

I have been involved in preparing the Mothers' Union response to the Windsor Report so I have done some careful reading and had discussions with various people.

Anyway, here are a few comments on the questions Clare asked about how we use/read the Bible; what our group might see as a major issue for the Primates; and what the Windsor Report might mean for us.

1. How we use, or should use the Bible?

I was interested to read the comment in section 67 of the Windsor Report, that it was by reading Scripture too little, not by reading it too much, that we have allowed ourselves to drift apart. Also the comment in section 61.

I do not have formal theological qualifications but it seems to me that this problem relates very much to TEAC because there are huge differences in the standards of biblical knowledge required before ordination, and consecration, in different parts of the Communion. And, some theological colleges, maybe especially the more conservative ones - I think of Sydney in particular, become very inward looking and strictly maintain a very conservative view amongst their students.

The Mothers' Union is currently looking at this question as we attempt to encourage our members in their reading and study of Scripture, and provide material necessary to equip them for their ministry.

2. Key Issue for the Primate's Meeting....

I believe that one of the key issues is the whole question of selection, election, qualification and appointment of bishops. Of course there needs to be attention to training and equipping for the task, both pre and post consecration but the key is to get it right in the first place. The qualities needed are awesome! It is important to remember that a brilliant parish priest does not necessarily make a good bishop, nor does a good archdeacon, nor a theologian. Discerning the necessary gifts in possible candidates is not easy.

3. The Windsor Report.....

I think we need Jenny to do this for us, after all she was there for the duration!

Sections 57 through 66 are very relevant for us.

How does the present way that theological education is done throughout the Communion add to the current problems we are facing?

The use of Scripture is of course central. As TEAC considers the task it faces how do we try to ensure at least a minimum standard of knowledge of Scripture, interpretation and scholarship, and an awareness of the great diversity of tradition throughout the Communion?

Would the appreciation of diversity be helped by some intentional dialogue across different theological boundaries during the early stages of training for ordination as well as later on? This may happen in some places - those directly involved in theological education would know about this.

Section 64 says something to all who are involved in the selection of bishops.

Concepts of *Adiaphora* and *Subsidiarity* are helpful as we consider how there might be accepted minimum standards, and understandings of diversity, in theological education and authority for ministry of various kinds, around the Communion. Maybe especially applied to the episcopate.

Sections 124 - 135 are clearly important to us, as are the many other references to the role of the episcopate in maintaining the unity of the Communion.

How do we move towards some definite recommendations about the kind of education, formation and ongoing support we want for bishops all around the Communion.

Are there ways that we can increase the opportunities for bishops from regional areas to come together for education and support?

Can we encourage those of different traditions to engage in dialogue rather than going to gatherings of the like-minded who come together to lobby and strengthen their prejudices?

Who has the resources to pay the bills?

Not very profound I'm afraid and very much from my 'just a simple lay person' perspective. So many questions. So few answers. So many prayers needed.

Regards to all,

Elizabeth.

Mrs Elizabeth Appleby AM
29 Biggs Avenue
Beachmere
Queensland 4510
Australia
Ph 61 7 5496 8707
reappleby@bigpond.com

THE WINDSOR REPORT

- a response from the Inter-Faith Section of the Committee for Christian Unity of the Church of Ireland.

PREFACE

The document *The Guidelines for Inter-Faith Encounter in the Churches of the Porvoo Communion*, as agreed at The Porvoo Communion Consultation in Oslo in November/December 2003, has been instrumental in the development of Inter-Faith thinking in the Church of Ireland. These Guidelines not only express principles which are valuable in themselves but also represent an important aspect of the outreach of our common Anglican-Lutheran witness within the Porvoo Churches. Their focus is properly theological. They are realistic about and rightly critical of our differing cultural contexts. They stress the centrality of reading Scripture together. They say something important to the church about mission. Finally they explore twelve issues for Christians in Inter-Faith Encounter – hard situations, hard sayings. These are unashamed in their perception of difficulties but also unremitting in their expectation of graciousness in dialogue. They form something of the backdrop to this Response to The Windsor Report from the specific interests of the Inter-Faith Section of the Committee for Christian Unity.

RESPONSE

QUESTION 1

The Preamble and Declaration of 1870 states: ‘The Church of Ireland will maintain communion with the sister Church of England, and with all other Christian Churches agreeing in the principles of this Declaration; and will set forward, as far as in it lieth, quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people.’ This is the primary statement of our Irish Anglican understanding of communion – in communion with the Church of England and with other churches who bear witness to the principles enshrined in the Declaration.

Therefore the sustained attempt to ‘put flesh on’ the word ‘communion’ in The Windsor Report is something which we welcome as valuable, informative and creative. To grapple with definitions of the Body of Christ as organic and active invites the institution of the church to be experimental and proactive towards others rather than sprawling and protective of itself. This is but a way of expressing the old cliché that the church exists for those outside it every bit as much as for those inside it. In this sense the challenge still laid at the door of the Communion is the motto: ‘truth shall set you free’ and not simply the lesser and occasionally attractive cliché: ‘compromise shall keep us together.’ Dealing in truth is vital as a ground-rule of Inter-Faith Encounter and also of Anglican Communion inter-dependence.

The Anglican method of discernment of the will of God as an impetus towards doing the work of God – Scripture, Tradition and Reason – carried out within the markers of The Lambeth Quadrilateral needs to be spelled out clearly in further work generated by the Report. The current Report is in many ways an exercise in internal Anglican ecumenism. That is a wonderful maturing of our perception of ourselves as ecumenical. At the same time this achievement and aspiration cannot in today’s understanding of the church world-wide be an end in itself. It must be a springboard to our being the eschatological Kingdom of God, however inchoate, now. It can be

inspired and informed by using in a contemporary context the time-honoured methodologies of Anglicanism to contribute to the fruition of the work of the Body of Christ within the divine expression of God's Kingdom. This work propels us into engagement with those of other Faiths.

One of the aspects of 'the truth that sets us free' is that the Body of Christ is already radically holy by being itself what and who it is by the operation of God the Trinity and, further, that it is not made up of the sum of our individual or institutional perfectionisms or impeccabilities. The inter-relation of grace and salvation is vital in understanding the priority of the divine gift of forgiveness in all God's dealings with us. Righteousness is of God, self-righteousness is a potion of our own concoction. Such arguments point us once more to the proper provisionality of the church and to the imperative to live holy lives with and for others. Communion itself demands of us a relational model of being the Body with and for others. In the Inter-Faith context our service of our neighbour cannot presuppose our subsuming that neighbour into compliance with the expressions of our own pattern of belief. This is also a valuable general principle of respect of others.

The proper emphasis on the authority of the triune God exercised through Scripture is important in that it asserts the Trinity of God as fundamental to communion as such, underwrites the importance of Scripture in the life of the church and articulates the conviction that the unfettered presence of God in the world stands alongside a lived Bible in the witness of self-conscious Anglicans to God with and for others. Scripture, the Report suggests, is not self-interpreting from its own text. Neither is it so comprehensively culturally circumscribed in its current ecclesiastical contexts as to be incapable of liberating peoples from an economically, philosophically or politically oppressive setting and system. Its own freedoms come from its being a series of historical documents inspired by God and which are to be applied critically in local situations. This is an important tool in the application of Scripture in Inter-Faith Encounter.

The relationship between *Illness: The surface symptoms* and *Illness: The deeper symptoms* is uneasy as the leap of application between the two is not always clear. This was, however, bound to be the case. The Report is responsive rather than prescriptive. The Report, by its silence on the issues which prompted its composition, is, as Oslo 2003 recognizes in its different subject matter, crying out for further presentations in readily accessible form of the contexts of contemporary Anglicanisms from historical, sociological and economic perspectives at the very least. This would give the tools of understanding which would make the (rightly) much vaunted expectation of listening possible and fruitful. In this work Inter-Faith understanding has a strong role to play.

In relation to mission in particular an emerging anxiety felt by many is that the boomerang may be swinging towards a Southern Hemisphere evangelization of the Northern Hemisphere which could prove to be no more than colonialism in reverse. If such an initiative were to become an established pattern within Anglicanism and base itself too heavily or indeed exclusively on a missiology of conversion, it would play havoc with Inter-Faith Encounter. It is also mission although not always recognized as such. Important in Inter-Faith Encounter is the freedom to explore theology together across the divide as well as manifesting a respect in personal and institutional dealings. The discussion of *Adiaphora* and *Subsidiarity* can be expanded in the facilitation of such Encounter as an expression of Christian conviction and outreach in such a way

as to be locally elastic but still bound by a common obedience to God rather than being seen as a selling out on principles.

QUESTION 2

'The Instruments of Unity' as outlined in The Windsor Report are not currently as tidy as they look. They in fact belie their essential origins in the codification of successive ad hoc provisions of fora for information, discussion and debate across the Anglican Communion, with the exception of the archbishopric of Canterbury, of course. All of this might have ticked along nicely were it not for the ways in which *The Surface Symptoms* have done the rounds of the three gatherings mentioned, with individuals and groups of individuals seeking either acceptance or denunciation of developments within specific, individual dioceses. This lobbying has been both unedifying and debilitating. It has caused alarm bells to ring across the ecumenical world and the same can be said about the Inter-Faith Encounter world. We are presented with a caricatured Islamic monolith, for example, in much political rhetoric and tabloid journalism along with the perception of internal chaos within and across the Anglican Communion. The danger is that these fora may already have become quasi-curial. Take, for example, the way in which what technically is a partial reading of 'Lambeth 1.10' has acquired a semi-creedal standing as 'the mind of the vast majority of Anglicans world-wide.'

A genuine weakness in the conduct of the debate around *The Surface Symptoms* is that, despite the long period of media coverage, we have not located the issues firmly in the pastoral realm. This is a severe limitation and has resulted in the near-calcification of opposing ecclesiologies and orthodoxies depending on whether your preference is for secular relativism or Biblical literalism. The existing Instruments of Unity need radically to be re-configured if they are to remain fresh and to fulfil their consultative role in the projected Council of Advice. This should be done as a matter of urgency and before any further thought is given to *A Council of Advice* for the Archbishop of Canterbury. This Council should avoid becoming yet another Standing Committee in The Anglican Cycle of Consultation because the issues at stake in the life of the Anglican Communion will be changing all the time. It needs to have a membership which can be asked to step down as appropriate without any insult being either intended or taken in order to make room for those whose involvement is pertinent to new specific issues. Its membership also needs to have a working instinct for the creative complexities of Inter-Faith Encounter which is, increasingly, the context in which the principles of Anglicanism will be lived in faith in Jesus Christ across the Churches of the Communion.

The enhancement of the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury presents the possibility of huge changes in the understanding of this person and the role which he (or she) fulfils in the workings and in the psychology of the Anglican Communion. In a real sense it will necessitate a trenchant examination of the viability of the Establishment which is peculiar to English Anglicanism in the Communion. The rest of us are de facto Disestablishments. Will it eventually lead to an election of the Archbishop of Canterbury from among any bishops validly ordained across the Communion? If so will it be an 'appointment' for a fixed term and will it be more edifying as elections go than any other contemporary election?

The exploration of a communion-wide Canon Law relating to inter-Anglican relations will take time to effect – and rightly. It is important that, in the spirit of The Windsor Report, it paint with a broad brush in relation to the creative mixture of autonomy, mutuality of respect, subsidiarity and adiaphora. Much of the law is an enshrinement in statute of practicalities and precedents. It is also the fruit of a philosophical exercise of jurisprudence. This is an exciting development which has all the potential to offer cohesion as a dividend of trust, something strongly underwritten in Section A of The Windsor Report.

