now moving to implement it. I am serving as their response person for AEO, and I want to brief you on our progress. This document will get you up to speed on where we are going. Please keep this document confidential, sharing it in hard copy (printed format) only with people you fully trust, and do not pass it on electronically to anyone under any circumstances.

1) Our ultimate goal is a realignment of Anglicanism on North American soil committed to biblical faith and values, and driven by Gospel mission. We believe in the end this should be a "replacement" jurisdiction with confessional standards, maintaining the historic faith of our Communion, closely aligned with the majority of world Anglicanism, emerging from the disastrous actions of General Convention (2003). We believe this goal is now pressed upon us by the Holy Spirit as a result of the rejection of the historic Christian faith and the rejection of biblical and Communion authority by the leadership of ECUSA. We will lead our congregations and partners in making the adjustment to adopt this strategy. We seek to retain ownership of our property as we move into this realignment.

2) As an intermediate step, we will respond to the urgent pastoral need in our country by offering Adequate Episcopal Oversight to parishes or remnants of parishes who share our deeply held convictions, proceeding under the guidance of our Bishops and the Primates. Bp Griswold's offer of "Extended Episcopal Care" is unacceptable, fundamentally flawed and disingenuous, and does not meet the needs of our parishes or the intentions of the Primates. Our AEO will maintain confidentiality in the application process, and seek transfer of parish oversight across geographic diocesan boundaries to an orthodox bishop, the right of pastoral succession, liberty of conscience in financial stewardship (the right to "redirect" funds), and negotiated property settlements affirming the retention of ownership in the local congregation.

The implementation of Adequate Episcopal Oversight will normally follow a two-step, "Stage 1 Then Stage 2" process.

Stage 1 will feature "spiritual realignment" while remaining within the letter of current canons. Parishes would publicly announce that their relationship with their diocesan Bishop is "severely damaged" because of the events of the

summer, and that they are now looking to one of the Primates or an AAC orthodox Bishop for their "primary pastoral leadership". Announcements will need to be carefully phrased to avoid canonical violations.

During the months of Stage 1, we will begin to reform our relationships to build the Network of Anglican Communion Dioceses and Parishes. We will move to initiate support structures for fellowship and strategy. We will act courageously and faithfully to support "at risk" parishes. We will creatively redirect finances. We will refocus on Gospel initiatives. We will innovatively move around, beyond or within the canons to "act like the church God is making us". Stage 1 will enable congregations/clusters to keep clear use of their buildings for the foreseeable future, and would give critical time to strengthen our leadership circles for what promises to be a turbulent spiritual season.

Stage 2 will launch at some yet to be determined moment, probably in 2004. During this phase, we will seek, under the guidance of the Primates, negotiated settlements in matters of property, jurisdiction, pastoral succession and communion. If adequate settlements are not within reach, a faithful disobedience of canon law on a widespread basis may be necessary.

Some congregations have already proceeded to "Stage 2" because of local circumstances. While we cannot offer AEO under an AAC diocesan Bishop at this time, we do have non-geographical oversight available from "offshore" Bishops, and retired Bishops. We may also be able to offer oversight from special designated priests acting on behalf of our AAC Diocesan Bishops.

3) **Our local strategy** for developing AEO will have to keep our goal and current hostile circumstances in mind. We call it a "cluster strategy", and it will closely sync with the establishment and spread of the Network of Anglican Communion Dioceses and Parishes. We are developing clusters of churches (3-30 churches per cluster) in 15-30 varying dioceses. These churches would join the Network and apply for AEO whenever possible as diocesan clusters. When they are prepared, we will sequence public announcements of their intentions to realign in successive weeks to build impact. These churches will need Clergy and Vestries who are unified, well networked, and ready for a season of conflict if necessary.

Smaller, isolated congregations that cannot connect with a supporting cluster will be welcome to apply, but encouraged to make a public announcement later in 2004. They will sail in the wake of the leadership of stronger clusters.

Parishes/clusters that go through this process in a "Stage 2" mode and Bishops who receive such parishes/clusters will be at risk of litigation and presentment, and should be prepared for such.

An AAC Bishop could be available to go with any parish/cluster to meet with the diocesan Bp, as needed. We think the presence of an AAC Bishop with a

stated partnership with the Primates could change the dynamics of such a meeting.

This "Stage 1, Stage 2, Cluster Strategy" has several advantages: It will...

- (1) build "rising orthodox network" DNA among the networked churches. Churches in the clusters would gain formative experiences of working together, depending upon each other, praying together, linking with the Global South, and if need be, suffering together. This would be invaluable for the months and years ahead.
 - (2) give us our best shot at a success. Any isolated parish that moves alone into the revisionist line of fire at this point is going to be in peril. Congregations moving in clusters have the advantage of leveraging their combined strength.
 - (3) generate significant public attention both within this country and among our world-wide partners.
 - (4) build "position" for any settlement talks in the future.
- 4) We are building a network of "Cluster Moderators" who will serve emerging clusters as they gather. These leaders should have a servant's heart and a broad base of support in their own parishes that will enable them to come alongside conflicted or imperiled congregations. They must be able to bridge the lines of our coalition with genuine respect for the differences within the orthodox community. We will identify these key leaders as soon as possible.
- 5) We would cover everything in intentional, dependent Christ-centered prayer, seeking the Holy Spirit's leading and provision at every point. Prayer support cells will be developed around the country and mobilized at critical moments.

Here are some "Frequently Asked Questions":

- 1) **What does it take to apply for AEO (Adequate Episcopal Oversight)?**
Normally we would ask for the signature of the Rector and a supporting vote of the Vestry. When you have reached this point of decision, send the application to the AAC office. There is no need to inform your Bishop yet of the application. We will inform him with you in due time. You can find the application and guidelines here:
<http://www.americananglican.org/News/News.cfm?ID=827&c=21>
- 2) **Does AEO mean that the orthodox overseeing Bishop would have control of the call, licensing, and canonical residence of the clergy?** We do not know the answers to that, but our Bishops will be exploring these issues as we move forward. The AAC bishops are not prepared to sign off on an arrangement that will leave a congregation in continuing high risk, and that means that issues of spiritual authority, pastoral succession and episcopal

oversight must be solved. That is the fundamental difference between Adequate Episcopal "Oversight" envisioned by Canterbury and the Primates and the Episcopal "Care" offered by Griswold. However, there are many details yet to be ironed out.

- 3) What legal liabilities would you face if you wanted to leave your current diocese? Recent litigation indicates that the local diocesan authorities hold almost all the cards in property disputes and clergy placement if they want to play "Hardball".

But we think that the political realities are such that American revisionist bishops will be reticent to play "hardball" for a while. They have just handed the gay lobby a stunning victory, but are being forced to pay a fearsome price for it. The opposition at home is far greater than they anticipated and the opposition overseas is serious and inflamed. ECUSA will certainly lose members and funds at a high rate over the next months, accelerating their decline. In one short summer they have managed to radicalize all the orthodox in our communion and take away the "middle ground" where so many of our members have hidden! This has put many (perhaps even most) parishes in conflict and made the survival of many smaller parishes a large and urgent question. No one is very happy about this inside ECUSA, and the American public is hardly cheering the events in New Hampshire.

ECUSA leaders know well how conservatives could quickly become the "victims" in the public mind. They also know that all of our AEO work will eventually find its way across the desk of the Archbishop of Canterbury (ABC). All of this together will create pressure for them to cooperate with the ABC/Primate's call for AEO. So we suspect that there will be a window of time before they return to "hardball" tactics.

