

Corresponding Secretary: The Revd Michael J. McCoy BA (Hons), MTh, DPS  
PO Box 70610, The Bridge, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 6032  
Tel/fax: +27 41 364-0902  
e-mail: <secretary@anitepam.org>

## **The Windsor Report: A response from ANITEPAM**

### Introduction

1. ANITEPAM is a network, recognised by the Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa (CAPA), that has served African Anglican theological education since 1993. It seeks to work in partnership with others – particularly with African theological educators and church leaders – to encourage and strengthen the ministry of theological education throughout the continent. It does this mainly through its quarterly *Bulletin* and the annual *ANITEPAM Journal*, but also through enabling faculty and student visits between theological education institutions and programmes, arranging appropriate consultations, and linking African theological education with needed resources. Our new and developing web site is another important way of serving our constituency.
2. ANITEPAM exists to serve the whole African Anglican theological education community in all its diversity. This diversity is found in the membership of ANITEPAM's Governing Council. So we do not promote particular causes or positions: rather, we seek to encourage African Anglican educators and learners to reflect on the issues that face us and sometimes divide us, bringing to these issues the rich array of resources – biblical, historical, contextual, cultural, ecumenical, personal, and so on – that are available to us.

### Comment on the Windsor Report

3. The members of the ANITEPAM Governing Council have been deeply pained by the controversy surrounding the issues of human sexuality that has divided Anglicans in recent years, and by the lamentable breakdown in relationships that has followed. ANITEPAM is committed to maintaining the “bonds of affection” and to building bridges, and thus trying to keep the conversation going even when our various theological worldviews make it hard for us to agree on all the issues. So we welcome the publication of the Windsor Report, and commend the Lambeth Commission on Communion for having produced an invaluable resource. It is clear, informed, firm, and reasonable.
4. We welcome and support the Report's reflections on Communion (Section A), and encourage all in our constituency – particularly institutions of theological education – to study this material and consider its implications for our common life as Anglicans in Africa.
5. We welcome and support the Report's discussion of fundamental principles (Section B). We call on African Anglican institutions of theological education to engage with this Section, and to reflect on how diversity within the limits of our common inheritance and mutual interdependence can be honoured within our communion with one another, especially within our colleges and other programmes.
6. We welcome and support the Report's reflections on our future life together, and in particular its proposal for an Anglican Covenant (Section C). We urge African Anglican institutions of theological education to engage critically with the draft Covenant in Appendix 2, and to enhance and strengthen it by submitting feedback to their respective primates. We also endorse the Report's proposal that a Council of Advice be created to support the ministry of the Archbishop of Canterbury (pars. 111-112), and request that African theological educators be among those who might be considered suitable members or *ad hoc* advisers.
7. We welcome and support the Report's findings (Section D), particularly as they relate to any in Africa whose actions and words have contributed to the breakdown of communion. We further urge African

Anglican institutions of theological education to continue studying, discussing, and reflecting on the issues raised in this Section pertaining to human sexuality, episcopal pastoral oversight, and liturgical rites.

8. We welcome and support the Report's reflections and suggestions on the Instruments of Unity (Appendix 1). We wonder, however, whether sufficient attention has been paid to existing and emerging *regional* "instruments of unity" such as CAPA, or the recent conference of African bishops, and to ways in which these might be drawn more effectively into the network of Communion-wide relationships.

#### Further issues for theological education in Africa

9. The Windsor Report's reflections on Communion and interdependence, and on the ways in which some basic principles of Anglicanism have not been observed by various parties in the current crisis, suggest to us that our institutions of theological education need to give urgent attention to their programmes of education and formation in Anglican history, theology, and polity – a point that ANITEPAM has made before, and has sought to address through facilitating grants of books on Anglicanism to African seminary libraries.
10. ANITEPAM believes that theological education programmes provide a rich opportunity for tutors and learners to explore questions about our faith and life together in all its breadth. We would therefore be deeply distressed if the current divisions in the Anglican Communion were to lead to divisions in the African theological education fraternity. As we continue to seek unity around what constitutes faithfulness to Anglican traditions of belief and practice, we'd encourage African programmes of theological education also to review their theology in the light of specifically *African* insights and values, whether traditional or contemporary. We therefore urge African theological educators (1) to engage in a process of deep, radical critique of their inherited theologies, and to seek fresh ways to articulate biblical and historic Anglican faith in Africa such that it enriches the whole Communion; and (2) to seek opportunities to meet with their primates, bishops, and other church leaders, to discuss the nature and purpose of African Anglican theological education in the context of a global Anglican Communion and world Church.

#### Conclusion

11. At various points in our response to the Windsor Report we have encouraged African Anglican institutions of theological education to study or respond to specific sections of the Report. We wish, in fact, to urge them to make a full and careful study of the whole Report as a core part of their programmes on Anglicanism. It is a rich resource for faithful Anglican reflection and action, not only in its content, but also in the method it has adopted, and in the range of references it includes.
12. We hope and pray that the Windsor Report receives the careful consideration it deserves at every level of Anglican Communion decision-making. And we look forward to seeing its recommendations bearing fruit in the form of genuine repentance and reconciliation, enhanced diversity-in-communion, deeper mutual understanding, and a renewed commitment to being one so that the world may believe.

#### **Governing Council, ANITEPAM:**

The Revd Canon Chad Gandiya (chair)  
Dr Esther Mombo (East Africa)  
The Revd Canon Lubabalo Ngewu (Southern Africa)  
The Revd Dr Emanuel Ekpunobi (Nigeria)

#### **Corresponding Secretary:**

The Revd Michael McCoy (Southern Africa)

21 January 2005

Name: The Rev. Canon Edward Rodman  
Denomination: Episcopal Church  
Location: USA

Subject: General Comments

Episcopal Divinity School Faculty Response to the Windsor Report

As a faith community made up of diverse people who are committed to the formation of lay and ordained ministers for Christ's Church, we herewith submit some general comments in response to the Windsor Report.

The purpose statement of the Episcopal Divinity School states that "we are committed to educate lay and ordained leaders for Christ's Church and the world who serve and advance God's mission of justice, compassion and reconciliation." Given this mandate, it is our belief that the Windsor Report fails to address these concerns of God's mission in any meaningful way. Furthermore, the Report continues a polemic within the hierarchy of the Church which is neither relevant nor of great interest to the vast majority of lay people, and lay and ordained ministers who are about the mission of God described by the ECUSA catechism "restoring all people to unity with God and each other in Christ" (pg.855 BCP). The ECUSA Catechism also notes that "the Church carries out its mission through the ministry of all of its members." We are concerned that persons in the American Church who have been targets of bigotry and discrimination, as well as those who have benefited from the ministry of the Right Reverend V. Gene Robinson, have had no direct input into the drafting process of the Windsor Report. Finally, an unintended consequence of the Windsor Report is to pit two previously marginalized groups, namely the former subjects of the British Empire outside of Great Britain and the gay and lesbian membership of our several churches, against one another. In a post-colonial and post-modern world, this does nothing to transform an historically European-American male, and clerically dominated hierarchical structure into one that can, in fact, effect reconciliation for all people within its membership and thereby witness to a world sorely in need of God's justice, compassion and reconciliation.

Submitted on behalf of the faculty by Rev. Canon Edward Rodman, Secretary of the Faculty

Comments on the Windsor Report

The Rev. Canon Dr. George Sumner

Principal - Wycliffe College

5 Hoskin Avenue, Toronto, ON M5H 1S7

The primary facts are these: (1) the Report confirms that the traditional teaching, articulated at Lambeth 1998 and reaffirmed by the Primates, is the teaching of the whole Communion; as a result any acts in violation of this teaching are not open to interpretation under the rubrics of "local option" or "reception." (See especially para. 69) (2) Continuation of such acts constitute "walking apart" and this will lead to the destruction of our Communion (see, most ominously, the end of the report). (3) In this light the Report calls for costly steps from both conservative and liberal for the sake of continued communion. The Report is a strong and valuable contribution, and it deserves to be affirmed and implemented by the Primates.

Common Sense

1. Most immediately and obviously, the Report has proved to be the object of opprobrium by both conservative and liberal- Archbishop Eames must have done something right! All would do well with a reminder: the Commission, created by the ABC Rowan Williams, was diversely representative.

2. The response of a number of liberals, in Canada as elsewhere, seems to amount to "they can't make us do it." And with this the Report agrees. As Ephraim Radner has said, the Report treats all those involved as adults. The Report's mandate was to lay out what would be required for the Church to hang together, and that it has faithfully done. In the adult world actions have consequences. The Church of Canada can indeed do what it will, but certain decisions will constitute what the Report calls "walking apart," for they will precipitate decisions by other communion Churches with respect to common life. The point of communion is precisely that we have moral and spiritual claims on each other; members of a family can say "you can't make me," but that isn't the point.

3. Oliver O'Donovan finished his theological careful analysis with some plain sense: the Report is "the only poker game in town." All the reactions right and left are just someone's opinion. If there is to be a collective means to maintain the Anglican Communion it will be based on the Windsor Report, through the Primates and Lambeth.

4. The least edifying response to the Report has come from those such as the Presiding Bishop and Bishop Ingham who have offered regrets only for pain they have caused, when in fact they were called upon by the Report to regret the actions that caused the pain. As Philip Turner has pointed out, the call for regret must be place in the context of the whole document with its call for repentance and reconciliation. This disingenuous response diminishes their moral stature. At the very least let us be honest with one another.

You were saying...

