



Volume 8, Nos.3&4

Publisher

Michael W. Hopkins

Editor

Mark Kozielec

Book Editor

Nick Downen

Regular

Contributors

John C. Bradley
Edgar Kim Byham
Ann Carlson
Louie Crew

Production

Judit Bilinzsky
Chuck Doyle

**Published by
Integrity, Inc.**

PO Box 5255
New York, NY
10185-5255

Fred H. Ellis III -
President

Editorial Office
(603) 595-4245

*Member
Episcopal
Communicators*

**Copyright 1998
Integrity, Inc.**

Contents

from the editor	3
credits:	3
reality warp	4
the road to the resolution	5
hijacked on the road to compassion	10
human sexuality: a report	14
a pastoral statement to lesbian and gay anglicans	15
9 reasons why the lambeth resolution has little credibility	16
contrary to scripture?	18
a response you can make	19
analysis of lambeth — how, why, and what effect?	20
fred phelps disguised as an anglican bishop!	24
the voice of lambeth, 1908	27
pb abstains, then says why	29
lambeth reactions	30
lambeth reflected	32
lambeth: a modest proposal	36
showdown at the lambeth corral	37
that we may be one: integrity/lutherans concerned	40
that we may be one: eu coverage	44
overheard	47
cherishing love and friendship	48
religious response	50
new board elected	51
beyond inclusion '99	51
parallel lives	52
dixit Anno: who counts? who cares?	54
president's column	55

Cover: A parody of tabloid covers with just a bit of truth (or perhaps, too much)?
Designed by Mark Kozielec.

PHOTO CREDITS: John Clinton Bradley, pages 43 and 47 (top); Edgar Kim Byham, pages 5, 7, 8, 11-13, 17, 23-26, and 29; Mark Kozielec, pages 41 and 47 (bottom).

Ten years and will you be a footnote merely...
e.e.cummings

I've been thinking about that cumming's line throughout the creation of this issue of *The Voice of Integrity*. As my tenure as editor (and executive secretary) comes to a close, I've been looking over three years worth of past issues with an eye to what constitutes History and the lesser "historical footnote."

It's easy to see that the Righter debacle, and subsequent victory, will stand the test of time – it's not everyday that "heresy trials" are bandied about. But what else?

It seems to me that the 1997 General Convention coverage, even the near-passage in Deputies of the same-sex blessings resolution, along with the passage of domestic partnership benefits, will be, for the most part, relegated to footnotes.

I think that it's safe to say that the recent events in Lambeth will be with us for some time. As this issue of *The Voice* shows, we Christians (and I don't mean only lesbigay ones!) have a long road ahead on the way to full inclusion. I hesitate to say "we Episcopalians" because I think that while our focus on our own sect is easily justifiable, our myopia often leads us to believe that we're much farther along than we are.

Integrity, as an organization, rightfully celebrated our hard-fought victories over the last few years. Many, however, have taken this progress to mean that the war has been won. I often hear from folks who say that, since they are accepted in their parish/diocese, there really isn't a great need for them to be involved in the struggle for inclusion. Lambeth showed that myopia can be a near-fatal disease.

As you'll read in this issue, many of our enemies will not be satisfied until lesbigay people are completely eradicated from *their* church. This policy of spiritual genocide should be no less shocking than physical genocide – yet we have "moderate" bishops voting along with it in order to "give our African brothers something to take home." Our own primate decides to *abstain* as we, and our sisters and brothers around the world, are being vilified in ways that lay the groundwork for the eventual justification and acceptance of a "final solution" regarding lesbians and gays in the church.

As you read this, you may feel that it's a bit *de trop* to equate the Lambeth resolution on sexuality to the birth of planned genocide. I would ask that you very carefully immerse yourself in the rhetoric of

those who would exclude us. And, to please pay particular attention to the words that spew forth from the lips of the spiritual leader of our Anglican communion – our very own Chamberlain and Petain, all rolled into one.

My rhetoric is raw and highly polemical for a reason: sometimes it takes a shock to resuscitate the complacent.

Yes, it's time to respond, to vociferously react by letting our rectors/bishops/primate know that we will not be led like mute lambs to the slaughter. More importantly (and this cannot be overstressed), *it's time to be proactive*, to plan for our *active* roles in annual parish meetings, diocesan conventions and General Convention 2000. If you're lucky enough, as I am, to belong to a parish/diocese that accepts you as a blessing of God's handiwork, volunteer your time/talent/treasure to a place that doesn't. Write a letter, make a phone call, give a presentation, write a check – whatever we do, we can't just sit here, happy in our own complacency. Happy, that is, until we become mere footnotes in this struggle of evil vs. good.

credits:

Many talented and passionate people contributed to this issue as well as past issues. As I prepare to leave, I want to thank everyone who contributed articles, pictures, criticism and advice over the last three years.