→ The AAC has a new "Legal Resources" link on their home page, and if you or your new Vestry need help in this area, we would suggest contacting them. (<http://www.americananglican.org/Issues/IssuesList.cfm?c=47>)

- 4) Can we redirect our funds? This is happening on a widespread basis. There are several strategies to consider. Some parishes have used "donor intent" to trump diocesan canon. The argument goes something like this... "In these conflicted times we will offer our congregation pledge forms with options to indicate their preferred use of their funds. The options go... 'Would you like to have a canonical portion of your gift sent (1) to the Diocese? (2) To the National Church? Or (3) To the Vestry for their judgment on whether to pass on funds to the Diocese or National Church? All redirected funds will go to Anglican missions who are committed to biblical faith, values and Gospel ministry."

The Vestry then informs the Diocese that they feel it important to allow their members to follow their conscience. Arguing for "freedom of conscience" and the honoring of "donor intent" is very difficult for liberals to oppose, regardless of

the strength of your state law. And it should give your parish some breathing room as you seek to move through this difficult season together.

For a biblical/theological understanding of redirecting funds, look at John Guemsey's talk from the Dallas Conference. You can find it here:
<http://www.americananglican.org/News/News.cfm?ID=784&c=21>

5) What is important over the next months? Here are some concrete suggestions for your consideration:

a. Join the Network of Anglican Communion Dioceses and Parishes.

Here's some basic information:

<http://www.americananglican.org/News/News.cfm?ID=920&c=21>

Look to the AAC website for updates.

- b. Form diocesan "clusters" with sympathetic churches. This is essential.** An AAC chapter can be the seedbed for a cluster that is seeking realignment. Circle up, pick a moderator, and contact us at AAC headquarters.
- c. Be careful of your language.** Don't declare yourself "out of communion" with your diocesan Bishop as such statements have been used as evidence for canonical action against clergy ("abandonment of communion" in Philadelphia). To say that your communion is "impaired" or "damaged" is a wiser response for the moment. Let the excommunications come from the Primates.
- d. Prioritize your issues and pursue them in due order.** Sort out the challenges you face and go after the most important first, while saving the least important till last. The issues you face could include securing new leadership, consolidating and educating your Vestry, building a network of support within your Diocese, stabilizing your congregation, etc. Take first things first. Operate in God's time. Don't be stampeded to early and untimely actions. The Primates will move over the next months to build a growing and determined solution to the crisis. It will be good to follow their lead and that of the AAC Bishops.
- e. Be measured, deliberate and courageous in your responses.** "Wise as serpents and gentle as doves" was Jesus' phrase for it! This is a moment for courageous and clear leadership. Watch out for the spirit of anger or self-righteousness! It will kill fractured parishes.
- f. Join and build the network of churches committed to biblical values and faith.** There will be safety in numbers. See if there are other parishes in your diocese who could also apply for AEO. Work in partnership with us in the AAC. Either we hang together or we hang separately! And don't forget (when it seems like you are all alone) that Christ himself has promised to walk with us through these times!
- g. Familiarize yourself with the strategy affirmed in Dallas in October** and talk and pray about how you can apply it locally. It can be found here:
<http://www.americananglican.org/petitions/Petition.cfm?petitionID=8>

- h. **Keeping close to Christ is essential.** Read your Bible. Pray lots. Be aware of Satan's opposition and resist him. Worship regularly. Stay in good fellowship with close Christian friends. Watch out for your own emotions, especially anger and frustration, and remember that the Holy Spirit's leading is not the same as your emotions! We will be of no use to the Lord Jesus in these struggles if we are not fully His!
- i. **Remember confidentiality!** Much is at stake over these next months. The careers of godly men and women, the possibility of congregational survival, the Anglican witness to Christ in our culture and generation, etc. We ask you not to spread these emails over the internet, and to speak of them only to people you trust. In the end, everything will be spoken plainly, but the ability to get organize and take counsel together effectively depends upon our readiness to keep confidentiality.

Here are some internet resources that might be of value in keeping you informed...

A site in Great Britain: "Crisis 2003"

<http://london2003.anglican.tk/>

Kendall Harmon's excellent web site

<http://titusonenine.blogspot.com/>

David Virtue's web page with a wide ranging collection of news stories

<http://ktserv.episcopalian.org/archives/virtuosity.html>

The American Anglican Council

<http://www.americananglican.org/News/NewsList.cfm?c=21&num=1000>

The AAC Legal Resources page

<http://www.americananglican.org/Issues/IssuesList.cfm?c=47>

The AAC Dallas Strategy affirmed by over 2300 people

<http://www.americananglican.org/petitions/Petition.cfm?petitionID=8>

Guidelines and Application for the AAC's Adequate Episcopal Oversight

<http://www.americananglican.org/News/News.cfm?ID=827&c=21>

We will keep all details of our contact with parishes in confidence. Please do not hesitate to keep in touch with me or with the AAC office if we can be of further help. God bless you, as you courageously serve Christ and his gospel.

Here is my contact information...

Geoffrey W. Chapman

Rector, St Stephens Sewickley, Pa



Draft Proposal for Overseas AEO

To: Ekklesia Society Primates and Bishops
NACDP
From: Alison Barfoot
Date: March 3, 2004

Background on the Need

The number of clergy, congregations with priests, and unincorporated congregations without priests who are looking for alternative episcopal oversight and affiliation through the Global South Anglican community is increasing. There have been occasional incidences where a priest and a congregation have been "picked up" by an "offshore" bishop and diocese, e.g., Bolivia, Uganda (Bunyoro-Kitara), Malawi, etc.

With the growing interest in these kinds of relationships, it seems prudent to discuss a streamlined process in which these relationships can be pursued, facilitated, and accountable, particularly with African bishops and dioceses who have been so supportive and forthcoming with a willingness to help.

After several conversations with Bill Atwood of Ekklesia, John Guernsey, Martyn Minns, and some clergy seeking "offshore" AEO, this proposal is being submitted as a draft for consideration of a process and protocol for establishing Overseas AEO as an interim stage on the way towards the realignment of Anglicanism in North America and the re-establishment of biblically orthodox faith as normative in North American Anglicanism.

This draft proposal reflects initial tentative steps and recognizes that there is still a lot of work to be done to think through structures that release Great Commission mission and ministry.

Draft Proposal

The analogy of citizenship seems helpful in this discussion. Ecclesiastical citizenship is being equated with canonical residency.

The process of moving into "Offshore" AEO would consist of one to three phases, depending on the situation.

Phase One is the phase of "Dual Citizenship", and for some clergy, this may be all that is necessary. For others it is the first step towards full AEO. The concept of "dual citizenship" is that a priest stays canonically resident in his or her ECUSA diocese, but also becomes canonically resident in an offshore diocese. The precedent for this is the many ECUSA clergy who are already honorary canons of overseas dioceses. The question then becomes: Which offshore diocese? And, how is that diocese and bishop selected? The proposed governing principle would be that these connections follow the lines of pre-existing relationships. If a priest does not already have a pre-existing relationship with an offshore bishop who is willing to participate in this process, then a match needs to be made.

This proposal suggests that CAPA (Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa), in consultation with Ekklesia, take an active role in this process. The proposed role of CAPA would be to recommend a bishop, if a priest and/or congregation does not already have a relationship with a Global South bishop. There would need to be some American NACDP structure that recommends a priest and/or congregation to CAPA as a recipient of AEO.

Phase Two: Rector/Vicar leaves ECUSA for the offshore diocese, ideally with Letters Dimissory, but not necessary, since the priest already has offshore "citizenship". The non-property owning congregation leaves with the priest. If the priest has a church with property and leaves ECUSA for an offshore diocese, it would be expected that the ECUSA bishop would probably depose the priest. The offshore bishop would not recognize the deposition, and then would transfer the priest to a Network bishop and diocese, who then provides AEO (a la David Moyer, Central Africa, and Pittsburgh). This would prevent "offshore" bishops from becoming involved in property disputes.

Phase Three: The season of AEO. The "offshore" bishop would delegate most of the day-to-day responsibility of spiritual oversight to the NACDP.