5. "We Anglicans are part of the Church catholic..." This rhetoric becomes real in practice as Churches live out their universality in mutual accountability, as they show they are really one in "apostles' teaching, breaking of bread, and prayers." We have an opportunity to make of our catholicity something more than congregationalism with vestments.

6. "We believe in unity, even at the expense of heresy...to break communion is the greatest sin..." So said Bishop Lee of Virginia in defense of his support of the election of Bishop Robinson and his objection to any kind of impaired communion. So we also have an opportunity to make good that commitment to unity even when it is costly.

7. "We have to see where the Spirit is leading us in history..." So the revisionist case has claimed. But at least as strong an historical claim can be made that the seismic shift in Anglicanism (with more than 400 bishops from sub-Saharan Africa at the next Lambeth) is part of the emergence of the "Next Christendom" described in Jenkins' book. To walk apart now is to squander a moment of enormous promise for the Anglican Communion. But this requires of us the moral imagination to overcome our deep-seated sense of dismissiveness of Third World countries.

Meanwhile Back in Canada

8. The Anglican Church of Canada is in the midst of deciding if the question of same-sex unions is doctrinal. This much is clear: the Windsor Report has rendered a verdict. It has stated clearly that the Anglican Communion teaches that such unions are to contrary to God's will. It says that this teaching applies throughout the communion. And it states that rejection of this teaching constitutes a reason for "walking apart." A teaching, applicable to all, whose rejection threatens communion: that is precisely what the Christian tradition has meant by "doctrine." To be sure, the Primate's Commission in Canada is free to decide otherwise, but the Report is saying in essence that such a decision by a national church amounts to "walking apart."

9. Canada's synod has claimed that the affirmation of the sanctity of committed same-sex relations is not a theological statement, and hence that it has no doctrinal import. Now it is true that the Report focuses, as is customary in Anglicanism, on what Churches do (or refrain from doing), and so this affirmation may evade excessive notice. Still, such a resolution is contrary to the Report's affirmation of the Communion teaching. Furthermore it erodes our theological credibility, since the notion that "sanctity" lacks theological content is absurd.

10. But, one might ask, where is the "give" on the conservative side? What the Report calls for seems to liberals like a big pill to swallow: a moratorium on same-sex rites of all kinds and the consecration of actively gay bishops for the foreseeable future. But from another point of view it is quite a limited request. How so?

Soon in Canada the secular realm will offer same-sex marriage. As a result, there will be gay couples in ACC congregations who are, in the eyes of the state and much of the society, married. Their state of life will be, strictly speaking, at odds with the teaching of the Anglican Communion. But no one has suggested any discipline against them, nor, in my view, should they. In

a number of parishes their names will presumably appear in the Prayers of the People, and their homes will be blessed at Easter. Now one could call this inconsistency, or one could see in it the local, pastoral latitude liberals have claimed to seek. What Windsor is telling the ACC is that there cannot be rites of union, approved by synods, which would imply the adoption of a new teaching for the ACC itself, a teaching contrary to that of the Communion. The liturgical and doctrinal status quo would remain, and so would the status quo ante diversity at the local level. We may infer from the Report that the Communion could live with this messy situation on the ground if the ACC is willing to refrain from pushing the issue to the max. In other words, the Report does not mandate an iron conformity of thought or pastoral application; by implication, it is content to leave this anomaly (among others in the West, such as widespread pre-marital cohabitation) as such. Why exactly is this not sufficient?

11. The elephant not yet in the living room is the implication of the Solemn Declaration, which ties the ACC to the teaching of the C of E, on this debate. At several points the Report refers to the elephant in question. The ACC is not at the end of the day purely autonomous if our decisions move us apart from the Church that was our mother. But for now, "sufficient unto the day is the trouble therein."

Finally on the Theological Front

12. It often seems that the world of theological discourse is isolated from the real life of the parish or the bureaucratise of the diocese. But the Windsor Report is an excellent counter-example, for it first expounds and then applies the sort of *communio*-ecclesiology which has come to dominate ecumenical discussions to our situation. In so doing the Report has applied the principles set out in the Virginia Report to our present situation; in other words, they are following the trajectory of reflection in the Communion already begun (as Ephraim Radner has pointed out). Far from simply being a papering over or a compromise, the Report offers a vision, rooted in the New Testament, of the "bonds of affection" that grow out of the *vinculum amoris* who is the Holy Spirit within the triune life itself. We can pray that the Report will not be reduced by all the sniping and skirmishing; is it possible that we might by grace rise up to a higher view of the *koinonia* to which we are called? Might we be granted a view clearer and farther than our culture of autonomy and power usually permits us?

13. The major question is whether the Report, and a Covenant of Unity of the sort it suggests, would be a radical new departure for Anglicanism? Does it take us down some papalist road? As to the latter, this is an overreaction. Our allergy to authority makes us see a papal legate under every bed. The covenant which is sketched in no way makes innovation in doctrine easy, for that after all was the traditional Protestant complaint with the magisterium. It envisions a minimalist capacity to put a break on in cases deemed to touch on major matters of the faith. If this is *per se* papalist, why do we allow General Synod an analogous power? But why should we allow our sibling Churches any such mutual oversight? The answer is because we claim to be a Church catholic, a Church whose faith is in continuity with the apostles. And furthermore we claim to honor the patristic period, when dioceses and bishops exercised just this authority over one another.

Now it is true that the mechanism here is new. But the idea that we are doctrinally responsible one to another is not. It lies at the very heart of the creation of the Lambeth Conference, for example. The difference is that those

founders assumed that a common inheritance and a common culture of mutual forbearance would suffice. In this they were wrong. The Report simply takes a step in making formal what was already assumed informally. In so doing, they have taken a crucial step in making of the Communion a true communio of spiritual equals.

14. The Report does well to note that the mechanisms of unity may be used in the future over other issues, at which point someone else's ox may be gored. So be it. For example Sydney evangelicals want to have lay people preside at the Eucharist, and some Church-growth evangelicals are content with giving communion to the unbaptized. Let the goring of these oxen begin as well, for here too we are dealing with novelties that corrupt ancient consensus catholic practices.

15. Last of all, we must reckon with a fact that is clearly before all of our eyes, one the Report reckons with, though we seem powerless to confront it. This controversy worms itself into every corner of our common life. It creates division and rancor everywhere. It determines every decision, every election, etc. It drains energy and interest from other pressing issues, and members away from the Church itself. We are, as it were, gripped by it, and must, all of us, pray for deliverance from it. What kind of liberation would be won at such a spiritual cost? Who could really imagine we are in any spiritual shape to make such an innovation amidst such a lack of charity? (Here one may refer to the call for a moratorium on innovation on these grounds offered by Ephraim Radner and me in ECUSA in the mid-1990's). Who does not see the obsessive determination to win? We need prayer and fasting to be given the illumination to see what this is doing to our common life.

The Rev. Canon Dr. George Sumner is Principal of Wycliffe College, an Evangelical Anglican Theological College, federated with the University of Toronto.

Karen

Karen Baker-Bigauskas

Assistant to the Principal

Wycliffe College

416-946-3521

[www.wycliffecollege.ca/](http://www.wycliffecollege.ca/)

## CONFORMITY: THE GOD OF WINDSOR.

**Peter Adam**  
**Ridley College**  
**University of Melbourne**

I am grateful for this opportunity to contribute to the ongoing search for a way forward that will honour God and serve Christ's will for the church. I enjoyed reading the Windsor Report 2004<sup>1</sup>, and I hope that these reflections will aid further reflection.

### **1. COMMUNION, THE GREATEST VIRTUE?**

- 1.1 I suppose that the reason why the Report takes 'Communion' as its main theme is because of the common expression 'The Anglican Communion'. However the danger of this approach is that it leads to an inevitable focus on relationships between the various national churches within the Anglican association, and so to a radical reduction in the notion of 'communion'. For despite the excellent Biblical foundations in paragraphs 1-5, the notion of communion is soon reduced to meaning little more than due process, conformity to everything being done decently and in order within the instruments of unity within the Communion. This demeans the value of 'communion', exaggerates the value of due process, and blinds us to the deeper significance of the problems that gave rise to the writing of the Report. Due process of consultation within the Anglican Communion is of great value, but is not the only value which we are called to espouse. And, as we shall see, if conformity to the due process is viewed as the greatest virtue, then nonconformity is viewed as the greatest vice.
- 1.2 The Report has in mind two groups who have produced the problems, namely the Diocese of New Westminster and ECUSA on the one hand, and those archbishops and parishes breaking geographical boundaries on the other hand. However, as we shall see, both kinds of actions are viewed merely from the perspective of whether or not they have taken place within due process. This is a very limited perspective, and betrays a mindset that is focused on administrative and organizational issues, and so ignores other assessments of human actions.
- 1.3 The focus on due process is an application of the great Anglican virtue of everything being done 'decently and in order'. However this virtue by itself is insufficient. Conformity to due process of consultation could merely lead us together on the primrose path to hell. The whole Communion could err, even with appropriate consultation. Of course true consultation would be one way of helping to avoid this unfortunate outcome, but by itself it is insufficient. The weakness of the Report is that it reduces communion to due process, and so fails to discover the deeper issues about the problems it tackles.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I understand the reason for use of the word 'Windsor' in the naming of the report, but it may have unfortunate resonances for some. Its most obvious association would be with the royal house of Windsor, and so indicate an established and privileged church. Would it not have been better named The Slough Report?

<sup>2</sup> Is it because the issue of the theological significance of homosexual practice is too difficult to resolve that the Report focuses on the more manageable if less significant issues of process?