First and foremost, our observers at Lambeth:

Edgar Kim Byham, past national president of Integrity, Inc. (amongst many other offices), is a member of Integrity/New York; a member of the House of Deputies from the diocese of Newark; and an attorney with the New York Power Authority. He lives with his partner of many years, Scott Helsel, a former editor of *The Voice* and executive secretary of Integrity, Inc. Both Kim and Scott were instrumental in assisting me when I took over as editor – I cannot thank them enough for their kindness (and patience!) with me.

The Rev. Michael W. Hopkins, Director of Communications and President-elect of the national board of Integrity, Inc. You can read more about Michael on page 51. Here, I want to thank him for being an editor's dream of a publisher: hands-off, except when needed!

Thank you, also: Judit Bilinzsky (graphics); John Clinton Bradley; Ann Carlson (who won two Polly Bond Awards in May for her column, *Dixit Anno*, and her article title, "Sex on the Floor;") Louie Crew; Nick Downen; Tobias Haller; Scott Larsen; and Jan Nunley.

I also extend my deep appreciation to the national board of Integrity, for allowing me the pleasure of working with them. I want to especially thank Fred Ellis, for all of his guidance, support and friendship.

Finally, I thank my partner of the last 10 years, Chuck Doyle, who listened to my gripes, celebrated my successes, and supported me spiritually and emotionally during my tenure as Executive Secretary/Editor.

from
the
editor

reality warp

by Michael W. Hopkins

T.S. Eliot must be a favorite of Archbishop George Carey's. He quoted him twice in his closing remarks to the Lambeth Conference.

It was Eliot who also said, "Human beings cannot bear very much reality." In the end, it seems that is the only lesson to be learned from the 1998 Lambeth Conference. Or, perhaps, Lambeth has taught us a corollary: *the Church can bear none at all.*

The saddest part of my observance of Lambeth was to watch the Church in what can only be described as a "reality warp." This seems to have been the net effect of the clash of realities as people from vastly different cultures with vastly different agendas attempted to speak and act as one. And it was certainly exacerbated by the agenda of some to rid the Church of the realities of others. The net effect, however, was to banish reality all together.

Reality was actually all around us in the ongoing life of the University and the Village. I only saw it break through to the Conference for a few moments when students stopped to stare (and some to shout back) at the street preachers who came on two days to make pronouncements about "homosexuals" and the wages of their sin. At all other times the students on campus seemed to studiously avoid anyone wearing a Conference badge. Those working at the lunch counter in the middle of campus seemed bemused by it all when they weren't being annoyed at all the foreigners who couldn't figure out the menu.

There was also Bishop Otis Charles' and my encounter with the owner of a pub where we had supper one of our first days. We were on the late end of the supper clients and she sat down to chat. After a bit she cocked her head and said, "You're not with that lot up on the hill are you?" We confessed that we were. Otis, sensing her disdain said, "It's really quite important . . ." He didn't finish his sentence, having been stopped dead by a

withering look of, "You can't actually believe that, can you?"

In his "intervention" in the debate on the human sexuality resolution, Archbishop Carey said, "I fully believe with all my heart that if this Conference is known and named by what we have said about homosexuality we will have failed." I hate to tell you this, your grace, but by the time you made that remark it already had failed. In fact, it was doomed to do so when you allowed the Conference to be hijacked by the American conservative jihad in the first place.

Of course most African and Asian bishops are extraordinarily conservative about homosexuality. That wasn't a surprise. Of course they voted the way they did. That wasn't a surprise either, given the opportunity. I certainly don't take any issue with those realities. But to allow the process to go on as it did? To allow the Bible to be used in such a blatantly prejudicial way? To allow the extreme, bordering on violent, statements against lesbian and gay people to be made with no challenge? To allow obvious scapegoating to go on? To allow a Conference of Anglican bishops to make such a sweeping statement—"rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture"—with no real chance for biblical and theological (not to mention experiential) discussion to take place in any kind of sustained way?

This Conference was a failure. It was a failure in that it failed to honor the faithful lives of a significant group of its own people, not to mention the world for which Christ died. It was a failure in that in doing so it allowed significant issues of world poverty and the violation of human rights, and even the most basic question of "What is the Gospel?", to take a back seat to bedroom politics. It was a failure in that doing so it sent the message to the world that the Church (at least this Church) will not deal with reality, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ has nothing to do with the daily lives of men and women struggling to live as best they can.

Is it any wonder these men and women studiously avoid and even disdain the reality warp that is the church? We are left with nothing to proclaim but the ridiculously mixed message that love is only love and goodness is only goodness and kindness is only kindness when we say it is.

This Conference was a failure in that it failed to honor the faithful lives of a significant group of its own people, not to mention the world for which Christ died.

the road to the resolution

By Kim Byham

The venue was the sports center at the University of Kent in Canterbury, England. Thanks to various tenting fabrics the gym used for the plenary sessions had an Arabian Knights feel. The surreal quality of the room seemed appropriate for the debate on homosexuality that followed.