1. The U.S. will be divided up into geographical and non-geographical archdeaconries that are coterminous with the NACDP convocations.
2. Convocation Deans have "dual citizenship" and wear two hats – one as Convocation Dean, and the other as Archdeacon of a Diaspora Archdeaconry.
3. The overseas bishop will delegate spiritual oversight to the Archdeacon, who will exercise ministry and authority on behalf of all the overseas bishops who have churches in that archdeaconry. So, as Archdeacon, he or she will have delegated spiritual oversight of all clergy and churches who are affiliated with offshore dioceses, in addition to the spiritual oversight of NACDP congregations in that convocation.
4. Any overseas bishop who is part of this plan may visit any congregation on behalf of that congregation's overseas bishop to perform Episcopal ministry. In the absence of a visiting overseas bishop, a Network bishop may be asked to provide Episcopal ministry on their behalf.
5. Clergy and churches who are part of an overseas diaspora archdeaconry in the US will be affiliate members of the NACDP with seat and voice, but no vote – it will be like they are "Green Card" permanent residents. They are not members of the Network because they are no longer part of ECUSA, and the NACDP is still operating within ECUSA. However, they will be encouraged to attend all NACDP clergy gatherings and NACDP conferences and meetings to say in relationship and fellowship, as the ultimate aim is the reunification of orthodox Anglicanism in the US. (Parenthetically, perhaps other Anglican jurisdictions could also affiliate in this way.)
6. Clergy and churches that are part of a diaspora Archdeaconry would be invited to participate in Convocation gatherings of clergy and churches in order to encourage ongoing fellowship and relationships.

7. Clergy who are affiliated with an “offshore” diocese would travel to their home diocese once a year for a clergy conference. Church representatives should also travel once a year for a mission trip, and perhaps a consultation on missionary work in North America.

The additional role of CAPA would be to:

1. Keep track of clergy and congregations serving as missionaries and missionary outposts in North America
2. Facilitate and coordinate the mutual recognition of Episcopal ministry by Global South bishops on behalf of other Global South bishops
3. Communicate standards of care and oversight to the Archdeacons, who will be providing care on behalf of all the “offshore” bishops who have clergy and congregations within that Archdeaconry.



THE LIVING CHURCH FOUNDATION

SERVING EPISCOPALIANS since 1878

Bishop Duncan: We're the Anglicans here
4/28/2005

At the conclusion of the second annual council meeting of the Anglican Communion Network held April 18-20 in Bedford, Texas, Suzanne Gill, communications director for the Diocese of Fort Worth and a correspondent of *The Living Church*, conducted a one-on-one interview with the Rt. Rev. Robert W. Duncan, Bishop of Pittsburgh and moderator of the network.

TLC: *Do you have any announcements to make?*

Bishop Duncan: My word would be, we've had a very important meeting. This is a time of huge anxiety, and without the Panel of Reference having been appointed, which really was designed to guarantee the position of those who are remaining faithful in the Episcopal Church, this is a hard season for many of our people. Most noteworthy were the six congregations and clergy in Connecticut. We are absolutely committed to standing with those six congregations in Connecticut and with those clergy. We have a clear plan of action; it's not something that we can talk about at this point, but that may well prove to be the most newsworthy thing that unfolds, that comes out of this meeting.

TLC: *Were you hoping that, by meeting toward the end of April, the Panel of Reference would have been appointed?*

Bishop Duncan: I think we all believed the Panel of Reference would be appointed immediately after [the Primates' Meeting]. Of course, none of us knew that there would be a Panel of Reference until the primates met. As it's turned out, the decision of the Bishop of Connecticut to move against the six congregations and six clergy, specifically after they notified him that they intended to appeal to the Panel of Reference, has made this moment of huge significance. The fact that we were all together in the very week when it begins to be clear how Connecticut is going to deal with it gave us an immense tactical and strategic advantage. So, this was not the time that we originally chose, but it was the time we think God chose.

One of the things we've seen in this meeting has been the sense in which God is realigning his whole Church. This is much bigger – and it's been said many times in this conference – than the Episcopal Church, much bigger than the Anglican Communion. Most of our time has been focused, not on the crisis, but on the mission. We've had some really exciting presentations on a vision for church planting, and at the heart of that vision is making a whole movement of self-replicating churches that reach and make disciples and create more churches. And that vision includes doing it across boundaries and lines. So [we'll do it] not just in the old way, where we're trying to create Episcopal churches, but we're trying to build the Kingdom. And we'll do it with whoever, wherever it seems right to do it. The exciting part is there's a realignment going on. There's a reformation going on.

TLC: *You've had Bishop John Chew Hiang Chea of the Diocese of Singapore here as your guest?*

Bishop Duncan: Yes. One action we took was to accept an invitation for the whole network to become partners with the Diocese of Singapore for the evangelization of Southeast Asia. The Diocese of Singapore has responsibility for all of [the former] French Indochina – that is, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia – as well as Thailand, Nepal, and Indonesia. That's almost 500 million souls who do not know the Lord. Singapore's a diocese of 20,000; it's exactly the same size as the Diocese of Pittsburgh. So Bishop Chew asked if he could come and

challenge the network to a special missionary partnership. Their strategy is to put a deanery in each nation that will become a diocese. And they reported on some of the progress there.

We have, in Pittsburgh, had a number of missionaries out in that part of the world. We're about to send another one out who will go to Thailand. What we've embraced in this is a first and special commitment to work with them at the ends of the earth, as we're also committed to working locally. It certainly was referenced that for many of us the war in Vietnam was a life event, and for many of us who are in the boomer generation, we either fought there or lost friends there, and there's a great yearning to go and give something back to that part of the world.

TLC: There's been a concern about attrition in the [Episcopal] Church. The defection of [Christ Church] in Overland Park, Kans., makes a huge difference, for instance?

Bishop Duncan: I'd say it makes a huge difference to the Episcopal Church. At one level, it doesn't make a difference to the network. I'm still regularly in touch with the rector and clergy and people of Overland Park. [Senior rector Ron] McCrary is one of our six convocational deans. The congregation, as it leaves the Episcopal Church, moves from being an affiliate of the network to being a partner of the network. We wish it hadn't been necessary, but it doesn't change our relationship to them. It does change their relationship to the Episcopal Church.

I would say that we have great sorrow about everyone who finds it necessary to leave the Episcopal Church, and yet we stand with them locally. However it is how they feel they have to respond. So we're able to bless Christ Church, Overland Park, and we're able to bless Ascension, Montgomery [Ala.]. And indeed we're committed to stand with the six parishes in Connecticut. But if they find themselves pushed out – and it will be clear, because they don't want to leave the Episcopal Church – if they're pushed out, we'll be standing with them, and they'll still be part of the network. Again, it's just the Episcopal Church is disintegrating, and that's the tragedy.

TLC: So, as a body within the Episcopal Church, what's your "lifespan"?

Bishop Duncan: Well, of course we claim to be, constitutionally, the Episcopal Church. And there's every evidence, both from what the Windsor Report says and what the primates said in accepting it, in their communiqué in Northern Ireland, that we are the Anglicans. If the Episcopal Church's constitution says that we'll be constituent members of the Anglican Communion, and the Anglican Communion now says, Episcopal Church, you're in time out. In fact, you're not only in time out, but it appears you're making a decision to walk apart. If in General Convention 2006 the Episcopal Church determines to walk apart, then the question we ask is, who is the Episcopal Church? And our legal basis will be to say, we are, of course, because they have broken the constitution.

TLC: Do you think General Convention will be the turning point?

Bishop Duncan: Oh, yeah. The Presiding Bishop has made it clear, and he made it clear in Northern Ireland, that this church has thought about this, prayed about this, and is committed to this course, and there'll be no turning back. And I think he reads the situation right. We also believe there'll be no turning back. We intend, one of the issues for us going into General Convention, and we will be in General Convention, is to attempt to force this Church to make a very clear decision, unmistakably clear as to whether they're going to walk with the Communion and repent from these actions, return to standard Anglican practice, or really going to move forward. They call it moving forward; we call it walking apart.