- 1.4 Even though communion is an important theme in the Scriptures, the Biblical material from 1 Corinthians and Ephesians used in the Report is of limited value, as it actually addresses the kind of communion found within local churches, and not the kind of communion that should be found within an international association of churches.
- 1.5 Of course we are right to claim that the Anglican Communion is part of the universal people of God. But is 'communion' the best term to use about the universal people of God, or about a subset of that people of God? If we described ourselves as 'The Anglican Mission', then we might worry less about our mutual relations, and more about serving God in the world. 'Communion' as a self-description seems to promote unhelpful introspection. We do also tackle our ecumenical relationships, but even this focus does not get us to think about how God is calling us to service in the world beyond Christendom.
- 1.6 We may claim that doing things 'decently and in order' is an Anglican strength; but every strength can also be a weakness. It may lead us to think of Anglicanism as an ideal predictable and Newtonian universe, in which circling churches sing on their ordered way under the direction of an eternal ruler. We may also value this virtue in our liturgy, in which all is ordered, controlled, and predictable. But God is not only the eternal ruler of the ceaseless round, he is also the God of surprises, and especially of surprises that reflect his grace, his judgment, and his refining of his people. Would we have persisted in supporting the weak high priest Eli and his corrupt sons, or have recognized God's judgment of Eli and his call of Samuel? Would we have recognized that Jesus of Nazareth had greater authority than the chief priest of his day? From one perspective, it would be difficult to say that the life and ministry of Jesus of Nazareth could be characterized as 'decently and in order'! Good order is a good servant, but a bad master. It may only reflect lack of vision, and desire for control. It is a remarkable feature of our church that most movements of reform and renewal have begun from below, and met persecution and insult, because they have been like new wine in old wineskins. Have not some of our greatest Anglican leaders been nonconformists?
- 1.7 In summary, communion or fellowship is a great gift of God through the Gospel, but it is not the Gospel. It suffers if it is reduced to organizational conformity and the following of due process. Then it may easily become a conformity that is restrictive and negative in its effects. Administrative conformity may be a useful servant, but it may easily be a tyrannical and intolerable master.

## **2. BREAKING COMMUNION, THE GREATEST VICE?**

- 1.1 The consequence of the puffing up of organizational conformity is that within this theological framework the greatest vice or sin must be that of organizational nonconformity. This is exactly what the Report identifies as the problem, namely the actions of New Westminster and ECUSA on the one side [paragraphs 22-28], and the actions of parishes and archbishops breaking geographical boundaries on the other side [paragraph 29]. Failure to follow due process is an issue of some importance, but not the most important issue. The focus on the issue of organizational order only identifies the formal shape of the problem, not its material content. This failure results in the Report failing to identify the real problem.

2.2 This focus on the formal shape of the problem rather than its material content also a failure to evaluate the gravity of the issues.<sup>3</sup> For which is more serious, to bless homosexual practice among lay people and clergy, or breaking down recognized geographical boundaries? If the former is a sin, then it is a sin against what Scripture teaches: if the latter is a sin, then it is a sin against church order. Of course there will be debate about the teaching of Scripture and its application to today. But my point is that if homosexual practice is a sin, then it is a serious sin because of the teaching of Scripture. There is no teaching of Scripture on the model of organization for a worldwide association of churches. It would take a very creative mind to find from Scripture any direct teaching on how a worldwide association of churches should arrange their connections. While the Report supports the geographical arrangements of dioceses and bishops, that is not an essential component of church order. It was unknown in the Celtic church of England, and was introduced by the Roman Mission. Though it has been in place since, in practice it has been severely modified and compromised. The geographical arrangement of the church is derived from the administrative arrangements of the Roman Empire.<sup>4</sup> However many vital ministries of the church have sat loose to diocesan boundaries, including monasteries and convents; Preaching and Ministry Orders such as the Benedictines, Franciscans and Dominicans; University and Hospital Chapels, Proprietary Chapels; and many Voluntary Societies. So geographical boundaries cannot be a matter of theological principle. The historic episcopate does not depend on the existence of geographical diocese, as the Celtic church had episcopate without dioceses. If homosexual practice is a sin, then it is a serious matter, because it is the subject of Scriptural teaching. If breaking diocesan boundaries is a sin, then it is a lesser sin, because it is not the subject of Scriptural teaching, and as I have shown, not a matter of theological principle.<sup>5</sup> The logic of the limited worldview of the Report is that these sins appear to have equal seriousness, because they are both merely sins against due process: so it fails to recognize the seriousness of the issues under discussion. In fact, from a merely administrative viewpoint, the actions of ECUSA and New Westminster are less trouble than those of archbishops breaking diocesan boundaries, because they are only a problem if someone regards them as a problem, whereas administrative confusion is easier to identify and provides more practical problems. But a merely administrative perspective is insufficient: efficiency is not enough.

2.3 How extraordinary to read that '[t]he depth of conviction...has introduced a degree of harshness and a lack of charity which is new to Anglicanism.'<sup>6</sup> I think that the already existing Celtic Church leaders and members who were forced to accept the customs of the new missionaries from Rome would have found those words hard to believe, as would have the Lollards, Cranmer,

---

<sup>3</sup> So, for example, disturbing my neighbour by making too much noise and murdering him have the same formal shape; they both express a lack of love for my neighbour. But they differ in material content, and one is more serious than the other.

<sup>4</sup> As the Roman Catholic church may be seen as the after-glow of the Roman Empire, so that Anglican Communion may be seen as the after-glow of the British Empire. Is the desire to keep administrative and conformity across the Anglican Communion a relic of Empire?

<sup>5</sup> It may seem odd that the point of tension between more liberal and more conservative churches is the secondary matter of morality. Matters such as the incarnation, atonement and resurrection of Christ are more central to Christian faith. However it is often the case that an issue of practice becomes the public issue which gains symbolic significance, as in the tonsure debate between the English Celtic church and the Roman Mission.

<sup>6</sup> The Lambeth Commission on Communion: The Windsor Report, p. 5

Ridley and Latimer on their fires, the other martyrs of the Reformation Era, the victims of Archbishop Laud, the 1000 clergy who refused to assent to a Book of Common Prayer they had not seen in 1662, nonconformists persecuted under the Clarendon Code, Bishop Ken made a Non-Juror, Roman Catholics and other nonconformists deprived of University education, the seven students expelled from Oxford University for ‘methodism’, F. D. Maurice sacked for inadequate views on hell, or Bishop King of Lincoln in prison for illegal liturgical practice. Those who claim the natural tolerance of Anglicanism do not know their history: however the making of the claim has a most serious aspect, and that is that it marginalizes those who are now making trouble by refusing to conform. The claim is a power play, and has the political value of condemning current dissent. The claim for Anglican tolerance is historically unsupported, and politically motivated. It claims the moral high ground in order to marginalize nonconformists of whatever persuasion. It serves to support the unstated claim that those currently in power have the right to establish the boundaries of Anglicanism, and that those who object are not ‘real’ Anglicans. Furthermore, we can now see that Anglican conformity has its destructive aspect, in attempting to rid the church of anything that has not followed due process.

2.4 The Report further obscures the problems it is trying to identify by the unhelpful use of the odd metaphor of ‘Illness.’<sup>7</sup>

- i. Illness is an odd metaphor because it does not easily associate with the notion of blame. It assumes systemic problems, and does not help us to name human causes. We may have systemic problems, and it is worth addressing these issues, but we also need to identify human causes. Does the Report use this metaphor because it has decided to focus on structural issues?
- ii. Illness is used oddly because it looks at first sight as if Theological Development, Ecclesiastical Procedures, Adiaphora, Subsidiarity, Trust and Authority are the ‘deeper symptoms’ of that Illness<sup>8</sup>. Of course they are not, they are only useful categories in which to perceive the problems. The Report is confusing the structural features of the Anglican Communion which have been either the context in which the problems have arisen, or which have contributed to the problems.
- iii. Again, the statement of the problem is solely in terms of failure of due process, as described in paragraphs 33, 35, 37. As I have shown, this focuses on the formal shape of the problems, but does not identify their material content.
- iv. Furthermore, because of its narrow view of the problems as those of failure of internal due process, the Report fails to name sin against God, which must be the subject of repentance. As we have seen, the Report takes material from 1 Corinthians which originally pertains to the internal life of a local church, and then applies it to the international relationships of an association of churches. If the Report is to be consistent, it ought also to apply Paul’s instructions in 1 Corinthians about the excommunication of the man engaging in sexual relationships with his father’s wife: ‘you are to hand this man over to Satan to the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved in the day of the lord.’<sup>9</sup>

2.5 In paragraph 134, the Report recommends that ‘the Episcopal Church [USA] to invited to express its regret...’ The notion of ‘regret’ fails to address the seriousness of the problems. As Paul explains in 2 Corinthians 7, remorse or

---

<sup>7</sup> Paragraphs 22-42

<sup>8</sup> Paragraphs 31-42

<sup>9</sup> 1 Corinthians 5:5

worldly grief produces death, while godly grief with true repentance leads to salvation.<sup>10</sup> If it is the case that ECUSA has sinned not only against the due processes of the church but also against the teaching of God in Scripture, then it must repent.<sup>11</sup> It is facile to apply some aspects of Corinthians and Ephesians to the life of the Communion, and to avoid other less palatable aspects.