QUESTION 3

The recommendations and proposals would impact as follows:

- A reassessment of the relationship between autonomy and inter-dependence among provinces which is timely.
- An ability to address together Holy Scripture as revealing the dynamic presence of the Triune God in history and in contemporary life.
- A recognition of the dangers of the ‘Russian Roulette’ theologically and practically played out by stretching the bonds of affection, which exist within the Body of Christ as lived in the Communion, to breaking point. There have already taken place actions which cannot be ‘received’ with any degree of affirmative ease across the Communion. There have already been unauthorized interventions by bishops from outside a particular diocese or indeed province who have no jurisdiction there which have set people at variance with their local bishop. Such apostolic ministry exercised locally is undermined by the insistence on compliance with particular positions on a variety of issues and provision of answers to particular questions which lie beyond the vows of the ordination of that local bishop.
- A mutuality of respect for diversity within a covenanted relationship, remembering always that the covenant in the Old Testament is a recognition and beginning of new creation.

QUESTION 4

The draft Covenant marks a substantial attempt to systematize parts of Communion life which have been in loose association with one another and until now have not needed to be defined with precision and explicit inter-relation. The Covenant is an expression of the trust to which the Report rightly draws our attention in the following terms: ‘Ideally, the Communion puts its trust in each province to exercise its autonomy appropriately within our mutual fellowship... This commits each church to a fiduciary duty to honour, and not to breach, that trust.’ (page 32)

From an Inter-Faith Encounter perspective the Covenant does nothing to undermine or impede the engagement in trust and in the name of Jesus Christ with those of other faiths which is the character of that Encounter. Its main thrust is to offer voluntary cohesion in terms of principles in order to avoid fragmentation of relationship in practice within the Anglican Communion. The Covenant provides the framework for Anglicans world-wide to understand communion as an ecclesiology with a mission. It is our conviction that ecumenism and Inter-Faith relations are integral to the mission of a Communion which wishes, as indeed the signs suggest, to avoid internal implosion by too assiduous a quest for consensus and also to avoid internal explosion by unilateral subsidiarity. The Covenant refreshingly avoids the use of the word *orthodoxy* as an

aspiration of consensus because we must never forget that orthodoxy has, in church tradition, needed to be radical and conservatism in doctrine has often been defined as heterodox.

The Right Reverend Michael Jackson, bishop of Clogher, chairperson of the Inter-Faith Sub-Group of the Committee for Church Unity of the Church of Ireland in consultation with members of the Sub-Group.

The Committee for Christian Unity is chaired by the bishop of Cashel and Ossory, the Right Reverend Peter Barrett. Its Honorary Secretary is the Reverend Daniel Nuzum, rector of Templebreedy Union of Parishes, Diocese of Cork, Cloyne and Ross.

19th December 2004

Colleges and Universities of
the Anglican Communion



December 16 2004

The Most Rev. Peter Kwong, Chair
Reception Reference Group
The Windsor Report
c/o The Rev. Canon Gregory Cameron, Secretary
The Anglican Communion Office
16Tavistock Crescent
London, W11 1AP
England

Dear Archbishop Kwong and Members of the Reception Group,

We have received your letter of this November requesting CUAC, as an official "Network" of the Anglican Communion, for a response to the "Windsor Report."

The Board of Trustees has been consulted on this matter.

It is the Board's decision that CUAC should not make a response to the report, since our membership is spread across so many provinces. To do so would be to presume upon the variety of relationships which our members have with their various provinces and dioceses.

CUAC tries to function as a kind of "Instrument of Unity" in the Anglican Communion, in that our programmes, exchanges and dialogues are intended to promote understanding and respect for the various churches and cultures worldwide to which our colleges belong. CUAC certainly does not sidestep important issues of faith and values, but rather seeks to create an educational and communication network to enable respectful discussion.

We are linked to various provinces and dioceses only through our member institutions, and as a consequence we do not feel it right for us to speak on their behalf.

We are hoping that some of our projects such as "Cross Cultural Collaboration" may engage students and staff in disparate parts of the Communion, whether south or north, east or west, to learn something of each other's life and faith, and to come to more of a global understanding. The Theme for our 2005 Triennial Conference this June at York-Canterbury in the UK is entitled "CUAC across the Communion - Learning through each other's living". At that Conference we will be discussing how matters of the Communion impact our various member

815 Second Avenue New York, NY 10017-4594 USA
Tel: 212 716 6148 Fax: 212 986 5039 E-mail: office@cuac.org Website: www.cuac.org

institutions. The Windsor report and any consequences will doubtless come up. Our focus there would still be to enable relationships which foster understanding and joint endeavour, and not to critique or judge.

We wish you well in the reporting task you and your group have before you, and also the task that the Primates and the ACC have before them.

We pray with the churches of our Communion that we may very much be "with another in Christ" and that we may "learn to love our brothers and sisters with the love shown to us in Jesus Christ our Lord".

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Don Thompson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Sincerely
(The Rev. Dr.) Don Thompson
General Secretary
dthompson@cuac.org

Name: Susanne Watson Epting - Anglican Communion Task Force on
Theological Education
Email: skwatsonepting@aol.com
Denomination: Episcopal Church
Location: USA

Subject: General Comments

The Windsor Report Questions for Consultation with the forty-four Churches of the Anglican Communion as formulated by the Primates? Standing Committee 18th October 2004

1. What in the description of the life of the Communion in Sections A & B can you recognize as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion? 2. In which ways do the proposals in Sections C & D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in Sections A & B?

My responses to Sections A and B are more specific and lengthier because of the foundation I believe those sections build for the rest of the Report. My responses to the question about Sections C & D are by and large, woven into the latter part of my response to Question 1.

In Section A the section on Biblical foundations is consistent not only with my understanding but I suspect, with the understanding of many Christians of many denominations around the world. Likewise in the section addressing the practical consequences of a healthy communion, a fairly expansive understanding of the Communion is described, particularly in paragraphs 7 and 8. However, as the document progresses, the definition of the Anglican Communion, I believe, becomes narrower, heavily dominated by the place and importance of the Instruments of Unity, more constrictive, less discerning, more authoritarian, more about the exercise of both authority and power. The inclusive, expansive and creative spirit in the description of our life together and our aspirations notably diminish.

I understand that this is because of the 'current crisis' we face. However, as the consultative bodies, companion dioceses, projects of common mission, engagement with ecumenical partners (paragraph 8) are left behind so too, I believe, are invaluable and vital parts of our life together that can aid in developing 'a common mind about how this great Communion might actually function together in those situations in which mutual discernment is necessary to sustain the life of the body.' And any sense of an appreciative or positive approach to both problem-solving and discernment, graced by the Spirit in creativity and imagination, is either lost or only 'squeezed' into legal and authoritative Instruments.

The section on recent mutual discernment within the Communion deals only with the ordination of women to the priesthood and subsequently to the episcopate. While there are clear examples of ways in which a consultative process was followed, there is little reflection of the honest and real pain that was felt by many parties. Indeed 'Anglicans can understand from this story

that decision-making on serious 'issues' can be carried out without division, despite a measure of impairment.' (paragraph 21) However, I believe we need to acknowledge clearly that our work with this issue, and the issue of the place of women in the Communion in general, is far from over. That priests ordained by women bishops are not recognized in some parts of the Communion points to a less ideal picture than what we might want to paint. While the major point here is the emphasis on consultative process, it might still be helpful to provide additional examples of those processes that would serve to strengthen the precedent and further to understand how these consultative processes applied 'over time,' might do more than avert the immediate threats.

The section on illness is set out clearly. It is also the section in which the emphasis on the Instruments of Unity begins to define the Communion in a more exclusive way than I understand it or experience it. The section talks exclusively about bishops and archbishops - a very small part of the Communion! And the 'controversy about the way in which the Lambeth resolution on sexuality (1998) was arrived at and voted on,' is glossed over. The sexuality debate and vote was hardly representative of the Communion at its best.

While the 'current crisis' led to the establishment of the Lambeth Commission, clearly we were already experiencing a degree of crisis that was being addressed, in part, by the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission. In a summary of a paper entitled 'Tuning Up The Instruments of Unity,' The Rev. Dr. Philip Thomas writes, 'I tried to illustrate how a better understanding of the roles of the instruments - which are distinct but not independent of each other, overlapping but not co-terminal, held together by bonds that are neither linear nor cumulative but, in the best sense of the word, charismatic. . . .It fantasized over a situation in which at Lambeth, instead of feeling obliged to pass decisive resolutions on every conceivable topic, the bishops had spent more time openly facing threats to their collegiality - and seriously listening to the best cases that could be put on both sides of the questions that divided them.' This points directly to my thoughts about the potentially over-simple statements in the section on the deeper symptoms of illness.

While it is worthwhile to explore the six underlying features of our common life, the story of what has happened points toward larger issues I feel are not addressed. Those issues are how we understand Anglicanism and how we understand culture. Both have dramatic impact on how we interpret both the challenges and the gifts that lie before us in our common life. This is demonstrated further in paragraph 40: 'The major cultural divisions in today's world, not least between the rich nations of western Europe and North America and the poorer nations of the rest of the world, have left their ugly mark on our ecclesial life.' I believe that this statement and all its implications point more accurately to the crisis we face than the issues of sexuality, and the subsequent behavior and escalated crisis are connected to more than one issue--manifestations of something much deeper to be addressed than resolution and authority around any one issue.

While I realize that the Lambeth Commission was called together because of particular events in our common life, I believe that to reinforce current structures and instruments and suggest specific actions to be taken without deeply and intentionally examining other root causes of our crisis, may be only temporarily effective and so pointed inward that while the bishops of our Communion may be more at peace, the witness of our collective life to a broken world will continue to be hampered by those cultural divides that our 'Anglican Way,' could so helpfully address. I will say more about the importance of this 'Anglican Way,' in subsequent paragraphs.

Section B does indeed begin to address the fundamental principles of the Communion we share. However, I believe that consistent with what is stated above, how we understand ourselves as Anglicans is a critical piece that is missing in the grounding of either Section A or B and were it present, would serve to strengthen the already hopeful and helpful section on Diversity in Communion. To say simply that the Anglican Communion would describe itself as that 'part of the Body of Christ which shares an inheritance through the Anglican tradition, that is, from the Church of England, whose history encompasses the ancient Celtic and Saxon churches of the British Isles, and which was given fresh expression during the period of the Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,' (paragraph 47) at this point in history may at best assume too much or too little about our common understanding, and at worst ignore the importance of what might be termed (at the risk of sounding somewhat confessional) a sort of 'Anglican Way.'

There is not time here to elaborate on all the potential that a more formal embrace of an expanded but common understanding of 'Anglican' might invite, but I am convinced that it is critical to contemporary discussions and attempts at consensus-building. Paragraph 41 in Section A does touch on this and I would strongly affirm the suggestion for more mutual exploration and explanation of our theological beliefs, our understanding of the Bible and our common life and witness. I believe this is every bit as important as the emphasis on the Instruments of Unity in constructively moving forward - perhaps more so - and would suggest this be incorporated as part of a solution. Without something like this the idea of a Covenant, I believe, is premature.