If they determine to move out, well, then they've determined to move out. We're the Anglicans here. We'll also stand in a way that says, we're the Episcopal Church where we are. You know, there'll be infinite court battles, but it'll be very interesting, since the Communion will have said the Episcopal Church walked apart, and the Episcopal Church's Constitution says that you've got to be constituent members, and we're the only ones they recognize as constituent members, so who's the Episcopal Church, legally? It'll be very interesting time. I mean, we don't want to go to court, but it's quite clear the Episcopal Church is always ready to go to court, and this time I think they might not be so willing to go to court, because we think there's every reason they'll lose.

TLC: But hasn't the Archbishop of Canterbury been counseled by his lawyers that he really can't intervene in this province?

Bishop Duncan: The great news is that the primates have given mechanisms by which they've said the Episcopal Church is walking apart. The Windsor Report has signaled that the Episcopal Church is going in another direction. It's moving away from the Anglican Communion. And the Panel of Reference, which of course hasn't been set up yet, but the very notion of it is that the Communion has said there needs to be intervention in this system because those who are recognizably Anglican – that is, the network parishes and the fellow travelers with the Episcopal Church – are the ones who are being persecuted for holding the faith that the Anglican Communion holds. So it is quite clear that all of the provincial primates have actually said the Episcopal Church is walking apart and said there has to be this panel appointed to deal with the folks who are being persecuted here. I think all that is in our favor.

TLC: At General Convention, do you intend to introduce resolutions or otherwise induce a vote?

Bishop Duncan: General Convention is still 14 months away. But what we will do as we lead up to General Convention is develop a strategy that will help it to be clear that the Episcopal Church has to choose, and the General Convention is choosing either to return to what the Windsor Report says is our teaching, which is Lambeth I.10. That is the official, present teaching of the Church; or to say no. If the Episcopal Church wants to say no, that's not where we are.

Now, I also expect, because this innovation is so aggressive, I would just have to expect that among those bishops who will be elected between now and General Convention 2006, we'll have somebody, whether a man or a woman, to join the ranks of [Bishop] Gene Robinson [as an openly gay bishop]. And what will be wonderful about that is that we don't actually have to have a resolution. All we'll have to do is have a vote of confirmation, which will confirm that this church is technically, I'd say, hell-bent on this innovation, for all the world to see. At the last convention, it wasn't any resolution we passed, it was the confirmation of a bishop. This church just can't hold back on this.

TLC: Shifting gears a little bit, is it a challenge for you to be both a diocesan bishop and to be the moderator of the Anglican Communion Network?

Bishop Duncan: They're two full-time jobs. Of course. But again, I have a wonderful diocese. The people and clergy of Pittsburgh could not be more supportive. And they have willingly sacrificed the part of me that has to care for the Network to the wider cause. And what I'd say is that this is like leadership in any province all over the Communion. In every case, the bishop who presides over a group of dioceses, whether it's the Archbishop of Canterbury, or [whoever it is]. The Primate of Nigeria is, after all, the Bishop of Abuja. Or the Archbishop of Southeast Asia is the Bishop of Saba. In our system and in our history...in the history of the Western World, even the one we call pope is Bishop of Rome. The only people who have innovated in a way that has gotten them into such trouble are, in fact, the Episcopal Church, which disengaged its presiding bishop in the 20th century from being bishop of a diocese. And Canada did the same thing. And so you get two bishops who are leading who are like corporate executives, but they're not bishops of a diocese. And so, what we're doing in Pittsburgh is what the whole Church has done through its whole history, where sometimes a particular local bishop gets asked to take responsibilities outside his diocese while he remains the bishop of his diocese. I just have the best people in the world, and clergy who are willing to sacrifice to make a difference for everybody.

TLC: You have one parish that has asked for a Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight (DEPO) relationship.

Bishop Duncan: Definitely. We've done that, and we're negotiating that. I've said from the beginning of my episcopate that I'd always grant that. I've wanted to model what I encouraged the Episcopal Church six years ago to do, which is, let's let one another go free, and let's let the Lord fight the battle on Mt. Carmel, and we'll see whose God is asleep. But of course the Episcopal Church, in its majority, wouldn't countenance that idea. But we in Pittsburgh have always said, we'll give people freedom to go, and we'll see what God does. Again, I wish ... Imagine how different history would be if the Bishop of Connecticut were doing what the Bishop of Pittsburgh is doing.

TLC: Do you feel particularly on the spot to behave impeccably with regard to the DEPO rule so that you can't be criticized?

Bishop Duncan: I'm certainly behaving in line with the DEPO rules. I think the DEPO rules, as I've often said,

don't go far enough. When I was talking with the congregation in our diocese, St. Brendan's in Franklin Park, and they wanted to know – there were statements people had made about DEPO being dead, or DEPO not going far enough – and I said, well now let's look at this. Suppose your rector were to leave. Would you prefer to have your DEPO bishop or me be a part of your search process? Does DEPO go far enough? Under DEPO, of course, I would be the one who deals with their search process. I've said all along I was prepared to go much further. But for purposes of the present moment, I'm doing what the Episcopal Church said it would do.

TLC: You are a signer on a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury asking for a meeting in late May, and on another letter similar to that, to Bishop Griswold. Have you heard back?

Bishop Duncan: I have no comment. The bishops together have agreed we'll have no comment, so I really don't have anything to say.

I can say that our coalition is expanding, and that's because once the choice is clear, do you choose the Anglican Communion, a global church and a faith that's held universally across the denominations, or do you choose an American sect with a rapidly declining market share? And when the question is put that way, many bishops and many dioceses begin to see, well, gee whiz, we're going to choose Anglicanism, because that's how to be part of the one holy catholic and apostolic church. I mean, the choice for me is, are you going to be part of the one holy catholic and apostolic church, or are you going to be part of something else? And that's what the Episcopal Church is now offering folks. And our job is to help everybody to make the choice. That's where our coalition is going.

TLC: And to help people in the pews see where it is going?

Bishop Duncan: Absolutely. We've got to help them, too. All of us in ordained leadership for years have been trying to keep the people focused on mission and not drag them down into these conflicts. Whether that was wise or foolish, at this moment we've got to keep working the mission, but we've also got to bring the lay people into an understanding that the hour of decision, as they used to say, has arrived.

TLC: Has the time when acts of canonical disobedience were necessary passed?

Bishop Duncan: Oh, well, again, different folks are acting in different ways. A principle that we have tended to use and I think have found very successful, is for those who make the canons their Bible, we're glad to play on that playing field. That is to say, if folks want to use the canons to say that people who haven't left the Episcopal Church have abandoned the communion of this church, then we'll help them to see just what the canons say in ways that, I think, they will find themselves very unhappy.

The best reference I can give you is, in 2002 or 2003, the [Rev.] David Moyer thing. The one great land battle we had, and victory we had, was we played the canons exactly according to what the canons said. When you really want to use the canons in ways they were not intended to be used, which is what I'd submit the Bishop of Connecticut is doing right now, we can also use the canons in ways they weren't intended to be used for ends which will actually break the system down. So we don't actually have to actually do canonical disobedience to help people see the absolute chaos that comes when a church is more concerned for power than it is for the truth.

Read these related articles:

- [Bishop Griswold Asks for Clarification](#)
- [Letters Express Bishops' Concerns to Archbishop of Canterbury, Presiding Bishop](#)
- [Bishops Request Emergency Meeting with Archbishop of Canterbury](#)
- [Bishops Affirm Loyalty to Communion](#)

To read more news, features, and commentaries not available online, we invite you to subscribe to *The Living Church* magazine. To learn more, click [here](#).