### 3. INSTRUMENTS OF COMMUNION?

- 3.1 The fact that the Report wants us to use the phrase ‘Instruments of Unity’<sup>12</sup> is a sign that communion and unity have been diminished to mean procedural correctness. For the true ‘Instruments of Unity’ are the works and gifts of God: original creation of humanity as ‘one blood’, the one incarnation of the Son of God, the work of atonement on the cross, the formative resurrection of Christ, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the one Gospel, the one faith ‘once for all delivered to the saints’. Compared with these, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, The Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates Meeting pale into relative insignificance! They may be useful for administrative convenience and symbolic significance, but it is pretentious to describe them as ‘instruments of unity or communion’. To do so indicates what a weak notion of Communion underlies the Report.
- 3.2 As the Report uses 1 Corinthians and Ephesians in paragraphs 1-5 on the Biblical foundations of the communion we have in Christ, it ought to have been consistent in featuring the instruments of communion found in those letters, including from 1 Corinthians the message of Christ crucified [ch. 1], the authority of the apostle Paul [chs. 1-14], and the Gospel received by Paul and handed on to the Corinthians, namely ‘Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures...’<sup>13</sup> The instruments of communion in Ephesians are clearly listed, ‘one body...one Spirit...one hope...one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all...’<sup>14</sup>
- 3.3 We need to clarify what aspect of unity we are concerned to preserve and express. Are our Anglican ‘Instruments of Unity’ merely concerned to preserve a unity of association, and to achieve it by helping us all follow due processes? As happiness is most often found by those who do not search for it, so too unity may be a byproduct of other aims. Unity might best result from holiness, or obedience, or doing God’s mission in the world. Introspective unity may deaden us, not enliven us. Unity which is merely administrative conformity is a petty aim, not a glorious goal. It may be a useful means, but it is not a great end or purpose. If it stands alone, it does not provide an adequate perspective on the welfare of the people of God.

The Report does not claim to make a final statement, but to contribute to an ongoing analysis of the problems we face. It is a privilege to contribute to that analysis. In summary, though there is much useful material in the Report, its weakness lies in its theological worldview, in which the notion of Communion is puffed up so that it fills

---

<sup>10</sup> 2 Corinthians 7:10

<sup>11</sup> Is the focus on conformity to due process the result of a reluctance to answer the question whether or not ECUSA and New Westminster have sinned against God?

<sup>12</sup> Paragraphs 97-112.

<sup>13</sup> 1 Corinthians 15: 3-5

<sup>14</sup> Ephesians 4: 4-6

the horizon, but is at the same time reduced in its effectiveness by being diminished to little more than organizational conformity.

Due process is a useful servant, but a bad master. Conformity may be a virtue, but may also be a particularly Anglican vice. May God save us from the God of Windsor.

From: Bob Hughes  
> Sent: 17 November 2004 21:16  
> Subject: Response  
>  
>  
> Attached is a Word file with notes from my talk on the Report at a  
> recent event sponsored by the Tennessee Anglican Congress in  
> Nashville, TN, Saturday, Nov. 13. I shared the stage with The Rev.  
> Dr. Kendall Harmon, who will undoubtedly submit his own remarks. I  
> raise some serious questions about the adequacy of the theology in  
> part B in particular, and suggest some unfortunate consequences that  
> arise as a result. If you have trouble opening the file, please let  
> me know. Bob Hughes  
> --  
> The Rev. Robert D. Hughes, III, Ph.D.  
> Norma and Olan Mills Professor of Divinity  
> Professor of Systematic Theology  
> School of Theology  
> University of the South  
> Sewanee TN

### **Thoughts on the Windsor Report**

St. Bartholomew's, Nashville,  
11/13/04  
The Rev. Robert D. Hughes, III, Ph.D.

- I. Thanks
  - A. First, thanks to Tim Jones and others responsible for my being here. We had a fine discussion of the document in Sewanee on Tuesday, honest but civil, and I hope that may spread around the Church. I thank my colleagues Bill Carol and Guy Lytle from that panel for the quality of the discussion, and ideas I have freely added to my own for this presentation.
  - B. Thanks also to the Commission for their hard work. There are several things I wish to praise before offering a critique.
    - i. First, the Commission seems to me honestly trying to find a way forward at a very difficult and stressful time. While calling on everyone to exercise appropriate discipline, their call to make every effort to stay in charity with one another is one I cherish.
    - ii. I believe they may have succeeded in turning the conversation from sex to Ecclesiology. As a systematic theologian who teaches a course on that very subject, it is hard for me not to see this as progress, though I know the issues about human sexuality are serious and we are not done talking through them. I shall not address them in this presentation, but am willing to do so in the ensuing discussion if the moderator permits and you so desire.
    - iii. On the Ecclesiological note, I think the sections on Communion and Ecclesiology as such are really quite fine, on the whole. The document reflects the current ecumenical consensus of an Ecclesiology of "A Communion of Communions." This is highly compatible with the current ecumenical consensus, shaped by ARCIC's adoption of a "Communion of Communions" model in its earliest work. Bob Wright, who was on ARCIC then, tells me they did it in response to Jerome Cardinal Hamer's *The Church is a Communion*. Contemporary works in a similar vein would include Robert Jenson's excellent treatment of the Church in the second volume of his superb *Systematic Theology*, and Orthodox Theologian, Metropolitan John Zizioulas's *Being as Communion*. Another very helpful book is by Prof. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen of Fuller, one of those remarkable Finnish Lutheran scholars, titled *An Introduction to Ecclesiology*. If I were

to recommend some background reading on the issues in the report, I would begin there.

- iv. On the whole, I am also very happy with the section on scripture and its authority in paragraphs 53-62, though what appear to be some gratuitous slams at modern critical method later in the document give me some pause.
- v. I would add a personal note. And I am not quite sure how I want to put this except as a kind of “issue statement.” I want to admit we did not consult widely and broadly enough in the Communion before assenting to Gene Robinson’s consecration, but I also do not want to compromise the appropriate autonomy of the American Church, and I am scared to death about the rise of a revived prelacy, and surprised my Evangelical friends seem so enthused about it, frankly. That is a tension within which we shall have to locate any ultimate covenantal solution, and within which we must hold our conversations. I will share some detailed concerns about the proposed covenant at the end.

## II. Problems

- A. The major theological problem I see with the document is in the section called “Fundamental Principles, Section B. After the section on scripture and its interpretation the document goes immediately to the episcopate. And it never does return to the missing two corners of the Chicago/Lambeth Quadrilateral, Creeds and Sacraments, with devastating consequences, in my view, for the ensuing doctrine of episcopate, autonomy, adiaphora, and reception, and hence of the proposed covenant. Let me spell this out more fully:
- B. The second corner of the Quadrilateral, incorrectly quoted in the report in Appendix 3, p. 73, reads as follows: The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith. That’s actually the Chicago Quad. The Lambeth version added “The Apostle’s Creed as the Baptismal Symbol.” But the important point is what is common to both. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith. Let that word “sufficient” sink in for a moment. As Robert Jenson points out, four things emerged in the life of the Church at roughly the same time, which the Church of the time decided were essential to its common life, its *koinonia*, its being as communion. They are precisely congruent with the Quadrilateral: The canon of scripture, the theological discussions that would eventually result in the Nicene Creed, the two great sacraments (at a minimum), and the historic Episcopate. As Jenson suggests, if the Church which made those decisions erred, there is now no true Church to critique those decisions.

The Nicene Creed, with the additions to the final paragraph at I Constantinople, is the patristic Church’s final statement of what was absolutely essential in the rule of faith. There were still other vital matters to discuss in interpretation of that Creed – the precise way to talk about the Incarnation of the Word and Wisdom of God in Jesus of Nazareth, the relation of his divinity to his humanity, and several implications all the way to the defense of Christian art at II Nicea. But the rule for determining “sufficiently” what is essential to the Christian faith received definitive statement in the Creed.

Here is the problem with not proceeding from Scripture to Creed. Everyone here who is ordained has made the so-called “first promise,” the declaration required of all orders “I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation;” followed by the declaration of conformity.

The language is quite precise, and reflects that of Article VI of the XXXIX: Nothing shall be taught as necessary to salvation, an article of the Faith, or required of any man, which cannot be read or proved therefrom. Nether the promise nor the Article says or even implies that everything in scripture is necessary to salvation and hence essential. Indeed, Article VII goes on to delineate things in the Old Testament which do not apply to Christians. Although the chief distinction is between Ceremonies and Rites and Commandments called Moral, the latter were usually taken to be the Ten Commandments, and many other things such as rules for Jubilee, against Usury, and

Cities of Refuge had also clearly been put in the “does not apply basket” even though they address moral concerns. Then there is Luther’s famous statement, “The Scriptures are but the Manger which contains the Christ Child, and also much straw.” He, of course, had the Epistle of James in his sights.

So, how are we to know what is necessary to salvation and hence essential and what is not? The answer is the Nicene Creed as the sufficient rule of faith for determining what in scripture is necessary to salvation. As my colleague Christopher Bryan argues in his fine book on the authority of scripture, *And God Spoke*, the implicit rule of faith, which would become detailed and explicit in the Creed, is used by the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church to make decisions about what is in the Canon of the New Testament. To set Scripture over against the Rule of Faith is to misunderstand scripture itself.