This becomes even more important when we consider the place of local expression in our tradition and points toward the importance of a shared acknowledgement of the importance and place of culture in the context of worldwide communion. Illustrated differently, I would suggest that we may not honestly know whether our current crisis is simply made worse by some of our cultural misunderstandings, or whether it came directly out of those differences. We may never know, but the important thing is that we cannot ignore the place of culture in forming who we are as Christians and as Anglicans.

While current divisions in American political life (as suggested in paragraph 40) may be exacerbating our lack of trust, it is also important to note historical

influences that may not yet have been analyzed in their impact on our common life. A brief review of the evolution of the British Empire and what it brought with it, in addition to the church, or a look at the unfortunate abuse of First Nations peoples in Canada, or the misappropriation of the church's power in other parts of the world, asks us (as reflected in the work of the Anglican Way subgroup mentioned above) to be aware of 'Anglicanism's past and present failures and its susceptibility to particular kinds of abuse (aspects of colonial heritage, excessive association with power and privilege, hierarchical authoritarianism, clericalism at the expense of the ministry of women and laity, its identification with Englishness).'

Even now for some of us the monarchical emphasis implicit in the episcopate, with three of the four official Instruments of Unity reinforcing that over and over, is not reflective of the real life of the Communion. Divisions between North and South, between richer nations and poorer nations are rooted from seeds broadcast in the fields of imperialism, colonialism, and materialism. I believe it is important that we proceed with caution in using this current crisis as the primary frame of reference for developing ongoing means of discernment and reconciliation. This risks resulting in temporary solutions and simply defusing the current crisis while the 'presenting issue' may only be the tip of the iceberg.

We know that the ways in which bishops are selected vary in different parts of the Communion. We know that the ways in which bishops are able to exercise ecclesiastical power (and sometimes other power as well) is different in various parts of the world. Given the differences in ecclesiastical polity, investing primarily in what we are currently calling the official Instruments of Unity, makes for a very bishop-heavy measure of unity. It may unintentionally imply a kind of conformity in the role and power of bishops that is not reflected universally in the Communion, and it certainly points toward how we value lay people, deacons and priests as a potential afterthought.

In an Anglican context where the most recent Instruments of Unity have come into being only in the last 40 years, might we not consider the addition of other Instruments, perhaps some of those we now call 'unofficial'? If we truly value a three-fold order of ministry might the Anglican Consultative Council not be expanded to ensure that not only lay people, but all three orders of ministry be represented in each delegation? Our emphasis on the Instruments of Unity seems also an emphasis on a monarchical model and with bishops being the overwhelming number represented and at every level, it seems a super-monarchy at that! Indeed how might the Instruments of Communion reflect the vitality and vibrancy, the suffering and the hope of the entire laos?

The section on 'Scripture and interpretation' can further be strengthened by how we acknowledge this tension. On the one hand we read that 'the message of scripture . . . must be preached and taught in all possible and appropriate ways. It is the responsibility of the whole Church' (paragraph 57) And yet paragraph 58 leads us to conclude that at the end of the day, only bishops are the real, authoritative teachers of scripture. The section on Diversity in Communion is a helpful tool and teaching on which we might all

reflect. I believe that, combined with additional consensus and teaching on the 'Anglican Way,' aforementioned, this could be commended for study at every level of the church.

In addressing more specifically the proposals made in Section C on 'Our Future Life Together' I need not reiterate my concern about the exclusive emphasis on the present Instruments of Unity. As to the recommendation on Canon Law and Covenant, I can agree that in theory a Covenant might be a way forward and should be seriously considered. However until we have an articulated common understanding of the 'Anglican' part of Anglican Communion, one that nudges us to use the tools and the processes inherent in the best of our tradition, I believe a Covenant may be premature. While it may be something we can aspire to, something we work toward, I believe that the best of what might be known as the 'Anglican Way,' along with the scriptural grounding of Communion, will help provide true covenantal language.

Finally on the section entitled 'The Maintenance of Communion,' it becomes increasingly difficult for me to comment. I understand and affirm that the work of the Commission has been in response to a specific mandate. It has been hard work carried out faithfully. But while the Commission's task was not to engage in the current debate about sexuality, it has been the constant point of reference. Whose issue is this really? What voices are being heard? There is no question that pain has been experienced on all sides of this issue.

And finally, as it relates to the maintenance of Communion, I believe that the Commission has commented precisely on what it said was not its mandate, albeit by virtue of its recommendations rather than a published stand on issues of sexuality. It is not as simple as, 'The process was not consultative enough,' rather it is 'Because this man is a gay man consultation was critical. Had you consulted, you would have known that a significant number of Primates in the Communion are unready or unwilling to accept this.' And then 'If ECUSA had moved forward in the same way' Would there then have been more reason, especially with the presence of a covenant, more reason and more credibility to ask ECUSA to leave the Communion?

Asking for a moratorium on the ordination of people in committed same-sex relationships is a commentary. Asking for a moratorium on the pastoral presence of the community with its gay and lesbian members through support of fidelity in their relationships is a commentary. And yet. I believe that sins of commission and sins of omission both require forgiveness. I believe the American Church omitted an important part of the process expected and owed as part of the Anglican Communion. The consultative process is important - critical. Forgiveness and repentance for hurts unnoticed or unknown or unanticipated is part of God's invitation to us and God's invitation through the church to us. All of us. But reception and discernment can only have meaning if we are open to receiving and if we are discerners. Where is provision for that in maintenance or covenant?

I often wonder if people around the world have any idea how wrenching this is

for some of us in ECUSA? I am not speaking of those who did not support the approval of the election of the Bishop of New Hampshire. I am speaking of those faithful people who, having said their prayers, decided that while this was not the best of all worlds - the way this came before the people in ECUSA, that after nearly 35 years of dialogue about the place of gay and lesbian people in our midst, we were being asked to cast a vote. I wonder if there is any level of openness or trust of the people of God who have been reading scripture and saying their prayers about this for decades. It also becomes more and more difficult to comment on the maintenance of Communion when 'the greatest tragedy of our current difficulties is the negative consequence it could have on the mission of the Church to a suffering and bewildered world.'

Indeed the longer our energies are diverted to one single issue, the more self-fulfilling the prophecy. Where do the other critical issues facing our world fit on the spectrum? Does this issue trump them all? What about the seeming never-ending violence against women? Or the deep divisions around distribution of wealth and resources? Around care of the earth? Around religious, racial or ethnic discrimination or oppression? Around genocide? Unjust war? How can we possibly say that because of this 'impasse' we will simply set aside the glorious possibilities that God can bring forth in the witness of faithful people? We will walk apart? How can we dismiss each other, any of us, no matter where we are in relation to this 'presenting issue'? How can we watch, in our minds' eyes, the Servant Christ, kneel not only to wash the feet of his faithful disciples, but of his betrayer, and say 'there is no room for you.' While we analyze the 'systems' that can both lead to or help us avoid institutional dysfunction, who is listening to the voices of our sisters in Africa dying of AIDS? Does our anguish, our preoccupation with the 'bonds of affection' strained by decisions that could have been better-made cloud our vision and dull our passion because our institutional life has such power over us? Does it now preclude people of different minds standing together in the midst of suffering? And while we strengthen the Instruments of Unity, who is carrying on the work of the church? Who is carrying out the mission? Who is binding wounds and stroking foreheads? Who is holding dying children, shooing flies, praying with dying grandmothers? Who is delivering relief to victims of the Tsunami? Surely it is not just bishops and archbishops and the archbishop of Canterbury. It is surely other faithful women and men from the length and breadth of this worldwide communion.

Does their Christ-like compassion, their devotion to the Gospel life not count as an instrument of unity? Do instruments of unity have only to do with doctrine and the exercise of power and authority? I know even from one small part of the institutional power structure how difficult it is even to make space for diaconal voices, for those who have been charged with holding Christ's call to service before the church. While we say we believe in a three-fold order, we seldom see all three orders. This, simply to say that I understand first-hand how we can on the one hand say that mission and discipleship and Christ-like service are important to us and yet, on the other, preoccupy ourselves with the maintenance of the institution. And if it is difficult to make space even for all the ministers of the church, how can we ensure that there is

space for those who cry for what we think we understand - the hope and the promise of God in Christ? All this is to say not that apologies and repentance are not important, but that in any attempt at maintenance, any way forward, any claim to who we are must actually be measured against the wailing of the children, the violation of our women, the thirst of those who have no clean water, the misuse and abuse of power, the oppression of the innocent and that they, they especially deserve our apologies, our efforts, our faithfulness, our witness, our very hope in Christ Jesus.

Susanne Watson Epting, Deacon Theological Education for the Anglican Communion Task Force Executive Director, North American Association for the Diaconate The Episcopal Church, USA TARGET GROUP: "THE ANGLICAN WAY"

Questions and issues to be explored by the Target Group:

1. Linked to Anglicanism as a whole Understanding and describing our unique ethos and contribution to the wider Church; defining the Anglican Way:

a. The Anglican Way, though rooted in its history and historical formularies, nevertheless is not fixed but continues to be shaped by its multiform cultural settings. The Anglican Way is a particular expression of the Christian Way (Acts 9:2).

b. Understanding and describing a distinctive theological method incorporating, for example, 'contemplative pragmatism', 'inhabiting doctrine', doing theology by preaching, liturgy, hymnody, artistic creativity, etc.

c. Scripture, tradition and reason: Reading the Bible together, corporately and individually, with a keen and critical sense of the past, a vigorous engagement with the present context, and with patient hope for the future.

d. Awareness and critical assessment of other defining characteristics commonly associated with Anglican identity - for example, spirituality nurtured by Word and Sacrament, Lambeth Quadrilateral, Book of Common Prayer, distinctive polity, comprehensiveness, unity in diversity, Via media, bridge between denominations, balance of freedom and order, balance of pastoral, mission and prophetic, exercise of ministry, etc

e. The polity of the Anglican Way includes the threefold order of bishop, priest and deacon, intended to be united collegially with the laity in synod; and the interaction of provincial, diocesan and parish structures, governed by constitutions and canons.

f. An approach to mission which is holistic, incarnational and transformational and which shapes the engagement of the church with the world in each context.

g. Acknowledgement of provisionality, incompleteness and vulnerability as potential strengths.

h. The four formal instruments of unity (Archbishop of Canterbury, Lambeth Conferences, the Anglican Consultative Council, the Primates' meeting) offer cohesion to global Anglicanism, limit the centralisation of authority, rely on bonds of affection for effective functioning but are put under strain in situations of acute disagreement. Other emerging instruments of unity include Anglican networks, commissions and taskforces.

i. Awareness of Anglicanism's past and present failures, and its susceptibility to particular kinds of abuse (for example, aspects of colonial heritage, excessive association with power and privilege, hierarchical authoritarianism, clericalism at the expense of the ministry of women and laity, its identification with Englishness, etc).

j. The Anglican Way encompasses communion (koinonia) with the united churches and other churches in full communion with the See of Canterbury. These relationships enrich our understanding and experience of koinonia.

k. The Anglican Way is deeply committed to building ecumenical relationships and strives to define itself through statements made in ecumenical dialogue.

2. Linked specifically to theological education How to provide the general components of the Anglican Way in denominational and ecumenical education and formation:

a. Identify and assess existing resources on the Anglican Way, including printed resources, courses and research programmes, audio-visuials, web resources, individuals, study centres, translations, etc.

b. Analysis of current level of teaching on the Anglican Way across the Communion.

c. Assess the relative merits of different modes of communication of the Anglican Way, especially for each of the four Target Groups and for theological educators.

d. Identification of new resources needed.

e. Recommendations on delivery of existing new resources.

Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations: Windsor Report

IASCER has been asked to respond to the Windsor Report in preparation for the meeting of the Primates in February 2005. Below are the initial reflections on the Report and its ecumenical implications, agreed at IASCER's meeting in December 2004.

The Windsor Report is a rich resource for ecumenical endeavours, offering mature consideration of Anglican self-understanding, grounded in Scripture, which invites partners to engage with the fundamental issues that it addresses.

These issues, and the Communion's response, have major ecumenical implications.

Reception of the Windsor Report: Implications for Ecumenical Relations

IASCER hopes the Communion will pursue the Report's recommendations, as this will significantly assist ecumenical relations. Not following this course is likely to complicate and further impair relations.

Provinces should note that ecumenical partners will follow their responses in close detail.

IASCER welcomes in principle the proposal for a Council of Advice for the Archbishop of Canterbury (§111,112). This should contain ecumenical expertise and be charged with considering ecumenical dimensions of the matters before it, in conjunction with appropriate advice from IASCER.

IASCER also welcomes in principle the proposal for an Anglican Covenant (§118-120). This could have major implications for the conduct of ecumenical relations, as a covenant might clarify the process by which the Anglican Communion makes decisions about proposed ecumenical agreements.

IASCER believes the recognition and articulation of the body of shared principles of Canon Law could strengthen the ecclesial character of the Anglican Communion (§113-117).

In their legislation, Anglican provinces should always be mindful of their local and global ecumenical responsibilities (§47, 79, 130).

Associated Developments in Ecumenical Relations

Several ecumenical partners have reacted strongly to the developments behind the Windsor Report (§28, 130).

Consequentially, there is a slow-down in some bilateral dialogues during what partners see as this unstable period prior to provinces' responses to the Report. Some have questioned whether we are a reliable and consistent ecumenical partner.

Nevertheless, partners have appreciated our ecumenical intent, shown by seeking their contributions to the Lambeth Commission, and now inviting their responses to the Report.

IASCER looks forward to studying these responses, as a further contribution to our ecumenical relations.

The Windsor Report as a Resource for Ecumenical Relations

Many of the Report's themes are prominent in ecumenical relations, eg the nature of the Church and local, regional and international ecclesial bodies, and relationships between them; authority; the instruments of unity; and episcopé, including primacy.

Koinonia refers primarily to the life of the one Church of Christ. Its theological principles therefore are relevant both to the life of the Anglican Communion and to ecumenical relations (Section B in particular). Fractures in communion are always serious and care should be exercised in using such expressions as 'impaired communion.'

The report also articulates a vision of the nature of Anglicanism which can be offered in ecumenical relations. Whatever we say about the Anglican Communion and its ecumenical relations should be brought to the touchstone of the four credal marks of the Church – One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic (§49).

Issues for Further Consideration

Many partner churches experience similar tensions over human sexuality. They also face the legislative redefinition of marriage in many countries (§28). We might profitably share with each other our continuing work on the theological understanding of human sexuality, and its grounding in Scripture, tradition and reason.

Many provinces have entered various Covenants with partners: fuller theological reflection on the meaning of Covenant might help our understanding of our interdependence.

IASCER considers that ecumenical relations would be assisted by further careful clarification of terminology (eg distinguishing between homosexual orientation and practice; also clarifying usage of 'church' between the Universal Church and its Anglican expressions).

Ecumenical relations would similarly be helped by fuller exploration and articulation of the following matters to which the Windsor Report refers:

- The role of the Archbishop of Canterbury – noting the Communion-wide ministry of the Archbishop of Canterbury as an Instrument of Unity, and in the service of the other Instruments of Unity (§108-110). *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* speaks of personal, collegial and communal dimensions of ministry operating at every level of the Church's life (BEM: Ministry, III.B.27).
- Adiaphora – noting that Hooker spoke rather of 'things accessory to salvation' (§36,37)
- The 'common good' – noting this applies within the Anglican Communion, and within the Universal Church and wider world (§51,80)
- Covenant – noting that several provinces have entered various types of covenant with ecumenical partners, and that fuller theological reflection on the meaning and expression of covenant may help our understanding of our familial relationship (§119)
- Language used to describe interdependence within the Anglican Communion, which may help us, and our partners, better understand and live out the autonomy within mutual commitments.

Montego Bay, December 2004

Windsor Report

www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/index.cfm

Response from IAWN, International Anglican Women's Network to Archbishop Kwong's three questions

1. How can the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion be helped to stay together?
2. How should a Christian behave when another Christian does something which they believe is deeply offensive to the Gospel?
3. Would you like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate ways?

This response is a compilation of answers from women of the Provinces of Canada, Central Africa, and the United States of America.

1. How can the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion be helped to stay together?

In order to stay together everyone must learn to truly listen in a non-judgmental way to each other. When groups speak from positions which others cannot fully understand, and judge without a serious attempt at understanding, the result is division and deep hurt.

One person said it this way:

“The ‘you versus us’ thinking which I experienced last year was very unsettling. It dawned on me that I was viewed as the ‘other side’ instead of ‘another Anglican’. I was an idea and not a person.”

People must be allowed to follow their consciences, yet, at the same time, accept differences and embrace them.

However, there is no formula for making people do that.

Education can help but it takes conviction from the top for it to be successful.

Archbishop Rowan Williams has our strongest support as he does a job which none of us might have the courage to do. It is a no-win situation at present, and yet he is required by God to lead. We respectfully submit, when he feels that it is the right time, that he call people of differing positions together to talk. There should be approximately an equal number of people in the various “camps”. If the divisive situation is about a particular group of people, then one of the sub-groups should be comprised of those people. This is very important as supported by the following research:

The United Nations Equal Opportunities Commission 2003 released Info Paper #CB(2)1636/02-03(01). I extract the parts that refer to women holding 30% of the seats in decision-making bodies.

“Nuclear physics theory teaches that, for there to be a nuclear explosion, a minimum amount of plutonium is needed. The minimum amount is named the critical mass.

The concept of critical mass was applied to gender analysis in the mid-1970’s by an American feminist scholar, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, who was studying women in business. She reviewed studies of the behaviour of minorities in task-oriented groups to find out the level of participation that was necessary for the minority members to function effectively as a group to press their interests. She estimated that when the proportion of minority members reached about 30%, they were able to influence decision-making autonomously as a group. At levels lower than that, effectiveness required the minority members to act more like those of the majority and, failing that, they would be ineffective and lonely dissenters.”

So not only does research recommend dialogue amongst people of differing view, but so does the IAWN.

We suggest a process that would include the following steps:

Determine the deep truth that underlies the difference. The conversation might begin with questions such as:

- God sustains me. Would you agree that God sustains you?
- I am comforted by the presence of Jesus. Have you been comforted by the words “carried in the arms of Jesus”?
- What kind of a person am I becoming? Is the Holy Spirit continuing the work in me that I may be “made like unto him”? Does the Holy Spirit work in you?

Search out a few passages of Scripture that are foundational to Christianity and check if there is agreement as to the interpretation, such as:

John 3:17 God did not send the Son into the world to condemn the world, but in order that the world might be saved through him.

Micah 6:8 What does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?

Ephesians 4:2-3 With all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, making every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

Be reminded of the traditional Anglican reluctance to define our theology beyond the ancient Creeds and the 39 Articles. This allows us the possibility of unfolding revelation.

Not only should there be a High Level Conversation (to borrow a descriptive phrase from the United Nations), there should also be conversations at the grassroots.

Through partnerships between dioceses across cultures and continents, it is hoped that we would learn to respect each other's cultural and socio-economic context fully, including the fact that priorities in each of these contexts vary greatly.

Through prayer, engage in meaningful intercession for one another's needs and concerns.

Through other creative ventures such as use of the media, internet, web sites, encourage people to talk to each other, to learn about each other, and to work together.

“We need to listen to each other's stories. When truths are told and heard, change and reconciliation may/can happen. We believe this is so with native issues in Canada and New Zealand, and also with reconciliation in South Africa. If we are not tolerant enough to listen to one another, (and that does not mean necessarily accepting that the other's truth as our truth), then communion will not happen. We believe that is what the IAWN is about: hearing from one another and developing some understanding of the other's concerns and situation.”

2. How should a Christian behave when another Christian does something which they believe is deeply offensive to the Gospel?

Rejoice in God who creates diversity beyond our imagination and pray that we may embrace the fullness of that diversity. Also, recognize that God-given free will may lead to behaviour that is abusive and may compromise the safety of others. Such behaviour must be stopped.

In situations where the action is deeply offensive, but not abusive, and does not compromise the safety of others, then it may be necessary to take a “time out” from argument, to allow people to become peaceful within themselves until they can resume respectful dialogue.

Listening is crucial. And sometimes it is not easy.

Using a parallel from family therapy:

We need to learn in some new ways the meaning of "maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace", and not take the easy route of relational cut offs. The latter is such a common (and worldly) emotional stance, rooted in reactivity, and does not become the people of God. It is the way of divorce, and of broken relationships, where, in so many instances, the more difficult path of truly listening to one another and walking a path of peace together is not attempted. When people use self-righteousness to justify cut-offs, it is rarely constructive.

In telling our stories and having others listen with compassion, we feel nurtured. In prayer, we speak to God knowing that God is listening with compassion, so we feel enfolded and supported and nurtured. It is in such an environment that people grow to their full potential.

To refuse to listen to another's story is to stand in judgement of who that person is.

God's love is unconditional. IAWN urges the Anglican Communion to listen with compassion, and to emulate God's love.

“Let us continue to support each other in prayer, let us continue to listen to each other and to walk with each other in this broken world, which is desperately in need of our witness.”

3. Would you like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate ways?

“We must move closer together” is the unanimous and passionate response of every Anglican woman who, informally or formally, responded to question 3.

Quote from a written response:

“Look at the potential for ministry, support, communion, fellowship, within the IAWN alone; so much work to be done, so many ways to serve, so many blessings for women by being a member of the international network within the Anglican Communion. How hurtful to all of us around the world to break that connection. We in IAWN must have a way to do our work and have our "sisterhood" and I am for "moving forward together" so that we don't lose this.”

And from another:

“Of course, it is desirable that all churches move closer together, not just in our Anglican communion but ecumenically too. Jesus prayed "that they might be one". I would hope that it not be necessary to move in separate ways but if an issue becomes another "Tower of Babel" (separating) situation, I believe that God's people will eventually work toward harmony. It may take more time than any of us have on this earth, but I believe that it will and must happen. “

And from Africa:

“If the Anglican Communion wishes to make an impact in a world full of divisions and hostilities, going our separate ways is no option at all. We must try by all means to stay together as a communion. The strength of the Anglican Communion has always been that it can accommodate high and low churches, hence is tolerant to a variety of ways in which the gospel can be lived. By all means we should try to keep that ethos. Some of us who live in very difficult situations have learnt to cherish the Anglican family. If it were not for the prayers

of so many of our Anglican friends in all the corners of the world, I doubt we would persevere in face of so many challenges surrounding us.”