The debate began at 3:30 P.M. on Wednesday, August 5, but the real work had begun over two weeks earlier in the Human Sexuality Sub-section. The members had gone back and forth about their report, and eventually, against all odds given their initial division, came out with a unanimous one. They spent less time on a proposed resolution.

As presented by Section 1 on Monday morning, August 3, the original resolution read:

VERSION 1

This conference:

- (a) In view of the teaching of scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between one man and one woman in lifelong union, and believes that celibacy is right for those who are not called to marriage; nevertheless,
- (b) Calls on all people to minister pastorally and sensitively to others irrespective of their sexual orientation and to condemn homophobia, violence within marriage and any trivialization and commercialization of sex,
- (c) Requests the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and the ACC to establish a means of monitoring the work done on the subject of human sexuality in the Communion and to share statements and resources among us.
- (b) In view of the teaching of scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that chastity is right for those who are not called to marriage;
- (c) Recognizes that there are among us persons who experience themselves as having a homosexual orientation. Many of these are members of the Church and are seeking the pastoral care, moral direction of the Church and God's transforming power for the living of their lives and the ordering of relationships. We wish to assure them that they are loved by God and that all baptised, believing and faithful persons, regardless of sexual orientation, are full members of the Body of Christ;
- (d) Calls on all our people to minister pastorally and sensitively to all irrespective of sexual orientation and to condemn homophobia, violence within marriage and any trivialization and commercialization of sex;
- (e) Cannot advise the legitimizing or ordaining of those involved in same gender unions;
- (f) Requests the Primates and the ACC to establish a means of monitoring the work done on the subject of human sexuality in the Com-

There was, however, an outcry from various conservatives not on the subcommittee. This led the sub-section to reconvene Monday and revise the resolution. It was released on Tuesday. This resolution was substituted for the original on the floor in the first vote on Wednesday.

VERSION 2

This conference:

- (a) Commends to the Church the sub-section report on human sexuality;

Michael Hopkins, retired Bishop Otis Charles and Kim Byham (l-r) outside their living quarters in Canterbury.

the resolution

munion and to share statements and resources among us.

As ultimately approved by the bishops, the resolution read:

VERSION 3 (FINAL)

This conference:

- (a) Commends to the Church the sub-section report on human sexuality;
- (b) In view of the teaching of scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage;
- (c) Recognizes that there are among us persons who experience themselves as having a homosexual orientation. Many of these are members of the Church and are seeking the pastoral care, moral direction of the Church and God's transforming power for the living of their lives and the ordering of relationships, and we commend ourselves to listen to the experience of homosexual people. We wish to assure them that they are loved by God and that all baptised, believing and faithful persons, regardless of sexual orientation, are full members of the Body of Christ;
- (d) While rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture, calls on all our people to minister pastorally and sensitively to all irrespective of sexual orientation and to condemn irrational fear of homosexuals, violence within marriage and any trivialization and commercialization of sex;
- (e) Cannot advise the legitimizing or blessing of same-sex unions, nor ordaining of those involved in same-gender unions;
- (f) Requests the Primates and the ACC to establish a means of monitoring the work done on the subject of human sexuality in the Communion and to share statements and resources among us;
- (g) Notes the significance of the Kuala Lumpur Statement and the concerns expressed in resolutions IV.26, V.1, V.10, V.23, and V.35 on the authority of Scripture in matters of marriage and sexuality and asks the Primates and the ACC to include them in their monitoring process.

The Most Rev. Robin Eames, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, moderated. His delightful Irish accent and manner helped relieve the tension, although he made at least two important decisions that tilted toward the conservatives.

Eames began with an Irish joke, ending with, "If I were going to Dublin, I wouldn't start here." That was intended to be a commentary on the upcoming debate. There was an extensive prayer.

"It is very obvious that there is a confused history regarding our resolutions," he said. He then said that he wanted to let the conference set its own rules. The accepted procedure was to first decide among the various substitute motions before moving on to the amendments thereto. "Rules are for people, rather than people for rules," said Eames, a former lawyer.

The Rt. Rev. Duncan Buchanan, Bishop of Johannesburg and Chair of the Human Sexuality Sub-section, began by taking responsibility for the confusion of the previous day. The sub-section members were, he reported, busy deciding between two alternative substitute resolutions and then consolidating them. It was almost too late. He was now supporting the substitute that his sub-section had written (Version 2 above).

"This resolution does not commit to anything other than traditional chastity in marriage or singleness." He continued that the sub-section substitute resolution, however, recognizes that those with homosexual orientation also merit the concern of the church. Buchanan's support for full inclusion was clear in his statements: "Love of Christ rather than fear and violence;" "We cannot unbaptize those [lesgay] people and they are as precious to God as any of us;" and "Let us be faithful to the truth – not by excising words from documents, but from holding a mirror of compassion to them." Lambeth is only an advisory conference, he emphasized, hence "advise" is the appropriate term to use in section (e). He said the work done in the Communion on sexuality is considerable. What is needed is a mechanism for monitoring that work. He ended with a plea to allow difference in points of view to be treated with "integrity and graciousness."