C. So far this sounds very academic and dry, but what are the practical consequences:

- i. The Creed is the rule for determining what in Scripture is necessary and hence essential. Beyond its boundaries, Luther’s great principle of the Freedom of the Christian obtains, constrained only, as Luther taught, by the second great commandment. The opinion of the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Marilyn Adams, is in agreement here.
  - ii. I would remind us all that the while the role of the bishop as a teacher of scripture, well spelled out by the Windsor Report, is certainly true, the first act of a new bishop in the American Ordinal, precisely as a new member of the College responsible for defense of the faith, is to lead the congregation in the recitation of the Nicene Creed. A bishop teaches scripture within the bounds set by the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, or he or she is no longer teaching as a bishop.
  - iii. This has direct implications for the discussion about essential and adiaphora. Many of you may have heard of the Episcopal Church Foundation Fellows’ Forum hosted last February by Dean Paul Zahl, then of Birmingham, now of TESM, on reconstructing Anglican comprehensiveness. It was a great gathering, and papers have just been published in *Anglican Theological Review*. One of the things Paul and I eventually agreed on was that there were more than two sorts of questions: essential and adiaphora –taking the latter as simply “things that really don’t matter,” such as what sorts of vestments are worn at a Eucharistic celebration. There is, indeed, must be, a middle sort of question which is *important*, and hence not adiaphora, but *not essential* in the sense that it does not touch on creedal matters.
  - iv. The bold claim I would make is that ALL ethical questions are of this middle type. The issue is this: if ANY ethical issue is raised to the level of essential, it is difficult to see how we avoid ending up with some sort of works righteousness. The Creed reminds us that the Gospel is about God’s faithfulness, not ours. It is the story of God’s faithfulness that is essential. Yes, that does mean that I do not think that even the issues of slavery, apartheid, or genocide rise to the level of essential. They are very, very important, hence hardly adiaphora. But I also would not want to declare all ecclesial acts of the Episcopal Church in the Confederacy invalid, despite its being dead wrong on slavery. We must have a severe caution not to fall into the Donatist heresy. But the very importance of the “most important” of these middle sorts of questions shows why we cannot treat this group as adiaphora, either.
- D. I confess I have only begun to think through the problems arising from the Report’s failure to give due weight even to the two great sacraments of the Gospel. I would offer the following two points as suggestive:
- i. Surely Baptism and Eucharist are more fundamental to our understanding of both the Church and its koinonia, its being as communion, than the report has indicated. Baptism is full initiation into that koinonia. Eucharist is its great celebration, and nowhere is the Church more itself than as a gathered Eucharistic fellowship.

- ii. The authority of the Episcopal Office also finds one of its chief expressions in the presidential prerogative of the bishop at all sacramental rites. The primary context for the bishop's role is liturgical/sacramental rites, just as the report has noted, in a satisfyingly Barthian manner, that the scriptures are most truly "the Word of God written" within the context of the Church's common liturgical life. So, the Bishop as teacher of scripture is bound by the confines of the Creed as the rule of sufficient faith, and located within the liturgical/sacramental context, which is also the context in which the word written is most truly the Word of God.
  - E. In sum, the report, by going directly from scripture to episcopate, produces a picture of the bishop as a kind of Lone Ranger bible teacher, removed from any of the three restraints that form the essence of communion : union of the apostolic office not only with the biblical twelve, but also with the "318 holy fathers" of the first Council of Nicea and the entire conciliar tradition as embodied in the creeds. It tends to separate the authority of individual bishops, especially primates, from the conciliar collegiality with their peers in the present, and cuts off the entire office from its proper context within the baptismal covenant community and Eucharistic Assembly. It is almost as if scripture is viewed as giving individual bishops a kind of authority *in propria persona*, a concept that violates all the principles of the Reformation, let alone of the American experiment with democratizing the episcopate.
- III. Consequences: The failure of the report to get Creeds and Sacraments in their rightful place in the discussion has some serious problematic effects on other parts of the report, by misunderstanding the full character of Episcopal authority, and by failing to recognize the reality of this middle sort of question I have proposed.
  - A. It really messes us the principle of subsidiarity, turning it on its head from what it meant at Vatican II. In its original form, that principle teaches that *every* decision should be made at the lowest or most local possible level on the organizational chart, since issues of contextualization are often paramount. Only issues that are clearly essential to be decided at the next level "up" should be referred there. By contrast, the Windsor report seems to me to suggest that ONLY matters which are adiaphora can be decided locally. This makes a complete mess of what subsidiarity intends.
  - B. Second, this pushes the proposals embodied in the suggested Covenant in a far more erastian/hierarchical/ even Romanist direction than any American or even any child of the Reformation, however Catholic, should embrace. The idea of a Covenant seems to me a good one, but the whole American experiment with the democratization of the episcopate, Bishops by Ballot, (see Frederick Mills's fine book by that title) is ignored. Our polity has no place in this scheme. Most disturbing is the increasing arrogation of power to the Primate's Meeting, at the expense of both local synods and bishops and the Anglican Consultative Council. It is precisely at this point that I am most concerned about the distortion of the theology of the Episcopal office in the report. I wish my fears of the Primates' meeting to do some a-critical bible study and then issue grand and supposedly binding decrees about what is "essential" were unrealistic or even paranoid, but I fear it is not. Cut off from the restraints of Creed, Council, Episcopal College, and Baptismal and Eucharistic Assembly, we would face an embodied prelacy more authoritarian than anything we critiqued at the time of the Reformation. I find it appalling that any Evangelical would want to jump on this boat of expanded prelacy, and Anglo-Catholics, especially Americans, should be very wary. In our polity the metropolitan authority is vested not in the Presiding Bishop, but in General Convention as a whole. I don't even like calling the PB "Primate" for precisely that reason. It would be inconvenient for us to send the whole Convention to the Primates' Meeting, but the principle is an important one. Frank Griswold's primacy is clearly defined in a synodical and conciliar fashion, and not in any way "in propria persona."
  - C. As you might guess, there will be a good bit of infighting among the various instruments of unity as this Covenant gets worked out. You can probably guess I will be among those arguing for an expanded role for the ACC as a body more democratically elected and representative of all orders of the Church, and both genders, by the way. In our session on the report in Sewanee, Guy Lytle made a point I wish to acknowledge – that the ACC is not yet as representative of the global

south and people of color as it should be. I concur, and suggest it should be made so before it takes on additional covenanted responsibilities. But my point still holds.

- D. Finally, I am concerned about the language on the expanded role of the Archbishop of Canterbury in Par. 109. Although it tries to disguise it, the language is frighteningly reminiscent of the “immediate, universal jurisdiction” granted the Papacy at Vatican I, a hole the Roman Catholic Church is still trying to dig out of which produces horrors like the Hunthausen case. I note that no Patriarch of the Eastern Church, not even Constantinople, has anything like the authority imagined in Par. 109, let alone at Vatican I. I am very fond of the current occupant of the seat of St. Augustine, but very, very leery of this increase in prelacy.

#### IV. Closing

- A. In closing, I would like to offer an alternative view of where we are.
- B. In his very fine book, *The spirit of life : the Holy Spirit in the life of the christian*, Portugese/Indian Jesuit Luis Bermejo offers a different model for reception than the one we have presented to us in the Windsor Report. He sees it in four stages, each beginning with a “C”. Communication, Conflict, Consensus, Communion. First, there has to be enough communication for folks to know a disagreement is arising. In the days of the early Church this was problematic, but when it did happen, slow enough that people had time to think, though we must recall there were riots and rock-fights in the streets of Constantinople over the Trinitarian formula. Communication has now become so rapid, however, that reflection is now mostly crowded out by reactivity and an ideological rhetoric which perpetuates conflict rather than resolves it. This is a deep infection in the Republic as well as the Church. Frankly, we all need to take a deep breath and declare a cease-fire.
- C. Then comes an inevitable stage of conflict as the Church uses all its resources to work through the issue at hand. Impaired communion sometimes occurs, but that is always regrettable, and ultimately means that one voice is not at the table, and may not return for centuries. Recent progress with both the Antiochene and Alexandrian Churches, as well as between them, to say nothing of the Lutheran-Roman Catholic agreement on Justification, remind us these arguments take much, much longer, even when in the end it looks as if we will be able to work them out, if communion is too impaired and voices are excluded. That is my real concern about the idea that certain bishops should voluntarily stay away from the councils of the Church or be disinvented. That will only prolong the conflict by attempting to bring premature closure to a serious theological debate. I agree with Rowan Williams that such efforts at premature closure are a serious form of unfaithfulness.
- D. We long for the ensuing stages of consensus and communion. But when we try to force it, they only recede from us. The issue for us, as I see it, is to learn how to remain faithful and in the maximum amount of charity with one another while we live through a protracted stage of conflict. It took a couple of hundred years for the Church to get the Creedal stuff worked out. I do not expect the current kerfuffle to be much shorter. Our job is to make as bright a future for our spiritual descendants as possible by being faithful in a stage of conflict. Obviously, I think we should not erect new authoritarian structures to terminate the conflict, but I think some kind of Covenant to keep it in bounds is a good idea. I also think we should begin by admitting on all sides that we are arguing about a matter that is not essential, but very, very important. Walter Bouman gave a great address at the dinner of the Fellows’ Forum in February. His point was simple: you Anglicans have everything you need to get through this. It’s called the Chicago/Lambeth Quadrilateral. Everything I have said is only a loud Amen to that point.

## The Windsor Report 2004

The report outlines crisply the problematic nature of diocesan and provincial decisions which have not received the assent of the whole Communion, and in this respect the four Instruments of Unity are to be welcomed. Their individual integrity and collective dynamic are in line with both the current ethos of the Communion and the checks and balances which have sustained the notion of Anglicanism over the centuries. It is good to see that the current isolation and, therefore, extreme vulnerability of the Archbishop of Canterbury is to be addressed through the formation of a Council of Advice. However, the chances must be high that the position of Archbishop of Canterbury, as stated in the Report, will continue to encourage a sense of conservatism rather than progression.