Respectfully submitted by the International Anglican Women’s Network

The Rev’d Canon Alice Medcof,	International Coordinator, IAWN, Canada
Elizabeth Loweth,	Ethics and Justice Portfolio, IAWN, Canada
June Dyer	Ecumenical Portfolio, IAWN, Canada,
Marie Reinsdorff,	Link Women Twinning Project, IAWN, USA
Liese Tamburino,	Link Women Twinning Project, IAWN, USA,
Ruth Bakare	Province of Central Africa Link Woman, IAWN, Zimbabwe
Annette Graydon	Province of Canada Link Women, IAWN, Canada
	Immediate Past President of the Canadian Mothers’ Union
Laura Wilson	Secretary, IAWN, Canada,
Diane Marshall	President, Institute of Family Living, Canada

With thanks to the late Primate of Canada, the Most Reverend Edward S. Scott, for some of the forgoing ideas.

The Windsor Report: Response from the Network for Inter Faith Concerns

Preamble

NIFCON (the Network for Inter Faith Concerns of the Anglican Communion) was, like other Networks of the Anglican Communion, invited to reflect back from its perspective to the Windsor Report Reception Reference Group.

We therefore consulted the following groups of people and invited comment from them

1. The Management Group of NIFCON
2. Provincial Correspondents and lead Bishops throughout the Anglican Communion who have been designated by their Provinces to relate to our Network.
3. The approximately 35 people who were involved in NIFCON's first consultation in Bangalore, India in August-September 2003. (There was an element of overlap between this group and Groups 1 and 2)
4. The Anglican members of the Al Azhar dialogue committee, which NIFCON administers on behalf of the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

In view of the particular brief of our Network, and bearing in mind that a number of people we were corresponding with might also be responding to the Windsor Report in other capacities, we amended the suggested questions to which we asked our constituency to respond so that they had a particular focus on the inter faith dimension.

The questions we drafted and sent out were:

1. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Windsor Report would impact on the life of the Communion and on your work in inter faith relations if they were to be implemented?

2. How far do you believe that the existence of the Anglican Communion as a worldwide Communion of Churches is important in enabling your work and involvement with people of other faiths?

- *locally*
- *nationally*
- *regionally*
- *internationally*

Feel free to make any further comments on the Windsor Report from the perspective of your involvement with inter faith concerns.

We received 19 replies in total, though a few of these were little more than expressions of good wishes and willingness to be in contact. Most of the others were written as semi personal emails either to myself, Clare Amos (the Coordinator of NIFCON) or my colleague, Susanne Mitchell, (the Administrator of NIFCON). They would not therefore be appropriate to reproduce in their entirety, but their content underlies this response which I am writing.

The exceptions to this were two formal responses received

1. From Bishop Christopher Epting, the Ecumenical and Inter Faith Bishop of ECUSA
2. From Bishop Michael Jackson, the Church of Ireland Lead Bishop for Inter Faith issues (who is also the Chair of NIFCON's Management Group).

Bishop Epting's response is substantially geared to his involvement with ecumenical relations – and presumably has also been received by those seeking 'Ecumenical' responses. However the detailed response from the Church of Ireland's Committee of Christian Unity (Inter-Faith Section) is appended to this submission – though the points it raises are also referred to in the text below.

Response from NIFCON

1. It was salutary that a number of the responses reminded us of the comparative insignificance of the Anglican presence in various parts of the world. Responses from Scotland, Fiji and Japan for example specifically commented that within the field of inter faith relations in particular Anglicans were perceived simply as a part of the wider Christian group, and that therefore the Windsor Report (and the issues it raised or dealt with) were not particularly significant – at least in relation to the Church's engagement with inter faith concerns.

2. On the other hand there are areas of the world where, although Anglicans are numerically very small, the specific concerns of the Anglican Communion are high profile. One of these areas is the Middle East, perhaps partly due to its importance in international politics and the traditional involvement of Britain in the area, and partly due to the historic importance of the region for Christianity, Islam and Judaism. This has meant that several initiatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the field of inter faith relations are focused in this region. It would be true to say that the Anglican leadership of the Province of Jerusalem and the Middle East feels that the presenting issue which led to the setting up of the Lambeth Commission and the preparation of the Windsor Report had made them feel more vulnerable in their minority situation. In a situation in which Christians are perceived by members of the majority community in their country as 'representatives of the West' (even though this is a distortion of the reality) it is understandable that members of indigenous Anglican communities feel that their powerlessness and vulnerability is not adequately appreciated by their fellow Anglicans. This seems to have led to a particular view of what the Windsor Report is trying to achieve, and perhaps in some circles not a full appreciation of all its nuances.

3. Broadly and perhaps inevitably speaking those whose own experience and engagement with inter faith concerns was primarily at the national or international level perceived most acutely the importance for their work of the existence of the Anglican Communion as a worldwide Communion of Churches.. Those whose engagement was focused around particular localities felt a specifically 'Anglican Communion' link to be of comparatively little significance. Comment was made however that the diversity of contexts within the Anglican Communion was valuable (and important not to lose) because it could help give

the lie to the sweeping and simplistic generalizations which underlie the ‘clash of civilisations’ account of the contemporary international scene.

4. There was an acknowledgement that there was a particular issue in the field of Christian Muslim relations. One respondent acknowledged that there was perhaps more difficulty in speaking with Muslims than for example, with Buddhists, precisely because both Christianity and Islam are competing ethical monotheisms. Perhaps linked to this apparent sense of competitiveness, homosexuality can be perceived by Muslims as an example of ‘Christian Western decadence’. The apparent disapproval by Muslims of this has impacted already on Christian-Muslim relations, for example, in the withdrawal of the Muslim delegation from Al Azhar from the dialogue meeting planned in New York in 2003. However several of the responses were concerned to point out that Islam was in reality far less monolithic that it is often perceived as being, either by many Christians or Muslims. One respondent referred to overtly Muslim ‘gay’ groups in both the US and Canada, and another to the practice of homosexuality in countries such as Nigeria and Egypt. In other words, whatever one’s view of homosexuality might be, it would be wrong for Christians to allow it to be pigeonholed as simply a Western Christian issue – and that it would be unhelpful if some of the more strident responses to the Windsor report encouraged such a perception.

5. Following on from the previous point, several of the respondents felt that the Windsor report offered opportunities for Christians to move beyond the defensive positions in which Muslims sometimes sought to place them, and indeed to offer a model of the valuing of collegiality in difference that could be helpfully creative in the area of inter faith discussion. Indeed the Windsor Report was appreciated by some respondents as an example of the ‘Anglican Way’ of doing theology, and there was the hope that some adherents of other faiths might be impressed with the determination of the Communion to remain in communion in spite of the strains and tensions of differing convictions. In the specific case of relations with Islam, it was felt that the Windsor process could even, ideally, assist Muslims in engaging with currently neglected aspects of their own theological tradition.

A respondent from the Church of England commented:

‘The Windsor Report sets out a vision of communion based on bonds of affection which are able to hold together individuals and communities who disagree radically on issues which they regard as being of fundamental importance. I believe that the development of structures of collegiality-in-difference of this kind could be a distinctively Anglican contribution, not only to ecclesiology, but by extension to inter faith relations also. Christians and Muslims, for example, have to find ways in today's world of affirming their commitment to one another under God while also acknowledging their fundamental differences and disagreements. An intra-Anglican modelling of a similar dynamic through a communion built on interpersonal relations rather than on juridical systems could give encouragement to the growth of appropriate inter faith networks of shared concern and exploration. In an article to be published in the *Journal of Anglican Studies* on “Anglican approaches to Christian-Muslim dialogue”, Michael Ipgrave wrote: “Such an [Anglican] approach can surely have a direct relevance beyond the body of the

Christian Church. In Christian-Muslim relations, one of the pressing needs of the current day is precisely to develop structures of collegiality which will allow believers and communities in the two faiths to work together while recognising the differences which distinguish them. There are many factors which can inhibit co-operation between Christians and Muslims – social, political, economic and ethnic divisions may breed suspicion of or hostility towards the other on either side. Such difficulties can be inflamed by a failure to deal honestly and respectfully with fundamental differences between the two religions. There are unquestionably points at which Christians and Muslims, who both care passionately about truth, will disagree with one another. The challenge is to find ways of exploring those disagreements in a spirit of mutual respect and genuine enquiry, rather than merely seeking to undermine or belittle the other. The Anglican experience suggests that a sense of collegiality between people who disagree in matters of faith can be sustained by an attitude which speaks more in terms of humans' participation in the truth of God rather than of possession of that truth. The language of common participation does not and should not in itself overcome serious differences of belief, but it can help to transpose those differences into their properly theological context, and to purge them from the self-seeking rancour with which humans so often invest them".'

Referring specifically to the use of scriptural texts there were two detailed comments made. One, from the Church of Ireland, suggested: 'The proper emphasis on the authority of the triune God exercised through Scripture is important in that it asserts the Trinity of God as fundamental to communion as such, underwrites the importance of Scripture in the life of the church and articulates the conviction that the unfettered presence of God in the world stands alongside a lived Bible in the witness of self-conscious Anglicans to God with and for others. Scripture, the Report suggests, is not self-interpreting from its own text. Neither is it so comprehensively culturally circumscribed in its current ecclesiastical contexts as to be incapable of liberating peoples from an economically, philosophically or politically oppressive setting and system. Its own freedoms come from its being a series of historical documents inspired by God and which are to be applied critically in local situations. This is an important tool in the application of Scripture in Inter-Faith Encounter.'

Another respondent, Dr David Thomas, Lecturer in Christian-Muslim relations at the University of Birmingham, commented that: 'On the matter of the process of discerning God's will and the truth in any matter, what has happened in the affair and the Church's response can help us to explain that the Anglican Church holds that truth is often not to be comprehended by human minds in any simple or immediate way such as reading a verse of scripture or an authoritative saying. The Church affirms that God acts by speaking through scripture to rationally endowed human minds in particular historical and social contexts. It follows that the community has the task of discerning what is communicated by listening, discerning, discussing and discriminating, and that some individuals or parts of the Church may apprehend truth before others. This means that we can never all be certain what the truth on any matter is except slowly and sometimes painfully. For those Muslims - a majority these days - who may assert that truth is to be found in verses from the Qur'an and sayings of the Prophet

which do not require a process of interpretation, this alternative form of appreciating God's truth can come as a challenge to think about their attitude towards scripture and their principles of understanding. It may also be a means of instruction about the ways in which their own scriptural sources have, in fact, been the constant objects of interpretation and discussion through the centuries, so that teachings that are often regarded by the majority to be direct divine injunctions are in fact the product of consensus views established at particular times and places. Faced with arguments that Christianity often appears not to know what it teaches, it is important to hold onto the principle that there is usually no simple or direct or indeed exclusive way of knowing what the truth is in any particular situation, but that long discussions and sometimes painful disagreements have to take their course.

At the same time, it is also important to stress that the Church can bear disagreements without losing its unity. The present experience may be a defining instance of this, and through it the necessity to seek the consensus way without recourse to hasty recriminations and accusations is brought out.'

And linked to the issue of social ethics Dr Thomas continued:

'On the specific matter of homosexuality, people in interfaith work can take this crisis as an opportunity to explain the way in which the Church attempts to face current social realities without hasty condemnation or indifference, while attempting to remain loyal to scriptural teachings and its inherited traditions. Again, it is not a simple matter of identifying isolated Biblical verses, but of considering all the information that is available, including that from medical and psychological findings, and from elsewhere, in order to see what is the appropriate response in conformity with Christian principles to this challenge.

The potentially embarrassing events that gave rise to the Windsor Report can be turned to some good, as they give Christians involved in interfaith relations opportunities to explain how Anglicans perceive the relationship between revelation and other sources of understanding God's intentions. It would be easy to abandon Anglican principles in face of the challenge to say something definite, but that would be to abandon the vocation Anglicans have been given.'