Debate then began on the various other substitutes to be considered as alternatives to the sub-section's official substitute. Their sponsors withdrew two alternatives. Three were offered.

The Rt. Rev. Catherine Waynick, Bishop of Indianapolis, spoke in support of her alternative that

essentially would have decided on nothing but would have left in the monitoring, which would include the negative documents such as Kuala Lumpur. It essentially called for choosing not to choose.

Next to speak was the Rt. Rev. Eustace Kamanyire, Bishop of Ruwenzori in Uganda, supporting a substitute by the Central & East Africa Region [the Provinces were grouped into regions]. This resolution called on all who “practice” homosexuality or ordain them to repent. “Homosexual practice is condemned in both Old and New Testaments, and is therefor a sin.” He called on the conference to “speak the truth in love.” The wording of the resolution was strange: “all sexual promiscuity is a sin, is convinced that this includes homosexual practices, between persons of the same sex.” [*Are those between people of opposite sexes all right?*] “Those persons who practice homosexuality and live in promiscuity.” [*This excludes most Integrity members!*]

The final substitute was offered by Peter Adebisi, Bishop of Owo in Nigeria, which was sponsored by the West Africa Region. It was without doubt the most inflammatory:

On Homosexuality
This Conference:

(a) noting that

(i) the Word of God has established the fact that God created man and woman and blessed their marriage;

(ii) many parts of the Bible condemn homosexuality as a sin;

(iii) homosexuality is one of many sins that Scripture has condemned;

(iv) some African Christians in Uganda were martyred in the 19th century for refusing to have homosexual relations with the king because of their faith in the Lord Jesus and their commitment to stand by the Word of God as expressed in the Bible on the subject [*Was the King a European? Not!*];

(b) stands on the Biblical authority and accepts that homosexuality is a sin which could only be adopted by the church if it wanted to commit evangelical suicide.

Adebisi began by commending CMS [the Church Mission Society, a British ultra-Evangelical organization] for their work in West Africa. “They came holding the Bible. Our forefathers accepted the Christian faith through the Scriptures. Scripture is superior to intelligence or experience.”

The Most Rev. William Moses, Moderator of the Church of South India asked that time limits be set. “We have far better things to discuss than this trivial matter,” he said. [The Churches of North India, South India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh are all first time members of Lambeth. They have been observers in the past. They are all union churches including Methodists, Presbyterians, and others. They bring a strong Calvinist bent into the proceedings.]

Debate was limited to 3 minutes.

The Rt. Rev. Wilson Mutebi, Bishop of Mityana in Uganda, spoke in favor of the sub-section version. “The Church is built on the Bible. Homosexuals and deviants teach what is opposite Scripture.”

The Most Rev. Richard Goodhew, Archbishop of Sydney [another outspoken opponent of lesbians in the Church] also supported the sub-section version. “We all wish to be compassionate.” “Go and sin no more.” This is “a first order issue.” Women’s ordination, he said, involved a balancing of scriptural issues – he allowed that there are contradictory passages. [His predecessor disagreed; he thought Paul’s claim that women should be silent in church was dispositive.] “Homosexual activity is always viewed negatively in Scriptures.” 2nd Corinthians, which the bishops had been studying collectively as a conference, warns against those who “carry another Gospel.”

The Rt. Rev. Michael Gay Bourke, Suffragan Bishop of Wolverham, Diocese of Litchfield, was a

the resolution

Bishop Jane Dixon, one of the organizers, at the open forum on lesbian and gay issues.

the resolution

breath of fresh air: “The Bible can be used both as source as faith and as a way to oppress people.” He said his wife worked with those with Huntingdon’s syndrome. “Two centuries ago they and others with mental illness were burned as witches.” “The Bible was used to justify racism in South Africa.” “We should use humility in interpreting texts. We should rely on Spirit of Jesus,” which he then went on to explain. “Lambeth is not going to say homosexuality is all right, but we need to listen to homosexual people. Listening to their stories is especially important if you think homosexuality is sinful – listening is the only way to overcome homophobic societies all around the world.”

The Rt. Rev. Richard Harries, Bishop of Oxford, also spoke in support of the sub-section’s new version. He was a member of the sub-section and claimed that its substitute “attempts to unify the Communion.” He called it a strong statement of traditional values. He also disagreed with Moderator Moses that this is “a trivial issue, it is a Gospel issue.” Part (c) is important, he said “The Gospel’s not there without (c).” He also endorsed Archbishop Michel Peers’ amendment tipping a hat to the Kuala Lumpur Statement.