APPENDIX G

News Resource

*Full Text of the Request to the Global South
Primates*

REQUEST FOR
ALTERNATIVE PRIMATIAL OVERSIGHT AND PASTORAL CARE
On Behalf of the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh

6th November, A.D. 2006

TO OUR BELOVED IN THE LORD,
PRIMATES REPRESENTING THE GLOBAL SOUTH,
AFFECTIONATE GREETINGS IN CHRIST JESUS:

Summary

The Bishop and Standing Committee of the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh, meeting on 26th and 28th June, adopted a resolution calling for “immediate alternative Primatial oversight and pastoral care so that a unifying solution might be found to preserve an authentic Anglican community of witness within the United States of America and [to] provide pastoral and apostolic care to biblically orthodox Anglicans in this country regardless of geographical location...”

At the annual synod of the Diocese, meeting at Pittsburgh on November 3rd, 2006, a resolution confirming the actions of the Bishop and Standing Committee was passed by overwhelming majorities of both clergy and laity. In addition to confirming the request for “alternative Primatial oversight and pastoral care” the synod also confirmed the Standing Committee’s decision to withdraw from the administrative structure known as the Province of Washington, or “third province,” under Article VII of the Constitution of the Episcopal Church, in order to re-emphasize our contention that the struggle we are engaged in is a constitutional crisis in which the progressive majority has walked away from its constitutional responsibility to remain as a “constituent member of the Anglican Communion.”

Thanksgiving

We in the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh are deeply grateful to Almighty God and to the Global South Primates for the witness from and decisions of the Global South Primates Meeting at Kigali, Rwanda. We rejoice with you at the work accomplished by the Economic Empowerment Track and by the Theological Formation and Education Task Force at that meeting. We are also

humbled by the continuing concern expressed for our embattled situation here in the States. We are particularly thankful for your assessment of the General Convention of 2006 as having acted "contrary to the Windsor Report," for your recognition of "the continued faithfulness of the Network Dioceses," and for your stated willingness, in consultation with the Archbishop of Canterbury, to "develop a proposal ... by which the requested Primatial oversight can be adequately provided." We also appreciate the call for a bishop representing the orthodox to be present at the next Primates Meeting, and for "initial steps toward the creation of ... a separate ecclesiastical structure of the Anglican Communion in the USA." We pray that the entire Primates gathering in February will come to similar decisions.

Our Need

We ask for and urgently require the following:

Connection.

1. We need to be connected to the Instruments of Unity of the Communion, and especially to the Primates Meeting. We cannot be represented in the Communion through the person of the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church. Bishop Jefferts Schori teaches a manifestly defective Christology as well as embraces moral actions and teaching directly contrary to the Windsor Report. We seek to be accountable.
2. We need a means of connecting among ourselves. All of the roles assigned under our Constitution to the Presiding Bishop need to be carried out among us, but cannot reasonably or impartially be carried out by Bishop Jefferts Schori. In seeking alternative Primatial oversight and pastoral care, we are seeking a Primate from elsewhere in the Communion who will carry-out, or cause to be carried-out, the constitutional and canonical duties of the Presiding Bishop.
3. We need an antidote to the inherent independence of action that has characterized relations among bishops and dioceses in the American Church. In the time between the present and the point at which some permanent structure can emerge, alternative Primatial oversight and pastoral care seems to us a wise interim strategy.

Cover.

4. During the period in which a "separate ecclesiastical structure" can be worked out among us, we need protection from those who would "seek to destroy the child." The moral influence of the Primates, one of the Instruments of the Communion, can, we believe, provide the protection necessary to counter-balance the historic hostility of the majority Episcopal Church.
5. A Primate in the role of alternative overseer, agreed by the Primates Meeting, allows us to continue our domestic legal and property battles as that part of the Episcopal Church that remains "a constituent member of the Anglican Communion in communion with the see of Canterbury."

Consultation.

6. We are fully prepared to take responsibility for our own future and to commit to a plan of action from which we will not retreat. Nevertheless, in this transitional period under alternative Primatial oversight and pastoral care, we would be immensely aided by the wisdom, insight and perspective that an outsider, discharging (and as appropriate assigning) the roles of "presiding Bishop," might achieve among us.

Way Forward

1. Appoint a Primate who will discharge the constitutional and canonical duties historically assigned to the Presiding Bishop, offering alternative Primatial oversight and pastoral care until a permanent and constituent Anglican Communion entity is in place in the United States.
2. Permit orthodox U.S. bishops and others to assist with sharing in the burdens placed upon the Primate charged with alternative Primatial oversight and pastoral care on behalf of the Communion's other Primates, by authorizing such delegations of authority and function as are deemed appropriate or possible.
3. Assemble the various Network and Windsor dioceses, and the Network and other Windsor-committed parishes in non-Network or non-Windsor dioceses, as well the congregations under foreign Anglican jurisdictions, in regular synods to prosecute ministry and mission in the period of transition before a permanent structure emerges.
4. Convene, when the time is right, an organizing ("constitutional") convention for the purpose of approving the infrastructure necessary to the permanent Anglican entity in the U.S., and to choose the domestic leader for, and Anglican Communion representative of, that structure.

Pittsburgh Particulars

Because the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh is a diocese that has embraced the ordination of women, the Standing Committee has requested that, if possible, a means be found in exercising alternative Primatial oversight, for a Primate whose Province also ordains women to have a significant role, if the Primate who exercises alternative Primatial oversight for all be from among those Provinces that do not ordain women.

Constitutional and Canonical Roles asked of the Primate Exercising Alternative Oversight

1. Chief Pastor and Primate. Canon I.2.4 (a).
2. Responsible for leadership in
 - initiating and developing policy and strategy, and
 - speaking for [APO dioceses] as to its policies, strategies and programs. Canon I.2.4 (a) (1).
3. Speak God's words to [APO dioceses] and to the world, as the representative of [APO dioceses] and its episcopate in its corporate capacity. Canon I.2.4 (a) (2).
4. In the event of a vacancy within a Diocese, consult with the Ecclesiastical Authority to ensure that adequate interim Episcopal Services are provided. Canon I.2.4 (a) (3).
5. Take order for the consecration of Bishops, when duly elected, and assemble the [APO] Bishops to meet. Canon I.2.4 (a) (4).
6. Preside over meetings of the House of Bishops; ...and recommend legislation to [APO dioceses or any national Council] . Canon I.2.4 (a) (5).

7. Visit every [APO] Diocese for the purpose of:

- Holding pastoral consultations with the Bishop or Bishops thereof and, with their advice, with the Lay and Clerical leaders of the jurisdiction;
- Preaching the Word;
- Celebrating the Eucharist. Canon I.2.4 (a) (6).

8. Report annually to [the APO dioceses] and, from time to time, issue pastoral letters. Canon I.2.4 (b).

9. Make appointments and delegate authority as appropriate to carry out his duties assigned by the canons. Canon I.2.4(c).

10. Appoint a Chancellor. Canon I.2.5.

Functions and authority of Presiding Bishop under disciplinary canons (Title IV).

Serve as focal point for all disciplinary procedures relating to a bishop under Title IV (The Disciplinary Canons):

- Charges against a Bishop. Canon IV.3.24 & 26.
- On his own initiative may require the Review Committee to investigate any Bishop whom he believes has committed an offense. Canon IV.23 (b).
- Appoints the five bishops who make up the episcopal membership of the Review Committee whose job it is to cause the charges to be investigated and to determine whether to issue a presentment against the Bishop charged. Canon IV.3.27 and 43.
- May issue temporary inhibitions against bishops (Canon IV.1.4-6); and may determine punishment and sentence of bishops who may submit voluntarily to the discipline of ECUSA without trial (Canon IV.2.9-14).
- Receives and acts upon the certificate of the Review Committee when it finds that a Bishop has abandoned communion of ECUSA, including the imposition of an inhibition of such Bishop. (Canon IV.9.1).
- If a Bishop inhibited under Title IV.9 does not recant within two months of inhibition, the Presiding Bishop presents the matter to the [APO] House of Bishops for the Bishop to be deposed. (Canon IV.9.2).