The Report throws up two problems, one through what is written and one through what is omitted:

1. the reference to *adiaphora* is helpful, but the difficulties with the New Testament instance cited, about food, are that:
  - a. while the issue of food may be to us *adiaphoron*, it was anything but to early Christians: hence the bias towards food conventions in the Council of Jerusalem declaration (Acts 15:19-20, 28-29, where three, if not four, out of four restrictions pertained to food), and the uproar caused over eating arrangements in Galatians 2: 11-14.
  - b. if we apply to our decision-making Paul's injunction to respect the consciences of those with whom we disagree, how will anything change, because on nearly all major issues there is disagreement of one sort or another
2. the Report is transparent about the immediate crises which have led to its necessity, and at one level it seems to be even-handed in its recommendations about future action needed to preserve the Communion in the face of deep division of opinion. However, there is no reference in the Report to the often messy way in which various dioceses and provinces have reached agreement on issues, sometimes through illegal or illicit activity (such as the liturgical developments in the use of ritual in the C/E in the 19<sup>th</sup> century) and sometimes through extra-canonical behaviour (as in the ordination of women to the priesthood in the 20<sup>th</sup> century). Indeed, it is somewhat surprising to see the Communion's position over the ordination held up as a model of good practice, when frustration on one side led to irregular communions before decisions were taken and anger on the other has made a subsequent mockery of our claim to be in communion with one another.

These two sets of problems suggest that the issue being dealt with is more complex than the Windsor Report has acknowledged. They might also suggest that striving for a solid measure of unity will be even more difficult. However, I would commend the demarcation used by Dietrich Bonhoeffer<sup>1</sup>, the origins of which appear in the work of Thomas Aquinas, between matters of ultimate and penultimate importance. The Communion holds together credally through a common commitment to belief in a triune God and morally through attempts to live out the trust and love we believe God has invested in us. We differ, and always have differed, in the practical ways in which we have understood and interpreted the Creeds and the moral injunctions deriving from or relating to them, but that has usually not prevented us from being in communion with one another. Indeed, is not the quality of communion enhanced when brothers and sisters share in the eucharist together, knowing that they are divided in so many opinions? In this respect, the Report might have been a little more direct in condemning the use

---

<sup>1</sup> Cited in CL Nesson *Many members yet one body* Minneapolis: Fortress 2004 pp18-19 from ed E Bethge of D Bonhoeffer *Ethics* London: Fontana 1964 from 6<sup>th</sup> German Edition 1963 pp125ff

of threats to break or withhold communion, which make the expression of mutual love and bonding ever more distant.

The decisions by two dioceses in the USA and Canada were reached in attempts to interpret the love of Christ which constrains us (2 Corinthians 5:14). Of course, not everyone inside and outside those diocese agrees with the decisions. My province frequently makes decisions its adherents disagree with, but we are surely losing our hold on the love of Christ, when we use a dominical sacrament as a bargaining chip. I fear that the Windsor Report's fine efforts will go unrewarded, unless there is some clear thinking and humble recognition of diversity among us. Why cannot we uphold one another across all the divides in prayer and respect, and nowhere more poignantly than at the communion table, instead of using a form of spiritual blackmail to impose our views on others?

Richard Bryant Principal of the Newcastle Local Ministry Scheme and of the Reader Training Course  
19/05/05

Responses to the Windsor Report Summary from Students

**Group 1**

**Question 2**

While Sections A and B are defining unity in the Anglican Communion, sections C and D are showing the divisions of the Communion. Therefore in this case we do not have a flow since we have lost (?) the initial direction of maintaining unity within the Communion. Therefore in the future cases the recommendations or proposals given about seeking permission will (?) suit and they are actually flowing in this matter. The issue of the gay bishop remaining bishop creates lack of flow since the diocese will be cut off from the Communion. He needs to be deconsecrated (?) to preserve the unity.

In spite of the fact that we agree with other (?) proposals we may not accept the Archbishop of Canterbury being the spokesman of the Anglican Communion (giving directives) as this may take us back to the years of the papacy in the Roman Catholic (Church) where the pope made ex-cathedra utterances.

**Question 3**

For the continuation of the unity of community there should be no gay bishop because it's against reason, scripture and tradition, hence the bishop of New Hampshire should be asked to step down and apologise to the communion.

The termination of the blessing of the same sex marriages will not help maintain our unity if we allow the already existing same sex marriages continue unrevoked for it to have impact these marriages must be revoked.

As already stated if this is allowed it will take us back to the days of papacy (dark ages). In case of the disputed cases the primates should meet and give a corrective directive.

**Group 2**

**Question 2**

Section C and D does not agree or there is no appropriate flow as in A and B. These sections rather contradict for in Section D, the situation has not been given. It tends to retain the already consecrated bishop instead of revoking his consecration. There is compromise and as a bishop does not reveal the unity and aspect of witnessing the gospel of Christ.

**Question 3**

The whole flock would be lost if the report is implemented as it would mislead the dioceses within the Communion. It would not reflect unity within Anglican Communion and would not reflect Biblical principles.

**Group 3**

**Question 2**

The proposals in sections C and D do not flow appropriately since we do not have the actual report from Windsor. It is to be noted as a fact that the Anglican churches have been able in the twentieth century (to) enter into agreements on Christian faith and discipline with other denominations it should be possible for them to enter into such a 'covenant' with each other as churches of the same denomination. We should not then be forced to unite on the path of evil for the sake of maintaining a communion that condones biblical evil and made (?) a tablet counting (?) good for swallowing. It is proper (?) to deem here (?) that the structures of the Anglican Communion is to be lamented for any disagreement that threatens the unity of the Communion (sic). It then concords with the suggestion to have a 'Council of Advice' appointed across the Communion to assist the Archbishop of Canterbury in discerning the views of the Communion.

### **Question 3**

As the report recommended some circumstances which have inflicted tension within the Communion cited as a) the ordination of a bishop living in a committed homosexual relationship; b) the authorisation of public rites of blessing for couples living in a same sex union and c) bishops operating outside of their calling to a particular diocese (their jurisdiction) to take the leadership of parishes which object to the ministry of their proper bishop.

Indeed for the future of the Communion, there should be no consecration of bishops with such life style since the issue of the bishop of New Hampshire had brought immense tension in the life of the Communion posing dangers of the communion tearing apart.

For the communion to remain united and strong, there should not be any advocacy in the future for public rites of blessing same sex unions knowing very well that such development cannot either be justified from the Bible or Christian traditions.

Any primate should be able to exercise their God-given authority to make sure all the bishops under their leadership should indeed be found (?) serving God within their jurisdiction which suggests they are in a football teams that are vulnerable and exposed to being 'bought' to play for the next team as is the practice already seen in the teams (sic).

We as Communion should also recognise the fact in granting the Archbishop[ of Canterbury it would interfere with the Provincial authority each province within the Communion enjoy (sic).

And that in considering any act of such developments, it is proper that every theology be relevant to the people's context (sic).

### **Group 4**

### **Question 2**

If C and D are observed then there will be holiness of life in Christ and the unity as suggested in Section B will be achieved.

### **Question 3**

Impact:

Faith will be strong.

The unity will be strengthened.

The authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury will be felt in the whole Communion of Anglicans in the world.

Practices/teaching/doctrine will be controlled from one central office than anybody coming up with his own practice (there will be unison).

2<sup>nd</sup> February 2005

From: The Principal of The Tabora Anglican Training Centre, Tanzania

I would like to respond to the Questions sent to me as follows:

1: The life of the Anglican Communion as stated in sections A and B. should be always based on biblical teaching that is accepted by all shades of Christian belief.

I indeed agree with the statement provided in section BE. that the Unity of Christian Churches is one of the ways in which we bear witness to the love of God.... and to remain a Communion of the churches we need to move together in harmony. However I see no reason to compromise with any Ungodly development which is contrary to the clear teaching of the Bible.

2. According to my Understanding I think all sections are trying to find a way forward for the Anglican communion by Continuing to combine the threads to common life and what should be adopted in the future for the welfare of the body of Christ.

I would like to comment that the Anglican Communion is just one part in the body of Christ. Therefore we should not uproot ourselves from the whole body of Christ, instead we should look beyond our Communion in our search for Christian truth.

Communities or denominations of the Christian Church and thereby risk uprooting ourselves from the body of Christ.

3. I think it is the right time to implement the Windsor Report so that we can? seek agreement within our (the Anglican) Communion no matter how hard we find it to reach that agreement.

4. The Anglican Communion can be helped to stay together by holding to the fundamental principles of the true God as revealed through the Scriptures.

5. As Committed Christians we should always hold to the principles laid down by Christ himself notably when he was

questioned about divorce, he took his questioners back to the fundamental principle that marriage

(i) Instituted by God (ii) to be entered into by one man with one woman (iii) for the duration of the life of either or both of them.

6. It will indeed be sad if, the Anglican Church separates from each other. However there will be no choice if others

choose to do so. We must however maintain our love towards them and seek reconciliation with them.

From The Rev. Canon Sospeter T. Ndenza  
Principal of TATC - Anglican Church of Tanzania  
Postal address: PO Box 1408 Tabora Tanzania East Africa  
Tel: +255 26 2604124  
e-mail: [acttbr@taboraonline.com](mailto:acttbr@taboraonline.com), [sndenza@hotmail.com](mailto:sndenza@hotmail.com)  
<<mailto:acttbr@taboraonline.com>, <mailto:sndenza@hotmail.com>>

19 May 2005

Dear Archbishop

**WINDSOR REPORT: Principals of Anglican Theological Institutions**

Theological Education by Extension College Southern Africa (TEECSA) is an ecumenical institution offering training for ministry to Christians from a wide range of denominational backgrounds and theological convictions. The Anglican Communion is strongly represented in our learner body through our more than 600 registered Anglicans, training for lay ministry, for the diaconate and for the priesthood. The Church of the Province of Southern Africa is one of TEECSA's founding members and remains a Council member of the College at the present time. The CPSA is therefore represented at a management level, and the Rt Revd Peter Lee, Bishop of the Diocese of Christ the King, is currently a member of the Executive of the Council.