The Rt. Rev. Alexander Malik, Bishop of Lahore, Church of Pakistan, was the first to oppose the sub-section version. It is “unclear, impotent.” “It does not uphold Scripture.” He opposed the use of the word “homophobia” which he said was used against all those who oppose homosexuals. “Opposing ho-

mosexuality is not gay bashing – it is a matter faith, doctrine, and dogma.”

Apparently to prove he was not homophobic, Malik then raised the ever-popular issue of bestiality. “What if someone comes asking you to bless their relationship with their pets? Will that happen at the next Lambeth?” [At this point I could not resist saying in the news briefing room, where fifty or so journalists and others with press credentials were watching the proceedings on a monitor: “That already happens every St. Francis Day!”] Various newspapers misquoted Malik. While there is no doubt that he was referring to bestiality, he did not use that word or any variation of “sex with animals.” Beware of quotation marks in the British press.

Malik concluded, “What is so new about this issue that put it on the agenda? We have known about this since Sodom and Gomorrah.” “Homosexuals betray the cause of Christ.” [*Can we blame him on the Presbyterians, also?*] “To all offenders of sexuality, I say God has created you in his image, but God hates your sins like all other sins. You can be part of the church’s fellowship, but how can you be a priest or bishop if you don’t uphold the teaching?” [*How can one even be a member of the Church if one betrays the cause of Christ?*]

The Rt. Rev. John Neil, Bishop of Cashed & Ossory, Church of Ireland, also commended the sub-section version. “It would be a pity if whatever we do is approved by only a tiny majority. It would lose all moral authority. Any outright condemnation would divide us, and any affirmation would likewise divide us. This [substitute] resolution assures that more work must be done.” “Faithfulness to Gospel is different in different cultures and situations, and what may be a way to avoid evangelical suicide in one province must not get in the way of letting the love of Christ act in another.”

The Rt. Rev. Michael Ligor, Bishop of Rejaf in the Sudan, began by saying, “If founders of the Church rose from their graves, they would laugh at us.” “We know nothing of homosexuality in the Sudan. We only know the Gospel.” [*Perhaps that delusion is why the founders would be laughing!*] “Let them [lesgays] go apart and confess their sins to God. Why did they come to this world [wide gathering?]” [*I was wondering that myself at this point.*]

The sub-section substitute was adopted in lieu or the other substitutes by a substantial voice vote.

The first amendment to be considered was one not on the official list but had somehow jumped to

Dr. Sigrid Rutishauser, from the Diocese of Chester (England), speaking at the open forum.

the resolution

first to be considered. Amendments were due two days earlier. Eames nevertheless permitted this diversion from the established procedure, presumably under considerable pressure from Archbishop Carey. The Most Rev. Donald Mtetemala, Archbishop of Tanzania, submitted the amendment. It called for inserting at the beginning of paragraph (d), the pastoral paragraph: "While rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture".

A fire alarm in the press center prevented my seeing much of the debate on this amendment.

The Rt. Rev. Robert Ihloff, Bishop of Maryland, was the first speaker I saw. It took awhile to tell whether he supported or opposed the amendment. He stated that he has not ordained any homosexual persons. There is a moratorium on blessing unions in his diocese. Nevertheless, he claimed to be "committed to dialogue." [*With friends like this...*]

The Most Rev. David Gitari, Bishop of Nairobi and Archbishop of Kenya supported the amendment "to make it clear we reject homosexual practices. This way we can go home happy."

The Rt. Rev. Catherine Roskam, Suffragan Bishop of New York was the next speaker. She was probably the hardest worker on lesgay issues among the Americans. Her speech was very well written, but she was obviously tired. "We will have a divided church if this amendment passes." "If affirming homosexuality is evangelical suicide in [Africa], to condemn it is evangelical suicide in my region. If you win it will be a Pyrrhic victory." This was the most oft-quoted pro-lesgay statement from the debate in the British press.

The Rt. Rev. Sehon Goodridge, Bishop of the Windward Islands West Indies: "The problem is homosexual practice – not ordination." [*Thank God, those of us who are lay got some of the blame.*]

The vote on the amendment was: Yes: 389; No: 190. This put the handwriting pretty clearly on the wall.

The Rt. Rev. Edwin Nyamubi, Bishop of Kagera, Tanzania, rose to state that after all the amendments, some still wanted the opportunity to vote against the resolution.

There was a closure motion, which was defeated 375 to 232.

Debate resumed with the fifth amendment on the original list. The first four had all been withdrawn.

The Rt. Rev. Samson Muraluda, Bishop of Taita Taveta in Kenya, offered an amendment to take out "homophobia" and substitute "irrational fear of ho-

mosexuals." The word, he said, "is often politically loaded to mean those who oppose any homosexual practices. We don't want to use a bashing word." [*Homophobia is a bashing word!!!!*] No one spoke in opposition and the amendment carried.