In addition to the foregoing functions and authorizations, there are a number of administrative functions provided in Title III (i.e., giving notice of a Bishop's election, preparing a list of episcopal resignations, etc.), not viewed as substantive and not included here.

- Posted January 29, 2007 -

THE BISHOP'S ADDRESS
At the Forty-Seventh Annual Convention
Of the Diocese of San Joaquin
St. James' Cathedral, Fresno, California
December 1, 2006

On trial for his life, the Apostle Paul began his defense before King Agrippa by saying: "I consider myself fortunate that it is before you, King Agrippa, I am to make my defense today against all the accusations of the Jews because you are especially familiar with all the customs and controversies of the Jews . . ." (Acts 26:2-3a)

The charges brought against St. Paul were none other than his proclamation of the Resurrection, his belief that a crucified carpenter from Nazareth is Lord, and that this same Risen Lord communicated directly with the Apostle in a personal relationship.

In his closing argument, Paul states: "I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision, but declared first to those in Damascus, then in Jerusalem and throughout the countryside of Judea, and also to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God and do deeds consistent with repentance." (Acts 26:19,20)

It is precisely this same proclamation that brings us to this 47th Diocesan Convention.

Undoubtedly you are aware that this meeting of the Diocese of San Joaquin is historic. You may have heard someone say that the diocese is seeking to secede from The Episcopal Church. If that is what you think, then you are **wrong!** This convention's business does not begin something new. On the contrary, we in the Diocese of San Joaquin are meeting to state clearly that we intend to go nowhere nor introduce anything new. Instead, we are defending the doctrine, discipline, and worship as this Church has received them. Why, then, are we amending our Constitution? This amending process is the first step in the removal from our Constitution of any reference to The Episcopal Church because --in our opinion-- they have decided to walk apart from the Anglican Communion.

Where, then, is the controversy? The departure from the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church began decades ago. At each step of the way many voices familiar to you withstood the erosion of faith, the lowering of the standards of

morality, and the unilateral action of the Episcopal Church when --without regard for law or order-- it went forward with 11 illegal ordinations in Philadelphia. Unashamed of this action and covering it with the mantle of "prophetic voice" it was cause for official celebration at the General Convention. This same illegal action, violating canon law carried no consequences or discipline for those involved, yet it caused a rift in the Anglican Communion and brought the hope of unity with Eastern Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church to a precipice. What began in rebellion ended with canon law that was explicitly stated to be PERMISSIVE not MANDATORY but changed in less than twenty years. Soon, The Episcopal Church --again, illegally-- sent squads of interrogators into dioceses that held to a different theological view without the bishops' permissions. (Somehow it seems to be all right to cross borders when the liberal part of the Church chooses to do so.) This arrogant disregard for canon law and diocesan borders when suited to those in power is only a shadow of what was to come.

When Bishop Spong published a book denying the Virgin Birth, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the Resurrection and Ascension protests to the then Presiding Bishop went unheeded. John Spong continued in his appointment as the Chairman of the committee on Theology for the House of Bishops with the then Presiding Bishop's support. And long after his retirement, Spong has continued to be the unchallenged voice of The Episcopal Church on radio and television. Twice, Bishop Spong has violated the canons by coming into this Diocese of San Joaquin and teaching both in Fresno and Stockton without permission from the bishop. These events, however, are mild by today's standards. With dismay we heard reports of the former Suffragan Bishop of Washington, DC forcing her way into a parish with police escort. Perhaps worse was the Bishop of Connecticut smashing down a parish priest's office door to gain entry in order to steal his computer and private files. No matter how outrageous all this is, this is not what has brought us to the crisis The Episcopal Church is in today.

Despite "eleventh hour" meetings with the Archbishop of Canterbury and specific pleas from Primates around the world, not to elect Gene Robinson as bishop of New Hampshire, the delegates of that electing Convention chose to ignore such calls for restraint. And, lest we think sexuality --or more specifically homosexuality-- is the issue, we need to put this to rest immediately. The concern has to do with the authority of Scripture which does not condone the practice of homosexuality. The REAL ISSUE has to do with the foundation of our faith as Anglicans. Liberals who would vote for Robinson didn't understand this. They saw the election of a man living with a male partner as a social justice

issue in the same way that they understood overturning the 2000 year practice of a male priesthood. It is likely that no-one was more surprised by the firestorm from around the world and from many denominations apart from the Anglican Communion than were those who voted for Robinson. Even if the liberals who have control of The Episcopal Church didn't understand what they did in 2003 everyone else did!

Before that General Convention in Minneapolis in 2003, urgent requests came from around the world asking Gene Robinson to follow the example of the Rev. Jeffrey John who had stepped down from being consecrated Bishop of Rochester in England because he, too, was a homosexual though celibate. Robinson refused. The General Convention confirmed his election . . . bringing forth the first emergency meeting of the Primates called by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Along with the 37 other Primates, our Presiding Bishop signed the document saying that to go forward with the Consecration of Robinson would "tear at the fabric of the Anglican Communion." This IS the definition of schism! Three weeks later after signing the document pleading with The Episcopal Church not to go on with the New Hampshire Consecration, Frank Griswold did just that.

If we are looking for a date when the Episcopal Church announced it was "walking apart", leaving, or going into schism, 2003 is the year.

Did believers within The Episcopal Church submit to this in silence? Some did. Many have stated clearly by their departure from the Church – "enough is enough." Over the past decades as the population of the United States has grown, The Episcopal Church has shrunk from 4 million members to 2.5 million and is now down to 870 thousand estimated to be in Church on Sunday. Many did NOT remain silent. A shadow General Convention met in Plano, Texas with some 4,000 in attendance. Through the then Cardinal Ratzinger Pope John Paul II sent a personal letter of encouragement to those who gathered. The Anglican Communion Network was founded by some 13 dioceses. Ministries to individuals and parishes located in hostile dioceses began. All recognized that something HAD to be done! For years organizations such as: The Evangelical and Catholic Mission, Episcopalians United, the Episcopal Synod of America– now Forward in Faith, North America– and the American Anglican Council... worked tirelessly to turn the tide of apostasy flooding into the Episcopal Church. These organizations along with others longed to see the Episcopal Church repent and were willing to "stay in" to work for a transformation that would never come. Consequently, Continuing Churches were founded to give a place for those leaving The Episcopal Church. Many –knowing they could not in good

conscience remain in an institution moving further and further away from a Biblical foundation still held back –not wanting to sacrifice their place as members of the world-wide Anglican Communion. Thus a second wave of departures began. These people sought refuge from Overseas Anglican Bishops and Provinces in Africa, South America, and Asia. (In deed, some of those people are among our visitors this week-end.)

Meeting in intense sessions, the Primates issued what has come to be called the Windsor Report asking The Episcopal Church to express its regrets for the actions of the 2003 General Convention and the consecration of Gene Robinson. Yet, even this mild discipline was rejected. Last summer the House of Deputies voted it down so that it couldn't come to the house of Bishops.

On the last day of General Convention in Columbus, Ohio a watered down substitute "regret" cobbled together in the middle of the night barely seemed to pass in the house of Bishops. So uncertain was the hand vote, the Bishop of Springfield called for a roll call vote. He was told to sit down. The vote had been taken. While that same vote was being cast later on that last afternoon by the House of Deputies, the Bishop of Washington, DC stood out in front of the Deputies' Hall with some twenty other bishops announcing that he, and they, would ignore this vote. He was prepared to go on permitting same-sex blessings. It is not surprising, therefore, that the General Convention ended in no small chaos. The failure of the General Convention to respond adequately to the Windsor Report did not create the schism, it simply confirmed it.