Our Anglican learner constituency is extremely varied, and we are aware that opinion among them about the current 'recent developments in the Anglican/Episcopal Churches of North America' is as varied. Many, probably the majority, take the view that the Lambeth Resolution I.10 of 1988 is normative. A minority support the consecration of Bishop Gene Robinson and the actions taken by the Diocese of New Hampshire. We are also aware that many Anglicans in the CPSA are puzzled and confused by the debate, as their first exposure to it was in the national media. They did not know that there was an issue, do not understand why there is one, have not reflected on the alternatives, and are upset by the signs of division.

As a College, our educational methodology is that of critical reflection and debate. The history of South African education, with its emphasis on rote learning, uncritical acceptance of prejudice and 'follow the leader' philosophy, has made it imperative for us to equip the saints to think for themselves! We help our leaders to wrestle with scripture, identify their own denominational doctrinal and ethical markers, understand a range of perspectives in those questions that are currently under debate in the Christian world, and draw their own conclusions faithfully, under God. Additionally, because we are an ecumenical college, we cannot take particular denominational stances. So we take the debates seriously and draw attention to them where appropriate. But we remain - with the joys and pains that this entails - a College with broad perspectives and the unresolved tensions of our constituency.

We hope that this gives you an additional, albeit complex, perspective, in your follow-up to the report, and wish you God's blessings in the process. We continue to pray for the Communion in this turbulent time.

Yours in Christ

Rev Dr Adrian Chatfield, Course Advisor, on behalf of  
Rev James Massey, Principal

Tel (Res): 256-41-290420  
Mobile: 256-77-770801 E-  
fax: (USA) 208-694-3355 E-  
mail: stephennoll@ucu.ac.ug



Tel (Off): 256-41-290828  
Fax: 256-41-290800  
E-mail: ucu@ucu.ac.ug  
Website: www.ucu.ac.ug

Our Ref: ..

OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR

Your Ref:

4 December 2004

The Most Rev. Peter Kwong  
Chairman, RRG Anglican  
Communion Office London

Dear Archbishop:

**RE: Responses to the Windsor Report**

Thank you for the request for responses to the Windsor Report. It so happened that the week after I received your letter, there was a conference in Mukono of all diocesan secretaries, principals of theological colleges, and academic staff here at Uganda Christian University.

After conferring with this group of church leaders, we circulated the enclosed petition. It is my hope that the Primates and other leaders of the Communion will take with utmost seriousness the crisis into which the Episcopal Church USA and the Diocese of New Westminster has thrust the Anglican Communion. As you will see from the petition, it is our conviction that only the firmest discipline will suffice to keep the Communion together under God.

Please feel free to let me know if there is any further information I can give you.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Stephen Noll'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

The Rev. Prof. Stephen Noll  
Vice Chancellor

Cc: Archbishop of the Church of Uganda

Cordially in Christ,

## THE PROVINCE OF THE CHURCH OF UGANDA (ANGLICAN)

### Statement by the Theological Educators and Diocesan Secretaries

TO: The Reception Reference Group  
Anglican Communion Office London

We, the Heads of theological colleges and faculties, and the Diocesan Secretaries of the Church of Uganda (Anglican) have been meeting together to discuss various matters affecting the life of our Church.

A request has been presented to us by the Most Rev. Peter Kwong to respond to the Windsor Report of October 2004. Not all of us have read the Report in full. Having received the summary of its contents and its recommendations, we feel able to make the following response.

We thank the Lambeth Commission for its work on behalf of the unity of the Anglican Communion. We appreciate its acceptance of Lambeth Resolution 1.10 as the Communion Norm on sexual morality. We understand the difficulties of enforcing discipline across the wide variety of churches of the Anglican Communion.

However, we wish to register an African point of view on the following points:

- We believe the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury and any Council of Advice to enforce discipline within the Communion should be exercised only in consultation and in the name of the Primates Council and full weight should be given to the views of the majority churches of the Global South.
- We believe the proper response of the Episcopal Church USA to the consecration of Gene Robinson and the authorization of same-sex rites is a formal statement of repentance, the removal or resignation of Robinson from office, and the retraction of all legislation permitting homosexuals to enter into marriage arrangements.
- We believe that the Bishop of Luwero and His Grace the Archbishop of the Church of Uganda were right to come to the assistance of those faithful parishes in the Episcopal Church USA who appealed for support.
- We believe that the Anglican Communion should recognize the Network of Anglican Communion Parishes and Dioceses as the true representative of Anglicanism in the United States until such time as the Episcopal Church USA has repented and reformed its ways.

It is our prayer that true unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace may emerge in our great Communion as a result of godly and biblical discipline.

[Signed by 20 Diocesan Secretaries, 18 Theological Educators and 7 others in attendance]

## **Response to the Windsor Report**

Westcott House is grateful to have been given the opportunity to respond to the Windsor Report. We do so from our particular perspective as a training institution for the clergy of the Church of England. The teaching of our founder, Brooke Foss Westcott, exemplifies what has become known as liberal Catholicism, one of the vital strands of world Anglicanism and an inspiration to its development. The major themes of his theological work were:

1. *Attentiveness to scripture and its interpretation.*
2. *The incarnation as the model of the Church in the world.*
3. *The transformation of society: a continuous engagement between Church and world with an emphasis on mission and social justice.*

We receive the Windsor Report as a response to a particular crisis in the history of the Anglican Communion. There is much that we welcome, in particular:

- *The attempt to develop the meaning of 'Communion' in such a way that our 44 member churches should be strengthened in bonds of affection.*
- *The attempt to make explicit the hitherto implicit theological and ecclesial values of Anglicanism.*
- *The reticence of the report in not emphasising the language of sin, and in calling for 'regret' rather than repentance.*
- *The recognition of the duty to inform and consult across the communion on issues where difference is likely to cause pain.*
- *The potential for discernment in the development of the concept of adiaphora.*

However, given our allegiance to the principles of our foundation we do have some concerns, which we present here, linked to the priorities above. The fact that we write of our concerns at greater length than those aspects of the report which we welcome should not be taken to mean that our concerns outweigh our welcome, and we trust that our reflections will be received in good faith as part of the process of reception.

As a theological introduction to our response we draw attention to what we believe has been a consistent emphasis in classical Anglicanism which distinguishes us both from the Roman Catholic Church and from the churches of the Reform, that is, the *provisionality* to which the Church is subject as it awaits the fulfilment of God's purpose in the *eschaton*.

### **Theological introduction**

The Lordship of Jesus Christ over the whole of creation is something which is not only personally *life* changing, but more generally *world* changing. After the Resurrection, the world will simply never be the same again. For Paul, the Christian is constantly exhorted to live out the reality of being a new creation, not for him or herself alone, but on behalf of the whole world, as God's purposes for the world are foreshadowed in the Church. The Church has always struggled to make sense of the implications of its new status, in terms both of ethics and its relationship with the non-Christian world. However, Paul is clear that the whole of creation *is* subject to the rule of Christ, and will ultimately be brought into relationship with Him. This creation is *good*, it has been brought into being through Christ as the Eternal Word of the Father. (John 1:1-18) As the report affirms, the Church exists to serve the world in the purposes of God (para. 9), to call the world to its true identity and urge it towards its destiny at the *eschaton*: a destiny which is assured because of the nature of its Lord.

The writers of the New Testament present a vision in which the world, though fallen, is redeemed. God's faithfulness to his promises results in his constant 'Yes' to humanity (2 Corinthians 1:20). Until the *eschaton*, when 'the earth is filled with glory of God as the waters cover the sea' (Habakkuk 2:14, Isaiah 11:9) members of the Church are to grow more and more into the likeness of Christ, and to live the fruits of the new creation. Conditioned by human frailty, mistakes are part of that growth. Where sin abounds, grace abounds even more (Romans 5:20), and that which is grievous can be turned into an occasion for good. This implies that a call from one part of the Body to the other for repentance must be to effect reconciliation, not humiliation (para 134 and the conclusions in para. 156). The Church's efforts to try to work out exactly how it lives in faithfulness to her relationship with Christ, as head of the Body, is given structure and safety by Christ's own promise that ultimately, 'the gates of hell shall not prevail' (Matthew 16:18) against the Church.

The fruits of the new creation are for the whole of humanity, and not just for a few. The danger of becoming inward-looking, and thus failing in its mission, can all too readily become apparent in the Church's analysis of its own structures. In a Church which is dynamically driving the world towards the *eschaton*, it is important not to attach permanence to temporary structures, or to endow them with an assumed soterial authority. Classical Anglicanism is essentially pragmatic. Very little is *given* apart from the Scriptures, creeds and three-fold order of ministry.

### **Attentiveness to Scripture and its Interpretation**

Westcott gave his life to the study of Scripture and saw Scripture as inexhaustible in its riches and depth. He accepted the need for historical criticism, assuming, (rightly in our view) that scholarship and sound reasoning have an important role in scriptural interpretation. He valued the way in which the early Christian Fathers interpreted Scripture in the light of their own cultural context, and sought to find in scriptures the resources, if not the precise answers, for meeting the challenges of his own day.