The next amendment was by the Rt. Rev. John Sentamu, Suffragan Bishop of London and the only English bishop of African origin. It called for replacing "chastity" with "abstinence." He talked about the Church modeling the "splendor and glory of abstinence." Again, there was no opposition. The amendment carried.

The Rt. Rev. Peter Selby, Bishop of Worcester pointed out that the amendment calling for listening to gay and lesbian people had been passed over. There was a procedural discussion and it was eventually put back on the docket. Bishop Bourke had presented it. Bishop Selby was the principal spokesman, however. "The resolution won't have authority if it doesn't respond to the people affected. We must listen." Amazingly, it was overwhelmingly approved.

The Most Rev. Moses Tay, the infamous Archbishop of South East Asia and Bishop of Singapore, had submitted a resolution to have the monitoring done only on the provincial level. [*I would have voted for this!*] It was overwhelmingly defeated by voice vote.

The Rt. Rev. Peter Chiswell, Bishop of Armidale, Australia [New South Wales Province, of course], moved to substitute "approve" for "advise" in paragraph (e). This would certainly have passed but for the Most Rev. David Crawley, Archbishop of British Columbia, speaking in opposition. "The Lambeth Conference can't approve or disapprove. What does disapprove mean? It's only advisory – and only to one order. A31 [the sub-section substitute] has been eroded. It is gradually acquiring a face of judgment and condemnation. We were asked to walk a mile on some of the earlier amendments which some of us voted against. Walk a few feet with us." The resolution was defeated.

The Most Rev. Michael Peers, Archbishop of Canada, moved his above-mentioned amendment noting the significance of the Kuala Lumpur statement. It was approved.

The debate had now ended and Archbishop Eames was about to take the vote. Much to everyone's surprise, Archbishop Carey then stood and indicated that he wanted to speak. This was Eame's second questionable call, but he had little choice. Carey began by thanking Eames for chair-

hijacked on the road to compassion

by Michael W. Hopkins

Representatives of lesbian and gay Christians arrived at the Lambeth Conference cautiously hopeful that their lives and ministries would receive a respectful hearing and that the Conference would endorse the continuation of this hearing in an international Commission. All signs from Conference organizers, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, pointed in this direction. Conservative lobbyists had other plans, and, in the end, carried the day, although it is dubious whether they won many hearts.

“Human Sexuality” (read “homosexuality” since there was never any real possibility of talking about anything else) had been set up as a separate sub-section of the “Called to Full Humanity” Section (one of four Sections into which the Conference was divided), chaired by the Most Rev. Njongonkulu Ndungane, Archbishop of Cape Town. The Sexuality sub-section chair was the Bishop of Johannesburg, the Rt. Rev. Duncan Buchanan.

The pre-Lambeth report for the “Called to Full Humanity” Section, issued in April 1997, called on the Conference to articulate both convictions held in common and differences in the area of human

sexuality, seek ways to live together despite the differences, and, perhaps, set up an Inter-Anglican Commission on Human Sexuality to work toward consensus on them. It acknowledged that “at present, there is a clear division of belief amongst Anglicans on homosexual behavior.”

There were some hopeful words from Conference leaders during the first few days. Preaching at the opening Eucharist in Canterbury Cathedral, Bishop Simon Chiwanga of the Diocese of Mpwapwa, Tanzania, chairman of the Anglican Consultative Council, said

Interpretive charity calls us . . . not to disenfranchise or un-church anyone. Hold unwaveringly to that which you believe to be of essential truth, but to God leave the final judgment in all matters. Change comes by enlightenment, not by force. Forcing your point of view by excluding from your circle those who disagree with you, or by compelling acceptance, is to usurp the place of God. . . . In our daily relationships with others and during this Conference may we be aware that a critical remark, a gesture of rejection, or an act of impatience can be remembered for life by those to whom it is directed. . . . Those of us in authority in the church need to be constantly reminded that the best way to express religious authority is in an awareness of God whose heart is based in compassion.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his Presidential Address on the first day of business, said

And let us also pray for the renewal of the Church through an outpouring of that same Spirit. In a world where so many people talk in extreme terms, and claim that their perception of the truth is the only one that counts let us remember that we have always been a Communion where diversity and difference has been cherished and, indeed, celebrated.

the resolution...

ing the session. There was heavy applause. Reportedly Carey later claimed that he thought the vote had already occurred. He continued to speak. He emphasized the need to listen to Scripture. He called it a painful debate, and while he supported the resolution as amended, he said he knew that not all were comfortable. “I stand wholeheartedly with traditional Anglican theology. There is no room for any sexual activity outside traditional marriage. But the dialogue continues.” “We must not impugn motives of one another. Important though the issue of homosexuality is, we are discussing so many more important things at this conference.” “If this Lambeth Conference is characterized by this issue, we have failed.”

Before the final vote, Bishop Buchanon again spoke. He said “recognizes” doesn’t mean “endorse.”