6. Comments were also made that the Windsor Report could act specifically as an encouragement to Anglicans (and other Christians) to engage in inter faith relations. The 'spirit' that was prepared to wrestle with the valuing and holding together of difference was actually the same spirit that encouraged Christians to engage more widely with those beyond the doors of the Christian church. This had implications for both mission and inter faith dialogue. A response from the West Indies noted how it was the Anglican insistence on the doctrine of *adiaphora* that allowed Anglicans to participate much more readily than some other Christians in the celebrations of their brothers and sisters of other faiths. A response from Ireland commented that, 'Important in Inter-Faith Encounter is the freedom to explore theology together across the divide as well as manifesting a respect in personal and institutional dealings. The discussion of *adiaphora* and *Subsidiarity* can be expanded in the facilitation of such Encounter as an expression of Christian conviction and outreach in such a way as to be locally elastic but still bound by

a common obedience to God rather than being seen as a selling out on principles.’ The same respondent reflected on some of the rhetoric which is accompanying the current discussion about the Windsor Report and the presenting issue. ‘In relation to mission in particular an emerging anxiety felt by many is that the boomerang may be swinging towards a Southern Hemisphere evangelization of the Northern Hemisphere which could prove to be no more than colonialism in reverse. If such an initiative were to become an established pattern within Anglicanism and base itself too heavily or indeed exclusively on a missiology of conversion, it would play havoc with Inter-Faith Encounter. It is also mission although not always recognized as such.’

7. Finally, there was the valuable observation that engagement in inter faith (and ecumenical) activity was actually important for the health and well being of Anglicanism. ‘It is our conviction that ecumenism and Inter-Faith relations are integral to the mission of a Communion which wishes, as indeed the signs suggest, to avoid internal implosion by too assiduous a quest for consensus and also to avoid internal explosion by unilateral subsidiarity.’ Communion, it was stated, is ecclesiology with a mission. The proposed Covenant with its doctrine of voluntary cohesion is to be valued precisely because it does nothing to undermine or impede engagement with people of other faiths. As those whose task it is to keep the need for sensitive engagement with the ‘others’ before the eyes of our fellow Anglicans throughout the world, we feel there is much in the Windsor Report, read in all seriousness and fullness, that could be valuable for our work.

Rt Revd Michael Jackson
Chair, NIFCON Management Group

Clare Amos,
Coordinator, NIFCON

with assistance from Susanne Mitchell,
Administrator, NIFCON

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION - NETWORK FOR INTER FAITH CONCERNS **WINDSOR REPORT**

1. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Windsor Report would impact on the life of the Communion and your work in inter faith relations if they were to be implemented?

The Windsor Report, to my mind, has come out at a time when the Anglican Communion worldwide needed an assurance from Lambeth that the events that occurred in America and Canada will never happen again. It has also come out at a time when it seems that the communion is in danger of disintegration. The Report (to my mind) is an instrument meant to re-awaken the minds of Anglicans worldwide to the responsibilities and obligations that we owe each other. St. Paul's description of the Church as the body of Christ explains why if one part of the body is sick, the rest of the body is affected. If one Diocese decides to go its own way, I wonder if they will stop and think how much harm that they are causing to the rest of the body. How much strain and stress that is inflicted to the rest of the body. The report quite clearly comes out with this point.

The "bonds of affection" or what we call in African terms, "the bonds of kinsmanship" as emphasized by the Report is another great instrument of this communion or "Koinonia" as St. Paul describes the kind of fellowship that the Church must be. In this great fellowship, we no longer live unto ourselves but we exist so that others may exist. In Africa, communal living is part of our existence. If there is a quarrel within the community, it is the duty of the elders of the community to bring unity and harmony and their judgement is final. One big problem that we have in the communion is the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury has no legislative authority to make rulings or pass decrees.

I was pleased to read in the Windsor Report the recommendations made in Section C-1, that "The Archbishop of Canterbury should be acknowledged as having a special ministry, to speak for the whole communion on matters of dispute. To assist him in this ministry, it is proposed that he should have a Council of Advice appointed from a cross section of the communion to assist him in discerning the view of the communion." The Pope has the legal and canonical authority to pass decrees and they are binding on all Roman Catholics and their Institutions. In the Anglican Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury has no such powers. Instead, it is a process of consultation and dialogue. I have come to the conclusion that the Anglican Communion is a loose union of Dioceses. This loose union has its advantages though I believe that the voice and authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury has to be strengthened in this century considering the many problems and schisms facing the communion.

If all the recommendations and proposals of the Windsor report are adopted by all Dioceses in the communion as an instrument of peace and reconciliation, then we would have saved the communion from disintegration. At the present, the witness of the Anglican communion and its authority as an agent of peace, has been threatened. For those of us who live and work with people of other faith, the matter of homosexuality and the consecration of a homosexual Bishop in America, has dampened the relationship between Muslims and Christians in this country. These acts have dwarfed the height not only of the Anglican communion but also Christendom as a whole.

However, the report itself clearly stated that it is not judgemental. That is part of a process. It is part of a pilgrimage towards healing and reconciliation.

2. How far do you believe that the existence of the Anglican communion as a worldwide communion of churches is important in enabling your work and involvement with other people of other faiths?

(a). Locally: I live and work in the capital city of Freetown. Here, it is a mixed blend of people - pluralist society. The concept of the Anglican communion being a "unity in diversity" helps me

to interact with people of other faiths. Some Muslims are sometimes amazed when I talk about Anglican Arab Christians or Indians or Pakistani Christians. I tried to give them the impression that the Anglican communion worldwide is an umbrella made up of several colors but that we are all united in matters of faith and worship. The concept of unity is an amazing reality in the eyes of Muslims.

(b). Nationally: Certain people still hold some misconceptions and in some cases, bad feelings about the Anglican communion. They connect Anglicanism with colonialism. National Anglican churches have not helped the situation either. They still appear in their worship and dress code as Europeans. Talk of indigenizing the worship patterns of the church is still a concept and not a reality. This, in some cases, hampers the growth of the church. Added to this, is this issue of homosexuality and the consecration of a homosexual Bishop in America. People of other faiths see these events as an anathema. They view this with complete dismay and hate. These events have strained the relationship and religious tolerance that existed with people of other faiths. Muslims now view us with suspicion. They feel offended and hurt that the Anglican communion can condone such evil. This recent development has not created an enabling atmosphere for dialogue with people of other faiths.

(c): Regionally: Because of the belief held by Anglicans that the Anglican Communion is a worldwide communion of churches, it has co-operated with other denominations to do mission and evangelism. This Diocese was one of the founding fathers of the "Islam in Africa Project" which had its headquarters in Nigeria. This project was founded mainly to engage Muslims to enter into a healthy dialogue so as to reduce religious tensions, though primarily, the main thrust was evangelism.

Here in Sierra Leone, this Diocese is also a foundation and a member of the Inter-religious Council of Sierra Leone. This agency was to foster unity between the two main religious bodies in Sierra Leone i.e Islam and Christianity. It was also, as part of its objectives, to look at ways in which both religious bodies could work together to promote development and reconciliation after the conclusion of the ten years rebel war. Some of these objectives were on through workshops, seminars and numerous meetings of the different religious bodies.

Windsor Report 2004

Questions for Consultation with the forty four Churches of the Anglican Communion as formulated by the Primate's Standing Committee 18th October 2004

Q.1. What in the description of the life of the Communion in Section A & B can you recognise as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

A.1. With our understanding of the Anglican Communion, the Section A & B, by and large, can be recognised as consistent. Moreover it helps us to understand the Bible fully, as many of our people in Myanmar read it literally. It also provides us the fully meaning of some terms, e.g., "adiaphora", "unity", "autonomy", the "Anglican Communion." It also help us to comprehend our faith and order which we have been practicing.

Q.2. In which ways do the proposals in the Section C & D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in Sections A & B?

A.2. The proposals in section C & D flow appropriately from Section A & B because they highlight the historical events which the Anglican Church and Anglican Communion had been practised. Based on the incomplete practice and understanding, Section C & D proposed some recommendations and proposals for the future of the Anglican Communion to be able to stay together as a "Communion." Moreover they also enlighten and enrich our understanding.

Q.3. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented?

A.3. If the Anglican Covenant be adopted some provinces would be happy and some would be sad. It depend on their ecclesiastical and theological orientation. But one thing is worthy to be noted that for those who don't want to follow it, they will just put aside the recommendations and proposals of the Report and would not use it. If they are really be put into practice, it would give more authority to the Archbishop of Canterbury and other instruments be involved in any controversial or dispute issue in the communion and could give more advice and help as a family member.

Q. 4. How would you evaluate the arguments for Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 of the Report? How far do the elements included in the possible draft for such a covenant in Appendix Two of the Report represent an appropriate development of the existing life of the Anglican Communion?

A.4. The arguments for Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 and in Appendix Two of the Report are very good, but do not cover every thing which will happen in the 44 churches. But generally, it is quite good because the inter-Anglican relations would become better than before and the relationship of each province will become more smoothly with greater concern and respect of each other. It is also good for each province to exercise true local autonomy which will not hurt the other provinces and encourage and comfort each other when one is really in need and facing great sorrow.

Questions on the Windsor Report for dialogue with our ecumenical partners

Q.1. What do you find helpful in the Windsor Report 2004?

A.1. The Windsor report reminded us what the Anglican Communion should be and live peacefully in unity in the future life of the Anglican Communion. It also reminds us how to interpret the "authority of the Bible and the autonomous authority, etc." If the recommendations and proposals in the Report be confirmed and implemented the role of the mentioned Four Instruments of Unity together with "A Council of Advice" would have more authority and clear functions, and would be able to give more specific and practical guidance or advice whenever a controversial issue occurs in the Communion. One fact is to be noted that some people regard the Windsor Report as it is against the Bible. Some said, the report is meant to be read only but not to judge what has happened recently in the North America.

Q.2. What questions does the report raise from the perspective of your church?

A.2. After long and frequent discussions, the Church of the Province of Myanmar raised some questions, e.g., what is "communion"? As practising before and now, only the Archbishop of Canterbury has had direct relationship to the 44 churches, but for each province there is no rule for having direct relationship to another province (though the report surely mentions about this kind of relationship in the communion), but we never have seen in practice. As far as we know and have been practising each diocese makes and has a link with another diocese in the communion, e.g., the Diocese of Yangon has a link with the Diocese of Liverpool. If each province has direct relationship only with the Archbishop of Canterbury, how could a province has a voice to advice other provinces which did something which is controversial? So can this kind of relationship be called communion? Anyway, the Windsor Report help us to understand fully the meaning of "communion" which is really practical for doing God's mission in this planet.

How can the words of Jesus, and Paul, for example, be put into practice in terms of the relationship between the 44 churches? "Do not judge,you will be judged with the measure you use.....", "Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eyes and pay no attention to the plank in you own eye?", "Rejoice with those who rejoice, mourn with those who mourn." (Matt 7:1-4, Ro 12:15, Life Application Study Bible, NIV). There are many texts which speak about to love, to forgive and to accept each other in the Bible, which has the highest authority on us, according to our Anglicans belief. In the Old Testament, e.g., Job, "".....Shall we accept good from God, and not trouble? (NIV) Job 2:10b)

Q.3. If the recommendations of the Windsor report were implemented, how would this affect your church's relation with the Anglican Communion as an ecumenical partner?