His example urges us not to force Scripture to yield over-simple solutions to particular contemporary dilemmas. As Rowan Williams comments in an essay on Westcott, both the ecclesial left and right are tempted to let doctrine be shaped by an apologetic concern which 'avoids the labour of working through why a new perspective on some questions remains part of one continuing conversation, part of a common work with the writers of the Bible or the creeds' (*Anglican Identities*, 2004, p 86).

At Westcott, following our founder's example, we practise a continuous exposure to scripture through prayer and liturgy. It is because of our commitment to the 'labour' of patient absorption of Scripture and an openness to the world which Scripture addresses that we reject any attempt to find in particular scriptural texts direct messages from God for the Church which are universally applicable without attention to context, new historical or scientific knowledge and the witness of reason.

We recognise that there are parts of the Communion which are more inclined to read Scripture as the source of such direct divine messages believing them to be applicable more or less in all circumstances and across all cultures. We believe our own approach to be at least as consonant as that approach with the 'classic' Anglicanism we aspire to uphold.

The report, on the other hand, is neither clear within itself about the kind of authority it assumes Scripture to hold, nor sufficiently frank about the differences within the Communion over its interpretation. We find that, though it commends scholarship and an awareness of context, it does in the end give considerable weight to the view that 'difficult judgements' in the life of the Church *can* be made definitively once there is 'full knowledge of the texts' (para.57).

We believe that this approach is potentially self-defeating as it is precisely this kind of interpretative technique which can be made to support two opposite positions, reducing the Bible, in effect, to a set of proof texts. The report does not recognise sufficiently how our reading of Scripture is conditioned by our historical and cultural contexts. There is no 'neutral' position from which Scripture can be interpreted which is above context and culture.

### **The Incarnation as the Model of the Church in the World**

B.F Westcott saw the incarnation as the heart of the Gospel and the key to the nature of the Church and its mission. The Church 'extends' the incarnation both in its sacramental and social life, manifesting God's purpose for human and humane life, based on equality, justice and dignity. The Incarnation requires all our theology to be **contextual** since God in Christ made *our* human life his context, and redeemed us within that context

The report, on the other hand, adopts an uncritically Reformed position on the purpose of the Church. It exists for 'radical holiness' (para. 3) to facilitate the mission of God, which is expressed exclusively in terms of 'the rescue of the created order from all that defaces, corrupts and destroys it' (para. 1). The Church here is presented in idealised terms as 'a united family across traditional ethnic or other boundaries', as though it is 'above' the messy world of human difference and beyond the necessity for patient negotiation.

While we acknowledge that many Anglicans are at home with the dramatic language of 'rescue' from evil, it seems to us that such a start focuses the mind primarily on *what is wrong* with human beings rather than on God's affirmation of the human condition through the incarnation. In a report designed to deal with a rift based on the

sensitive issue of human sexuality this seems to undermine the affirmative theology of creation that has always been a part of our classic Anglican heritage. Alongside the Sin / Redemption axis of Anglican thought, we want to affirm the Creation / Incarnation axis and to suggest that it has not been given due theological weight in the report.

Furthermore, we suggest that if the Creation / Incarnation axis *had* been given due weight it may have had implications for the ecclesiological developments outlined in the report. The centralising tendency of the report might be taken to suggest that the Church is simply giving up on the labour of taking culture seriously. We believe this is a mistake. In contrast to the centralised Roman Catholic model and the looser federation model of the reformed Churches, Anglicanism has a unique opportunity to affirm a middle way in which a central core is accepted by all, with genuine flexibility for regional and local culture to impact on issues of interpretation and practice. An articulation of the Creation / Incarnation axis would at the very least have suggested that the Communion should not lightly attempt to impose centralising authority, but rather continue to require dialogue between those from different contexts in the confidence that human cultures are capable of godly transformation as long as they remain open to one another in Christ.

### **Church and World, Mission and Social Justice**

In tandem with his attentiveness to the detail of scripture, Bishop Westcott's theological approach was one of *looking out* to and *engaging* with the world. His personal commitment was to a Christian transformation of the order of society. This optimistic vision was a uniting force among leaders of the Anglican Communion in his time, and contributed to the development of common life.

In our own age the question of how cultural identities can coherently relate to one another within an increasingly globalised and media-formed world are of major concern to Christians and non-Christians alike. We increasingly see different groups reacting to this situation through sectarian retreat and hostility to potentially compromising engagement. This report has been written in response to a particular crisis and we recognise the need for such a reaction. However, it would be valuable to consider the context of this crisis: a newly-emerged media and communications agenda which runs the danger of forcing the church away from its missionary task of engagement towards an excessive focus on its own interiority, a retreat which involves the search for supra-cultural and a-historical readings of scripture and tradition.

If this context makes *theoretical unity* more difficult for the churches of the Communion to achieve, the challenge to us of a *unity in social purpose and worldly engagement* is surely greater than ever. It is not issues of 'church order' that dominate the life of our world but AIDS, war, poverty and oppression. Whenever the Church becomes too inward-looking it runs the grave risk of forfeiting its apostolicity.

It is the world of need and injustice that the Church is called to inhabit, not least in its scholarship. We fully recognise the need for scholarship to move beyond the entrenched positions of purely secularising enlightenment thought. But the meaning of a scholarship "constrained by loyalty to the church across time and space" (para. 60) is unclear and potentially introspective. Rather, contemporary scholarship must inhabit the time and space of the world, with all its inequalities and injustices - which is surely the proper locus of the Church itself. To quote one of the Communion's leading thinkers, "the purpose of liberal thought is not to compromise Christian faith, but to rediscover the meaning of maintaining it in the modern world." (Daniel W Hardy, *Strategy of Liberalism*, 1991, p.301)

We believe that one part of the engagement to which the Church is called involves taking up the dialogue with lesbian and gay people to which the Communion has already committed itself at the 1998 Lambeth Conference.

### **The Church Empowered**

The report suggests that some restriction of provincial autonomy must be implemented to prevent the disintegration of the Communion. Although the report argues that decisions should be taken as locally as possible, it implies that provinces are not individually competent to decide on whether an issue is *adiaphora* or not. The problem of this judgement is that if only a *central* body can decide what is or is not *adiaphora* the principle of provincial autonomy may be undercut to such an extent that a locally appropriate pastoral response could well become impossible. The central issue here is at what level decisions are taken and judgements about those decisions made.

We recognise that there are a number of deep-seated tensions within the life of the Anglican Communion. Because of the tendency to extremism from various directions, we cautiously welcome the introduction of a Covenant, which would enable what is implicit in our shared tradition to be given explicit and binding authority. We agree that this should involve a commitment to the supremacy of Scripture, the acceptance of the Catholic Creeds and the Threefold Order. This is the firm ground for all other dialogues of faith, morals and the meaning of 'communion'. We believe, however, that the adoption of the Covenant into inter-Anglican polity requires a more coherent and positive theological rationale than is given in the report.

We also recognise that for such a Covenant to be effective it must be possible for judgements to be made, on developments and controversies within the Communion, and that the Communion may well require some such forum as the proposed 'Council of Advice' to the Archbishop of Canterbury which is proposed. We have serious reservations, though, about the enhancement of powers of particular centralised bodies within the Communion. In particular we question:

### *The proposed enhanced role of the Archbishop of Canterbury*

We are concerned that any enhancement of the Archbishop's role to being '*the significant focus of unity, mission and teaching*' which articulates 'the mind of the Communion especially in areas of controversy' (para. 109) runs the risk of attaching magisterial authority to an office which has never claimed such a charism, and certainly not outside its own Province. It makes nonsense of the fact that the Archbishop's primacy is currently held to be one of honour (as agreed by the Lambeth Conference of 1968) and not of any claim to universal jurisdiction.

### *The status of the Lambeth Conference*

There is a tendency in the report to view the Lambeth conferences, the ACC and the Primates' Meetings as possessing a status close to that of the great Ecumenical Councils, (e.g. para. 94). Whilst a gathering of the Bishops may have moral force, we do not believe Conferences involving such bodies should be regarded as universal councils. The Conference of 1920 explicitly rejected any such claim. It would be wrong to imbue Conference decisions with permanence, when 'periods of reception' are consistently urged by Anglican documents as a major part of any process of change.

## **Conclusion**

In sum, while we welcome the invitation to commitment to the inheritance of Anglican faith as set forth in Appendix 2:1-IV, we have reservations about the way this is given 'teeth' in Section V. In particular we fear that the attempt to impose centralised solutions to problems that arise from the clash of different cultures in our Communion is likely to be received as law rather than grace by those on either side of this debate who feel that their concerns have been dismissed, or that they have been 'defeated', or used as scapegoats. We question whether it is possible to express the 'traditional bonds of affection' through teaching which is 'explicit and forceful' (para. 118) without destroying the openness to 'the other' which has always characterised Anglicanism. At the very least it needs to be demonstrated that the proposed developments in the report, have some organic connection with four hundred years of Anglican experience of dealing with 'difference' without an authoritative 'centre'.

Our concern is that such a centre, though itself a development of Anglican Communion polity, could all too easily function to *prevent* legitimate development. For example, it must be an open question whether, had the present proposals been in place, it would have been possible for *any* province to proceed with the ordination of women. The two opposing sides in that debate were finally able to reach an accommodation which preserved the integrity of both positions without splitting the Communion. The difficulty for an Anglican 'magisterium' is that it would inevitably be open to appeal from both sides who would naturally tend to state their arguments as forcefully as possible while awaiting arbitration. Something of the 'patient labour' which Bishop Westcott believed was so necessary in our struggle to interpret Scripture, context, culture and one another might thereby be lost to world Anglicanism.