After prayer, the final vote was announced: Yes: 526 No: 70 Abstentions: 45.

In the Archbishop of Canterbury’s own words, this Lambeth Conference will be characterized by the mean-spirited debate on homosexuality and history will agree that the Conference failed.

Agreeing to disagree?

The Conference immediately had difficulty embracing these sentiments. The opening meeting of the Human Sexuality sub-section was described as an “ugly row” by many of those present. The Chairperson, Bishop Buchanan, had scheduled a presentation by an England-based group of lesbian and gay Anglicans called “Changing Attitude.” Members of Integrity had been invited to participate in the presentation as well. The announcement of this presentation was met by extreme anger by some. At a press briefing the next day, Bishop Buchanan said, “The strength of the anger left me shocked and traumatized. I expected opposition. What I didn’t expect was the strength of it. But I respect their right to be angry.”

The sub-section voted narrowly at its first meeting not to include the presentation in their deliberations. For a few days both Bishops Buchanan and Ndungane hoped such a presentation might still be possible, but in the end, it was not. The sub-section did work diligently through the issue, eventually arriving unanimously at a report which basically fulfilled the pre-Conference report’s desire to articulate both areas of agreement and disagreement. At the press briefing after the polarized first meeting, Bishop Buchanan had said he didn’t know if the sub-section could even agree to disagree. It seemed almost by miracle that at the end of their deliberations they had. At this point there was a hopeful mood, and the sense on the part of many progressive bishops was that a compromise had been reached with which everyone could live.

Lesbian & gay voices heard, sort of

In the meantime, the Bishop and Suffragan Bishop of Washington, the Rt. Rev. Ronald Haines and the Rt. Rev. Jane Holmes Dixon, agreed to sponsor an open presentation by Changing Attitude and Integrity, in an effort to bring some lesbian and gay voice to the Conference. About 150 people, including about 75 bishops, many support staff members, and a substantial number of press came and heard six people make presentations.

Bishop Otis Charles (retired of Utah and as Dean of Episcopal Divinity School) talked about his own coming out experience and how it has affected his faith journey. The Rev. Stephen Coles, Vicar of a parish in the Diocese of London spoke about his failed efforts to remain in celibacy and the gift of his several year relationship with a man who eventually

died of AIDS. Ms. Sylvia James and Dr. Sigrid Rutishauser, a lesbian couple from the Diocese of Chester (England), both spoke with sadness of their experience of, at best, cool accommodation in the Church. Ms. James said

We object strongly to the assertion that the “only ‘sin’ that militant homosexuals recognise is to repress their inclinations.” Sexuality of any kind is like a fire that can burn for good or for ill. Uncontrolled it wreaks havoc, but managed it becomes a powerful source of warmth and light. We, too, seek the discipline of Christian living that manages the fire of our sexuality in ways that enable it to be a creative source of life.

The Rev. Michael Hopkins spoke about the positive experience of openness within his own congregation, St. George’s, Glenn Dale, Maryland. “The news is very good on the other side of this issue,” he said. He continued

I don’t need for the whole Communion to be where St. George’s is now. But I do need, and my people—heterosexual and homosexual—need, to know that their witness can be heard and will not automatically be dismissed. They are Anglicans because they want to be part of a catholic church, a worldwide Communion. They do not understand—they are even, I dare say, outraged—when they hear

Openly gay retired US Bishop Otis Charles at the open forum.

hijacked

themselves labeled apostate or not worthy of this Communion because they happen to have a priest who is gay. They wish—as I and lesbian and gay Anglicans all over the world wish—to be known by the faithfulness of their lives. We wish to be transparent. We are not afraid to be transparent. Examine our lives. Examine our faith. . . I believe that when our lives and our faith are examined, then it will be as when Peter went to examine the life and faith of Cornelius and his household in the Book of Acts, the 10th and 11th chapter. I believe those who examine our lives will return to the rest of the Church and say, just as Peter did, “If then God gave them the same gift that he gave us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could hinder God?”

A time of questions from bishops who were present followed, with Bishop Dixon moderating. Bishop John Howe of Central Florida, one of the few bishops present known to have decidedly different opinions than the presenters, asked why he had heard words like “faithfulness, commitment, and covenant,” but not the word “monogamy.” Ms. James replied that their commitment was indeed monogamous but wondered why the question was asked at all. “We’re doing the best we can with language that the Church won’t officially allow us to use,” she said.

Archbishop Richard Goodhew of Sydney (Australia), another strong opponent of the full inclusion of openly lesbian and gay people in the Church, asked what any of the presenters thought of “scientific data” that gay men on average only live to the age of 42, even factoring out the affect of AIDS. Bishop Charles fairly bounded to the microphone, shouting out, “I know many, many older gay men,” he said, to the delight of most in the audience. “I myself am 71!”