A.3. There would be no problem for the Church of the Province of Myanmar. We can even have better relationship with the Anglican Communion than before. We have been longing to see and have these kinds of "Covenant." The recommendations in the report also strengthen the bond in the Anglican community, and also help us to know our true identity and mission as believers, in the body of Christ.

Suggestions for more general questions

Q.1. How can the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion be helped to stay together?

A.1. The 44 Churches of the Anglican communion can help each other and stay together by practising truth, love, forgiveness, acceptance and other virtues in the Scriptures and try to give wholeness to each other as Jesus and the Apostles want us to be. We can help each other by exhorting and sharpen our understanding of the communion."

Q.2. How should a Christian behave when another Christian does something which they believe is deeply offensive to the Gospel?

A.2. The answer for this question is clear. Just love them everything would be alright. "The entire law is summed up in a single command: "Love your neighbour as yourself." (Gal. 5:14 NIV). Actually, if we measure our behaviour with the Gospel (Bible) we are all sinners in one way or another. We also are reminded not to forget the baptismal covenant to live in the truth of Light.

Q.3. Would you like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate way?

A.3. We would like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together. We expect the Anglican/Episcopal churches have mutual understanding, mutual love and have a common covenant for the benefit of all churches in the Anglican Communion, which will prevent schism. As peace cannot be kept by force, but only through understanding, each church must understand each other. Only then the direction will lead to moving closer together.

Saw Maung Doe, Principal Holy Cross College, Province of Myanmar
Member of TEAC Laity Target Group

Theological Education for the Anglican Communion (TEAC)
Submission to Windsor Report Reference Group

Theological Education for the Anglican Communion (TEAC) is a working party established by the Anglican Primates. It has been tasked with making recommendations for the improvement of Theological Education (for bishops, priests, deacons and licensed lay ministers, and for the laity) throughout the Communion. Its findings and recommendations will be presented to the Primates meeting in 2007 and will feed into the 2008 Lambeth Conference. Along with other working groups and Networks TEAC was invited to contribute its reflection on the Windsor Report. The Steering Group asked the Coordinator of TEAC to send out the following email (Relevant text incorporated below) to the approximately 35 members of TEAC (representing most of the Provinces of the Anglican Communion) and request comment. TEAC is working through five Target Groups: each with a particular focus: theological education for bishops, for priests, for vocational deacons and lay ministers, for the laity, and the 'Anglican Way' Target Group.

*The R.R.G. has invited responses to its 'Questions for Consultation' from the widest possible range of individuals and groups, including TEAC: these are set out in the second attached document. The relevant questions for TEAC are those in sections 1 and 3. It would be good to add a fourth question to section 3, along the lines of:
Are there ways forward which can be assisted by improved theological education, for instance, in asking how Christians use the Bible?*

A number of replies were received, both formal and informal – formal replies are appended at the end of this report. The content of informal replies, and key issues that arose generally have been incorporated in the comments listed below. The Coordinator of TEAC has also had sight of the replies from theological colleges which arrived by 29 Jan – indeed she sent an accompanying letter when such institutions were requested for information. Comments received have informed the points made below.

1. Much of the thinking of the Windsor Report was welcomed by the respondents of TEAC. We felt that the basic thinking of the Report ... which held together a vision of diversity in unity... was consonant with the description of the 'Anglican Way' which TEAC has formulated as a part of its work.
2. We would want to draw the attention of the Reception Reference Group to TEAC's description of the Anglican Way, which was first formulated by the Working Group and then honed through responses to a questionnaire which was widely distributed around the Communion. This description of the Anglican Way is set out at the end of this report.
3. A theme which has run through the work of TEAC to date – and indeed has come up in a number of the responses – has been the need for a widely accepted theology of Scripture. As does the Windsor Report (pp. 38-42) those involved in the work of TEAC would certainly wish to acknowledge the primacy of scripture in Anglican theology. However to make such a statement is only the beginning – rather than the end – of the story. There was some criticism from one of our respondents as to the lack of integration in Report regarding its theology of Scripture. Some pointers and parameters have been given in the Windsor Report as to how scripture should be read and used, but we would strongly concur with the comment made in para. 61 of the Report regarding the urgent need for the whole Communion to explore seriously how we use scripture. We see this as intimately related to the task of theological education, and would like to be able to contribute to this endeavour.
4. More widely we feel that there are a number of educational imperatives which come out of the Report – and that it is important that these are taken forward. Once again we would like to offer any help that TEAC can supply to take these forward.

5. We note the section in the Windsor Report on the Episcopate (pp.42-45). The work of our 'Bishops' Target Group has already discovered evidence of the disturbingly 'uneven' level of ecclesiological understanding and in some cases experience among senior clergy across the Anglican world. We also notice the extent to which the teaching role of Bishops is highlighted and upheld in the Report in accordance with the scriptural decrees about this matter. We feel that the developments of programmes and resources to support the work of Bishops is an important task – and one to which TEAC is hoping to contribute.

6. However one concern that members of TEAC had in relation to the Report was its inevitable 'elitism' and focus on a particular ministry of the Anglican Communion. One of our respondents commented that if it is intended to strengthen the Anglican instruments of Unity then three (out of four) of those Instruments only consist of bishops (with two of the four being entirely male). It will be important that any deliberations about strengthening the instruments of unity ensure that the voices of priests, deacons, lay ministers and the laity are properly heard and that their ministries enabled to contribute to the Communion of which they are part.

7. One of our respondents queried the Report's stress on the transferability of bishops arguing, from the Orthodox practice of episcopacy that the norm was for bishops *not* to be transferred from their see.

8. The same respondent also queried whether the suggestion of a 'Covenant' was an Anglican model – suggesting that it reflected a more Reformed ecclesiology. Other respondents were however more positive about this suggestion.

9. There was also the feeling expressed that the Report had not taken sufficient account of what was described as the 'positive Hookerian or Maurician approach to the contemporary world'. This feeling was expressed directly or indirectly by several respondents.

*Clare Amos
Coordinator TEAC
(on behalf of the Steering Group)
31 Jan 2005*

Relevant section of Brief of Anglican Way Target Group of TEAC

a. The Anglican Way, though rooted in its history and historical formularies, nevertheless is not fixed but continues to be shaped by its multiform cultural settings. The Anglican Way is a particular expression of the Christian Way (Acts 9:2).

b. Understanding and describing a distinctive theological method incorporating, for example, 'contemplative pragmatism', 'inhabiting doctrine', doing theology by preaching, liturgy, hymnody, artistic creativity, etc.

c. Scripture, tradition and reason: Reading the Bible together, corporately and individually, with a keen and critical sense of the past, a vigorous engagement with the present context, and with patient hope for the future.

d. Awareness and critical assessment of other defining characteristics commonly associated with Anglican identity – for example, spirituality nurtured by Word and Sacrament, Lambeth Quadrilateral, Book of Common Prayer, distinctive polity, comprehensiveness, unity in diversity, *Via media*, bridge between denominations, balance of freedom and order, balance of pastoral, mission and prophetic, exercise of ministry, etc

e. The polity of the Anglican Way includes the threefold order of bishop, priest and deacon, intended to be united collegially with the laity in synod; and the interaction of provincial, diocesan

and parish structures, governed by constitutions and canons.

f. An approach to mission which is holistic, incarnational and transformational and which shapes the engagement of the church with the world in each context.

g. Acknowledgement of provisionality, incompleteness and vulnerability as potential strengths.

h. The four formal instruments of unity (Archbishop of Canterbury, Lambeth Conferences, the Anglican Consultative Council, the Primates' meeting) offer cohesion to global Anglicanism, limit the centralisation of authority, rely on bonds of affection for effective functioning but are put under strain in situations of acute disagreement. Other emerging instruments of unity include Anglican networks, commissions and taskforces.

i. Awareness of Anglicanism's past and present failures, and its susceptibility to particular kinds of abuse (for example, aspects of colonial heritage, excessive association with power and privilege, hierarchical authoritarianism, clericalism at the expense of the ministry of women and laity, its identification with Englishness, etc).

j. The Anglican Way encompasses communion (koinonia) with the united churches and other churches in full communion with the See of Canterbury. These relationships enrich our understanding and experience of koinonia.

k. The Anglican Way is deeply committed to building ecumenical relationships and strives to define itself through statements made in ecumenical dialogue.

l. The Anglican Way as interplay between witness to the Lordship of Jesus Christ; yearning for and working towards mutual respect, peace and just relations with other faith communities; and a prophetic critique of religious and political ideologies.

Individual comments attached from (see following entries)

1. Bishop Ann Tottenham, Canada
2. Revd Susanne Watson-Epting, USA
3. Revd Anthony Thiselton, England
4. Revd Saw Maung Doe, Myanmar
5. Mrs Elizabeth Appleby, Australia

**REFLECTIONS ON THE WINDSOR REPORT (2004) OF THE
LAMBETH COMMISSION ON COMMUNION**

ANTHONY C. THISELTON

The Report contains four main sections: Section A, The Purposes and Benefits of Communion; Section B, Fundamental Principles; Section C, Our Future Life Together; and Section D, The Maintenance of Communion.

I. EVALUATION OF SECTION A:

(1) The exposition of the biblical concept of communion/koinonia. This is an excellent series of paragraphs. The conclusions should not be abstracted from it, for this, not sexual doctrine, is the subject of this Report. The paragraphs helpfully draw on 1 Corinthians (1:5-7; 1:9; ch 12; and ch 13), stressing that communion is both vertical (grounded in Christ) and horizontal (bonding churches together). 1 Cor. 12 lays the groundwork for dialectic between unity and diversity; 1 Cor. 13 lays the groundwork for mutual respect; 1 Cor. 5 recognizes that this does not exclude discipline. Nevertheless the Report might *also* have drawn further on not only 1 Cor. 16:1-4 but also Rom. 15: 26 and 2 Cor. 8 – 9 to emphasize at a level akin to that of “*Provinces*” the mutual resourcing, respect and common theologies (rule of faith) that marked *koinonia* between the churches (=provinces?) of Rome, Corinth, Macedonia [Philippi, Thessalonica], and Asia [Ephesus, Galatia]. Such N.T. language questions the Archbishop of Sydney’s critique that we might as well recognize from the start that the Anglican Communion is no more than a federation of virtually autonomous churches. This says a lot about both “wings” (ECUSA and Sydney!)

(2) Consequences (paras 6 – 11) and **(3) Mutual Discernment** (paras 12 – 21) The key issues here are (a) “*autonomy*” and (b) “*degrees* of communion” (cf. the fuller discussion in B). Lambeth 1988 affirmed the goal of seeking to maintain “the highest possible degree of communion with the provinces which differ” (para 19)

(4) Symptoms of Illness (paras 22 – 24, pp. 25-33). This spells out heart of the issue incisively. If “communion” involves solidarity, reciprocity and mutual respect, decision-making processes *that are not exclusively local in their effect* should be

worked out in *mutual, patient, listening, sharing and consultation*. Lambeth 1978, 1988 and 1998 put up clear markers on this, and in October 2003 the Primates affirmed that sexual issues were not merely “local” or culture-specific; but had “moral force” (para 24, p.26). Hence *unilateral decisions flout these instruments of communion and damage communion*.

(5) “**Deeper Symptoms**” lists six factors including development of doctrine, ecclesiastical procedures (cf. the Virginia Report, 1997); doctrinal difference or lack of difference (*adiaphora*), and authority. Transparently ECUSA and New Westminster have stepped beyond these implicit boundaries. These paragraphs set out a convincing exposé, with rigour, balance, and courtesy.