Only **after** the General Convention did most of us learn that the newly elected Presiding Bishop not only rejected the Windsor Report of the Primates but that she had continued to allow same-sex blessings in Nevada while bishop there. Her statements saying clearly that Jesus is **not the only** way to the Father caused further consternation. Her public statements, both written and televised, have caused one theologian to discern five different schools of heresy forming her thought and faith. On the day before this Convention, in a last minute attempt to hold together a failing institution, Presiding Bishop Shori has proposed the creation of what is now being called a "Primatial Vicar" as a substitute for the requested Alternative Primatial Oversight. Bishop Duncan of Pittsburgh has commended the national leadership of The Episcopal Church for realizing that the time has come for a structural change. Nevertheless, he rightly points out: "At first glance what is proposed is neither Primatial, nor Oversight, nor is it an Alternative to the spiritual authority of one who, by both teaching and action, has expressly rejected the Windsor Report and its recommendations."

How sad this all is. Time does not permit a rehearsal of any more events. What IS important is that we in San Joaquin took note long before last summer's General Convention that The Episcopal Church would depart – not solely in justifying sexual behavior specifically rejected by God's Word but by endorsing "Core Doctrine" so drastically reduced by judges in a sham trial of a bishop years earlier, Christianity itself had been trivialized. It was easy to foresee what the General Convention would do in 2006. For this reason and THIS REASON ALONE, a letter was written on April 8th this year and sent to faithful Primates around the world from your Diocesan Council, Bishop, and later from the Standing Committee. In it we simply asked that no matter what the General Convention did, we wanted to be recognized as an orthodox, faithful diocese **still** within the Anglican Communion. This request for recognition of who we have always been so infuriated the liberal leadership of the Episcopal Church that a systematic harassment of me personally began to take place almost daily at the General Convention. Bishops who had not talked with me for years were sent over to my table to try to talk some "sense" into me.

It was obvious that they were reading dark motivations and goals into three different documents of the diocese that simply were **not** there. When bullying and intimidation seemed to fail it was but a short journey of 24 hours from the conclusion of General Convention to bringing charges against me by four bishops in California. Their behavior, obviously supported by others in leadership on the East Coast, caused many in this diocese to take a serious look for the first time at the storm gathering on the horizon. The storm? The Episcopal Church has twisted the truth by continuously manipulating the press into reporting a caricature of who we are and what we are standing for:

The Episcopal Church walks apart from the Anglican Communion but accuses *US* of leaving the Church.

The Episcopal Church challenges and publicly denies core Christian doctrine but accuses *ME* of breaking vows to uphold the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church as it has received them.

The Episcopal Church labels us as divisive simply because we would rather remain faithful Anglican Christians instead of complacently accepting the new religion which the General Convention has created.

The Episcopal Church heralds justice for those who act sexually outside of Holy Matrimony while inflicting INJUSTICE on those who uphold God's Word, Sacraments and His historic Church.

With Bishop Jack Iker and the Diocese of Fort Worth calling for Alternative Primatial Oversight, many of us came to realize that was precisely what we had asked for on April 8th without having the terminology available to us.

By September this year meetings of cataclysmic importance for the well-being of the Anglican Communion and of The Episcopal Church happened in rapid succession. In New York City it became apparent to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primates that the American Church was – as Bishop McNaughton of Texas announced some fifteen years ago – that there were two churches, two separate religions under one roof. It was also obvious to all that the chasm between these two churches could neither be bridged nor healed from within The Episcopal Church.

The Diocese of Texas welcomed 22 bishops who agreed that the Windsor Report of the Primates was the only way forward and that General Convention had failed to respond adequately to the mildest request of the Primates.

The Primates of the Global South met in Rwanda to address many and varied problems of their own but – out of concern for the Anglican Communion and believers in The Episcopal Church – they turned their attention to us and ended by setting up a Steering Committee of their leaders from around the world, among them: John Chew, Archbishop of Singapore; Drexel Gomez of the West Indies and the Caribbean; Gregory Venables, Primate of the Southern Cone, South America; and a three Archbishops from Africa, including Peter Akinola of Nigeria as Chairman. These outstanding leaders took it upon themselves to meet with 10 of us dioceses in Virginia last month, and there they asked three things of us:

- 1) What were we prepared to give up in order to achieve unity among ourselves?
- 2) A single spokesman to be elected by us to speak for all the orthodox.
- 3) Submission to their authority and --as a demonstration of that-- flexibility to allow them under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to prepare a way for us to live in a separate ecclesiastical structure which would eventually provide a way home for many Anglicans

who had left The Episcopal Church for conscience sake, and many individuals and parishes that had been isolated in hostile dioceses to be part of the world-wide family of the Anglican Communion.

Working independently of this Virginia meeting three of our Rural Deans: Frs. Dan Martins, Jim Snell, and Richard James came up with a substitute for the originally proposed changes to our diocesan Constitution. I believe this was the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, for their work perfectly responds to the requests of the Primates that we remain flexible and allow them to provide the necessary leadership for us. Not only do I commend their work to you, I passionately believe what will be introduced to us at this Convention is a way for us to remain faithful to the Word of God, be set free from intimidation, and secure our present position as a faithful diocese of the Anglican Communion.

This initial vote does not separate us from The Episcopal Church but positions us to respond positively to the Primates. It leads the way for other like-minded dioceses to become part of a structure that remains true to all that The Episcopal Church has received in the past and which, tragically, the present institution and its leadership have chosen to walk apart from.

Your vote and the action of this Convention may be seen as historic within Anglicanism but-- ultimately and spiritually-- it is only doing what St. Paul did before King Agrippa -- remaining obedient to the heavenly vision -- that enables us to follow in his footsteps of proclaiming the Lordship of Jesus Christ and recognizing that His words are spirit and truth. By being faithful in these ways we will discover our lives coming into an ever deepening harmony with God's revelation of Himself and eager -- when we find anything that proves to be a wedge between us and Him -- to repent.

How grateful I am that we are not alone! We share this vision in common with thousands in this country along with Bishop Robert Duncan, Moderator of the Network, our fellow Network bishops and dioceses, as well as Primates around the world who continually support and encourage us as we seek not only the Lordship of Christ but to remain faithful in the Anglican Communion.

The Rt. Rev. John-David Schofield

**Private and Confidential Westfields Response
to the Global South Steering Committee
November 16, 2006
Chantilly, Virginia**

The undersigned, having convened with the Global South Steering Committee in Chantilly, Virginia, on November 15-17, 2006, declare:

ARTICLE I: We are firmly committed to the Lordship of Jesus Christ, the authority of holy Scripture and historic Anglican faith and practice.

ARTICLE II: We have chosen the Rt. Rev. Robert W. Duncan as our leader and hereby submit to his leadership without reservation in building unity among us and as our representative for the present in the councils of the Anglican Communion.

ARTICLE III. We pledge to lay aside all obstacles, which may prevent us from achieving our common purpose.

ARTICLE IV: We solemnly pledge not to withdraw from these commitments.