II. Evaluation of Section B: Fundamental Principles (paras 43 – 96, pp.45 – 51).

(1) **The Communion we Share (paras 45 – 51)**. Descriptions of the Anglican Communion are “all about mutual relationships” (para 49). If we take “common life” seriously, then some unilateral actions bring about a kind of “impaired” communion, and “degrees” of communion emerge, even if at its core there remain shared reading of scripture, tradition, worship, and apostolic leadership (paras 50 – 51).

(2) **Bonds of Communion** (paras 52 – 66, pp.38-45) entail recognition of scriptural authority and responsible, community-based interpretation. Scripture is “central” (para 53). Biblical interpretation (paras 57 – 62) in Anglican tradition gives weight to (a) *bishops as teachers of scripture* (para 58); (b) scholarly work on language and historical situations; (c) critical caution about values imposed from the secular Enlightenment (paras 59 – 60). This again is excellent. Philosophical hermeneutics (Gadamer, Ricoeur) exposes the shallow, instrumental, anti-theist nature of many Enlightenment assumptions, some of which are untested in debates about social constructionism. *All this will lead up to the valid claim that ECUSA has never really fully debated and justified its actions at this serious level.*

A *positive* summons to find something *good* in the confusion left by ECUSA and New Westminster now follows: “The current crisis thus constitutes a call to the whole Anglican Communion **to re-evaluate the ways in which we have read, heard, studied and digested scripture**” (para 61, p.42). *If only all of our theological training institutions, dioceses, and clergy would now put Bible and doctrine at the centre where they belong (in place of endless “reflection on experience”, with its*

inbuilt modern Western individualism) all this anguish just might lead to resurrection for the wider Anglican Communion.

(3) The episcopate (paras 63 – 66) is “the foundational form of government within Anglican churches ... the distinctive mark of its claim to be Catholic and Protestant ...” (para 64). This rightly aims at stressing *episcopal responsibility* rather than episcopal elitism, for it implies that (a) *bishops must be theologically articulate as teachers*; (b) bishops must *take responsibility for the effects* of actions not only upon their congregations but also upon the worldwide communion. Again, this is *excellent*, and applies all the more to “the transprovincial level” (para 65).

(4) Reception and Diversity (paras 67 - 71, pp.65-47)

“Reception” is a *process* involving the “common mind of believers”. It is very good to find “reception” taken seriously. Rightly understood, *this would nurture more patience* on all sides in Anglican debates. **Change cannot be instant** if “reception” is taken seriously: a generation is hardly a long time for “reception”.

(5) “Autonomy” and “Adiaphora” (paras 72 – 96, pp. 47-54).

The section on **autonomy** is one of the most *important and best*. (Cf. the Archbishop of Sydney’s astonishing claim about a federation of “autonomous” churches! Well, but in what sense?) Autonomy may mean “having one’s own laws”, but *Lambeth acknowledged the “autonomy” of Anglican Provinces only if and when local house-rules do not affect other people elsewhere* (paras 75 – 79; cf. 80 – 86). It may apply only where we may assert that change makes no doctrinal “difference” (*adiaphora*) at a defining level of identity. These paragraphs make *excellent conceptual distinctions that implicitly sharpen the critique of ECUSA. Nevertheless I would go much further*. (a) 1 Corinthians throughout attacks the very mind-set of autonomy. (b) Striving for autonomy is at its root a mirror of the desire to “Do one’s own thing” that characterizes human sin and fallenness (Cf. W. Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Clark, 1994) pp. 175-81 and 231-65: “... the autonomy of the will that *puts the self in the centre, and uses everything else as a means to the to the self as an end*” (p. 245); “... the absolute self-willing that alienates us from God by putting the self in the place of God...” (p. 261). Autonomy is also linked with over-ready cultural assimilation (cf. present debate) of Kant and the secular Enlightenment. Does the obsession with “democracy” owe more to the Enlightenment than to the Bible? (Cf. Oliver O’Donovan, *Desire of Nations*).

III. Evaluation of Section C: Our Future Life Together (paras 97 – 120, pp. 55-64)

Instruments of Unity include: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates' Meeting. But these have been "ignored or sidelined by sections of the Communion". Other Instruments of union may also be used. All this is valid.

IV. Evaluation of Sect. D: Maintenance of Communion (paras 121-57, pp. 65-76).

(1) General Findings. ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada "have not attached significant importance to the impact of their decision on other parts of the Communion" (para 121). The Report also regrets that some Primates have sought to intervene, which arguably reflects the same problem of acting hastily, also in unilateral ways without waiting for communal consultation and action (para 122).

Many have expressed regret that the remonstrance is two-sided. Bishop Tom Wright disputes that it is even or two-sided, but he says that as it may, *only by being even-handed about unilateral action without due consultation, can the Report so decisively cut the ground from beneath any defence that ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada could possibly mount about its own unilateral action as causing damage to the Communion.* Tom Wright also notes that some extreme conservatives share with some extreme radicals a cavalier politics of wanting to urge unilateral action, each to serve their own "autonomy" (my word here).

(2) On Elections to the Episcopate (paras 124-35, pp. 65-69).

Here is an excellent rebuttal of the claims often made in some Synods that a local diocese *alone* should elect its bishop without reference to the Province or to the wider world. "*A bishop is more than simply the chief pastor of a local church. Bishops are consecrated into an order of ministry in the world-wide Church of God*" (para 124). *This suggests a careful re-appraisal of the constituency that elects a diocesan bishop within certain provinces.* (The Church of England might be less critical of its own procedure here, even though some Synod members call for more "local" autonomy).

(3) Invitation to ECUSA to Express Regret (para 134) on the ground that "the bonds of affection were breached ...in the election ...for the See of New Hampshire..." and ECUSA is "invited" to effect a moratorium on the election ... of

any candidate who is living in a same gender union until some new consensus in the Anglican Communion emerges” (para 134).

(4) Rites of Blessing in Same Sex Unions (paras 136-46, pp. 69-73).

The Diocese of New Westminster did not have “unqualified freedom” to authorize a liturgical form of this kind “unilaterally”. The basis of the argument is all the material above. This ruling will explicate and clarify the position for diocesan bishops under pressure to employ such homegrown rites not only in Canada, but also throughout the Communion.

(5) Care of Dissenting Groups (Sects 147-55, pp. 73-75).

This issue is keenly sensitive on both sides. The Report *recognizes* the need for alternative episcopal oversight, but in accordance with its consistent emphasis upon church law, consultation, and courtesy, it urges that such oversight should not be offered “*without reference to the proper authorities of the diocese concerned*”. At the level of *ecclesiology* two wrongs (if they are!) do not make a right (if it is!). Nevertheless arrangements acceptable to both sides for such pastoral care **are needed and are appropriate**.

Final Comment. Those who believe, with Paul and with Hooker that the first step in resolving doctrinal disputes is to return to Scripture, tradition and rigorous rational argument will welcome the Report as a model of incisive reasoning based on Scripture. Those who want to precipitate irreparable action will dissent from it. Although he took decisive *co*-action about the church’s arrogance over the case of incest (1. Cor. 5:1-6), Paul does not appear to have excommunicated those in Corinth who still wrestled with doubts about the resurrection. I Cor. 15 is a rational exposé of the inconsistencies and self-damage involved in doubting the resurrection, but it argues, pleads, declares, and expounds, before moving to ecclesial action. Like the Report, it uses patient rational argument. Since the Report rightly attacks premature *action* on the part of ECUSA, how could it commend action of the very kind that it attacks? To back to debate not ecclesiology but sexuality would merely repeat the declarations of the “instruments of union”: the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lambeth, the Consultative Council, and the Primates’ Meeting. A vicious circle of recrimination would ensue. As it is, ECUSA has not a leg to stand upon!

January 9,2005

TO: Robert Paterson, Clare Amos

FROM: Ann Tottenham

RE: Laity Group TEAC

I have already sent you a copy of my general response to the Windsor Report dealing with Archbishop Kwong's three questions but not specifically from the perspective of TEAC. This is an attempt to answer the suggested fourth TEAC question: "Are there ways forward which can be assisted by improved theological education, for instance, in asking how Christians use the Bible? .

1. Section B has considerable relevance to TEAC (this is from my general response) The most significant parts of section B are those [53-62] that refer to the centrality of scripture in our common life at all levels. Despite the fact that we say that "The Bible has always been at the centre of Anglican belief", there is widespread and often frightening ignorance of scripture in all quarters of our church: laity, clergy and bishops. There is no agreement or even much discussion about what it means to talk about the "authority of scripture". There is little if any teaching about the richness of the scriptural witness to God's presence in our lives. There are too many clergy and lay people who are so immersed in the Hebrew Scriptures that they seem never to have heard the good news of the Gospel in the teachings of the New Testament.

There is an enormous job of education needed in all provinces of the Communion. Needs will vary from parish to parish and from province to province according to varying educational levels and cultural assumptions. In many provinces there is a desperate shortage of contemporary translations of the Bible and a shortage of the texts themselves.

This challenge confronts TEAC in all its divisions: better education for clergy and a solid grounding in scripture as a pre-requisite for ordination; an understanding among bishops that leadership in teaching and proclaiming scripture is the priority for episcopal ministry rather than something to be fitted in when there are no meetings to attend; an understanding amongst clergy and laity that this is the bishops' most important role; the provision of courses of study for laity at all levels; the expectation that "continuing education" in scripture is a fundamental part of the journey of all Christians.

This is a daunting challenge which will be costly in terms of money, expertise and time. At the same time it has to be said that this would be a much more productive use of these resources than the money, time and expertise that would be needed to build up the "Instruments of Unity" as committees multiply and lay and clergy leaders and teachers spend their time constructing increasingly complex and legalistic systems to keep us all together.

2. TEAC's Mandate – one of the frustrations of TEAC is the overwhelming scope of its mandate; one hardly knows where to begin. It would seem to me sensible for TEAC to narrow this mandate to focus on Biblical education, teaching, training, and resources as applicable to our various groups. With this would go issues of authority and interpretation as well as suggested courses of study.

3. Possible Approaches

- Use of existing communication resources especially the Anglican Communion web-site and magazine
- Development of a CD which would not be expensive to produce and would be easily circulated to provinces and even dioceses for reproduction and use
- Produce a study guide for the relevant parts of sections A & B of the Windsor Report as a common point of departure for understanding and discussing issues of authority and interpretation together with the suggested texts for considering communion and union. This might serve as a general paradigm for Bible study.
- Resources of all kinds need to be clear about their target audience. The Anglican Way book list is an excellent resource that seems to be aimed at an audience with an academic background higher than that of the “General Reader”. This is all very well but we should also consider other target audiences.
- We need to consult professionals when producing resources so that they are “user friendly” and entice the reader to become involved. The Anglican Way book list, although filled with good reading, is presented in a way that is unlikely to encourage most Anglicans to use it. Bibliographies which are annotated and more clearly focused on a particular audience would be helpful and might prevent the reader from being overwhelmed. The format of page layout and presentation on the screen are important can make materials more or less accessible.
- There are in all our provinces people whose culture is mainly oral and/or who have minimal levels of education and literacy. We need to speak to primates and those in charge of training colleges to find out how we can best serve these Anglicans. It may be that the best thing we can provide in some instances are the financial resources for translation and purchase of Bibles and Prayer Books