Robert W. Duncan

John M. Heidengren + Robert W. Duncan

APPENDIX J

- > Anglican
- > Communion
- > Network
- >
- > Biblical Missionary Uniting
- > 535 Smithfield Street
- > Suite 910
- > Pittsburgh, PA 15222 412-325-8900
- > Fax: 412-325-8902
- > PASTORAL LETTER FROM BISHOP ROBERT DUNCAN
- > Contact: Jenny Noyes
- > Phone: 412-325-8900 x108
- > March 9, 2007
- >
- >
- > The Rt. Rev. Robert Wm. Duncan, Moderator of the Anglican Communion
- > Network, is requesting all Network priests to read the following
- > letter to their congregations this Sunday or make hard copies
- > available to parishioners. You are receiving an advance copy of
- > this letter. This document has not yet been released to the general
- > public. The Network will make the letter public on Monday by
- > posting it on our website at www.acn-us.org and releasing it to the
- > press. Please do not publish this letter online in any fashion
- > until Monday, March 12.
- >
- > Due to the latest of this email, please feel free to read this
- > letter to your congregation on a subsequent Sunday and to send it
- > electronically or post it on your own website after Monday, March
- > 12. We appreciate your partnership in the Network and hope that
- > this letter is an encouragement to your parishioners. Thank you.
- >
- >
- > 9th March, A.D. 2007
- > Third Friday of Lent
- > TO ALL WHO ARE A PART OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION NETWORK OR
- ARE
- > ALLIES IN ITS WELFARE:
- >
- > Beloved in the Lord,
- >
- > The Primates' Meeting in Tanzania considered in great depth the
- > plight "of those congregations and dioceses within the Episcopal
- > Church who have sought alternative pastoral oversight because of
- > their theological differences with their diocesan bishop or with

> the Presiding Bishop."(1) The hope of the Primates' Meeting, in
> the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is that a "sufficiently
> strong scheme" can be put in place so as to be "sufficient for all
> dissenting congregations and dioceses to find their home within
> it."(2) Another way to say this is to say that a sufficiently
> strong plan must be found for the congregations and dioceses of the
> Anglican Communion Network (plus any others from the wider Windsor
> coalition that may desire similar insulation). The responsibility
> for developing such a system has been given to the wider coalition
> of Windsor Bishops who signed on to the "Camp Allen principles" ^
> a group that includes the Network Bishops ^ to shape such a system,
> a system to be led by a Primatial Vicar. (3)

>
> There is much question as to the degree to which the vision for an
> international Pastoral Council and a domestic Primatial Vicar would
> leave the Network "within" the Episcopal Church. At the start, one
> has to say that the eighty-six congregations of the Network's
> International Conference (Uganda, Kenya, So. Cone and Central
> Africa) are neither under nor within the Episcopal Church, anymore
> than are the one hundred and forty churches in the Anglican Mission
> and CANA. Since the Key Recommendations of the Dar es Salaam
> Meeting anticipated "a place for [AMiA and CANA] within these
> provisions," there is envisioned something much different than can
> be described as "within" the Episcopal Church.

>
> For the hundreds of Network congregations in the Network Dioceses
> and Convocations, (who claim to be what they have always been,
> which is the Episcopal Church where they are) I want to share the
> following assessment. Most of us are at present within the
> Episcopal Church. This is where the Network was principally called
> to stand. One can be "within" something and not "under" it. The
> Network has been proving that for the last three years. The Dar es
> Salaam Communique and Key Recommendations represent a last attempt
> at reconciliation in the Anglican Communion and in the Episcopal
> Church. What the global leadership of the Anglican Communion has
> proposed is a marital separation. Pastorally, the church
> recommends such separations because they sometimes bring
> restoration of right relationship. Both parties are still
> technically within the marriage. But marital separations never
> leave one party "under" the other; such an arrangement would be
> doomed to failure from the start. The words of the Dar es Salaam
> Communique and Key Recommendations are carefully chosen. Any sense
> that the Pastoral Council and Primatial Vicar are "under" majority
> TEC is absent from the documents themselves, would surely doom the

- > vision to failure, and could hardly prove "a sufficiently strong
- > scheme."
- >
- > Whether this last effort to reconcile both the Episcopal Church to
- > the Anglican Communion and the two parts of the Episcopal Church to
- > each other can succeed is, in human terms, up to the Network, to
- > the Windsor Bishops, and to the wider House of Bishops of the
- > Episcopal Church. Three things must be said:
- >
- > 1) As Network Moderator, I will do everything I can to bring
- > the hopes of the Primates Meeting to fruition. Necessarily, I will
- > attend the meeting of the House of Bishops about to convene. The
- > Archbishop of Canterbury has asked for "generosity and
- > graciousness" in response to what the Primates have done. I will
- > go in that spirit. Attendance at the meeting of the House of
- > Bishops, however, should not be construed as anything more than
- > doing what the situation requires. It remains that "the
- > theological differences" with the Presiding Bishop and with those
- > Diocesan Bishops who have taught and acted contrary to received
- > Faith and Order (as upheld in the Windsor Report, and the
- > Dromantine and Dar es Salaam Communiqués) are of such magnitude
- > that discussion of the issues before us is the limit of our
- > participation in the life of the House of Bishops at the present
- > time. This represents no alteration of the grounds on which most
- > Network Bishops have participated in the House of Bishops since
- > August of 2003.
- >
- > 2) The Windsor Bishops (which includes the Network Bishops) ^
- > all those who adopted the Camp Allen principles (4) ^ will meet
- > shortly after Easter to shape our part of what the Primates'
- > Meeting has envisioned. Obvious agenda items include discussion
- > about a Primatial Vicar, about a "sufficiently strong" plan for the
- > Network and Windsor minority, and about imagining whether any form
- > of ministry could be designed that would be acceptable to those
- > who have gone out.
- >
- > 3) The House of Bishops will have to respond to us and to the
- > recommendations of the Primates' Meeting in a vastly different
- > manner than has characterized the majority's behavior toward us in
- > recent experience. As already stated, the Archbishop of Canterbury
- > has called on all to "approach [the] challenges with a spirit of
- > graciousness and generosity." (5) Pray toward this end.
- >
- > From the earliest days, we in the Anglican Communion Network have

> known that our vocation is to stand for the Faith once delivered to
> the saints, in submission to the whole Anglican Communion. From
> the earliest days, we appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and
> to the Primates (6) to make that possible in an increasingly
> hostile environment here in the United States. Again, the
> Archbishop and the Primates have heard us. Again, they have
> spoken. They have determined to give the Episcopal Church one more
> chance to make it clear about the majority's intentions vis a vis
> the teaching of Lambeth I.10, the Windsor Report and the Dromantine
> Communique.

>
> Most of us, but certainly not all, in the Anglican Communion
> Network now believe that it is the Episcopal Church majority's
> clear and continuing intention to "walk apart" in matters of Faith
> and Order. Nevertheless, we owe it to our beloved Communion to
> follow the Primates' wisdom as to how to take a last step in that
> discernment. The Primates have established a deadline of September
> 30th for the Episcopal Church's entire House of Bishops to make an
> "unequivocal" response. (7) For all that is ahead, the Anglican
> Communion Network will continue to work with those "within" and
> with those who have "gone out" for a biblical, missionary and
> united future for North American Anglicanism. There can be no
> turning back from that Godly commitment: the Network's vision from
> the beginning. "And since we have this ministry by the mercy of
> God, we do not lose heart." [2 Cor. 4:1]

>
> Please continue to pray with fervor for me and for all who lead, as
> well as for all who are having an especially hard time with yet one
> more time of waiting and of testing. Your prayers are the vehicles
> of our Lord's victory realized in the crises and crosses we face at
> every level both great and small.

>
> Faithfully in Christ,

>
>
> Moderator, Anglican Communion Network

>
>
>
>
> (1) Archbishop Rowan Williams, Pastoral Letter to the Primates, 5th
> March 2007.

>
> (2) Ibid.

- >
- > (3) Key Recommendations of the Primates, 19th February 2007.
- >
- > (4) Ibid.
- >
- > (5) Archbishop Rowan Williams, Pastoral Letter to the Primates, 5th
- > March 2007.
- >
- > (6) Dissenting Bishops' Statement, 5th August 2003.
- >
- > (7) Key Recommendations of the Primates, 19th February 2007.
- >
- >
- > -30-
- >
- > The Anglican Communion Network is a biblical, missionary and
- > uniting movement of North American Anglicans in fellowship with the
- > worldwide Anglican Communion. The Anglican Communion Network is
- > comprised of over 900 parishes and over 2200 clergy. The Anglican
- > Communion Network operates under the legal name of the Network of
- > Anglican Communion Dioceses and Parishes as a tax exempt
- > organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue
- > Service code.
- >
- >