Michael Hopkins was asked what he had meant by “the Good News” when he said in his presentation that this issue was about the question, “What is the Good News?” He said that answering this question involves other questions such as “What is grace? How has it freed us from the law? What is the message that we send to the world? The Good News, in fact, is liberation from fear. It’s amazing to me what happens to the people of God when they stop being afraid.”

Mass confusion on the way to a “Resolution”

The Human Sexuality sub-section had anticipated bringing some form of a resolution to the full Conference. Delicate work on the report itself kept this from happening, and, in the face of a deadline for the submission of resolutions, the chair introduced one on behalf of the sub-section that he felt summarized the report. He received assurances that it could be replaced by a resolution from the sub-section if such could be reached before the deadline for filing amendments to proposed resolutions.

Such a resolution was hammered out by the sub-section, but by all accounts the atmosphere was a return to the original contentiousness of the group. Every word was haggled over and, in the end, it sounded a somewhat more conservative tone than the report, including the statement that, “we cannot advise the legitimizing or blessing or ordaining of those involved in same gender unions.” In addition, the establishment of an Inter-Anglican Commission was softened to a request for the Primates and the Anglican Consultative Council “to establish a means of monitoring the work done on the subject of human sexuality in the Communion.”

This substitute was presented at a press briefing on Friday, July 31. On Monday, August 3, it was learned that the Resolutions Committee of the Conference had not accepted the substitute, insisting that the original resolution had to stand since it was what had been printed and distributed. Conservatives exploded with complaints about the process

Integrity President-elect Michael Hopkins speaking at the open forum.

hijacked

being tampered with. "If they want division, if they want a revolution, they'll get it," said Bishop James Stanton of Dallas. "All they [Resolution Committee members] have to do is more of this sort of thing."

On the other hand, it became clear that even though conservative in tone, the substitute resolution clearly did not go far enough for conservatives and left too much wiggle room for liberals, with the use of the word "chastity," which some might imply applied to homosexual couples, the use of the word "advise" instead of an outright moratorium on blessings and ordinations, and the use of the word "homophobia," which they felt was a political term. Proposed amendments were filed to address all these concerns.

Through Tuesday it was still not clear which form of the resolution would be debated as the "substantive" one. A coalition of progressive bishops met and filed their own set of resolutions. An unsolved mystery at the Conference's end was what happened to most of them. Although filed together, only two appeared on the eventual official list. At least three disappeared, and of the two that did appear, only one of these was scheduled for debate if the fuller, more conservative resolution became the substantive one.

In addition three major resolutions on homosexuality came out of regional meetings (Provinces were grouped into nine regions, which met several times during the Conference and could propose resolutions). One, from the Southeast Asia Region, called on the Conference to endorse the Kuala Lumpur Statement "as an authentic expression of Anglican moral norms." One, from the Central and East Africa Region, among other things, said, "Those persons who practise homosexuality and live in promiscuity, as well as those Bishops who knowingly ordain them or encourage these practices, act contrary to the Scriptures and the teaching of the Church. We call upon them to repent." The last, from West Africa, concluded by saying, "[we] stand on the Biblical authority and accept that homosexuality is a sin which could only be adopted by the church if it wanted to commit evangelical suicide."

It had been determined that all sexuality resolutions would be considered in one plenary session on Wednesday afternoon, although it was never clear which resolution would be considered as the substantive one, and whether proposed amendments that spoke specifically to one resolution would also be accepted if a different one became the main one.

Confused? Not half as confused as the bishops were on the ground at Lambeth.

Following the debate and changes, the final vote on the resolution was called, the chair ruling that it was best if it were counted. In the midst of counting Bishop Geryl Wolf asked if abstentions would be counted. Archbishop Eames said yes and the counting began again. In the end it was 526 for, 70 against, and 45 abstaining.

It had lasted two and one half hours. Many progressive bishops gathered on a little knoll outside the plenary hall, consoling some devastated observers, and themselves. An impromptu press conference was held with Bishops Holloway, Waynick, and Randerson (Canberra, Australia) speaking while many others stood behind them in support. The predominant comments about what had just happened were a feeling of betrayal by those who had seemed to want compromise, including the Archbishop of Canterbury himself. His action at the end of the meeting, one said, was like twisting the knife. The Pastoral Statement which had been prepared by Bishop Ronald Haines beforehand "in case things went bad" began to circulate. Many seemed grateful for the opportunity to say something in opposition to what had just happened.

Sylvia James, partner of Sigrid Rutishauser, speaking about sexuality at the open forum.

[The following is the official report of the "Called to Full Humanity" Section of the Lambeth Conference in regards to human sexuality.]

1. Human Sexuality is the gift of a loving God. It is a gift to be honored and cherished by all people. As a means for the expression of the deepest human love and intimacy, sexuality has great power.

2. The Holy Scriptures and Christian tradition teach that human sexuality is intended by God to find its rightful and full expression between a man and a woman in the covenant of marriage, established by God in creation, and affirmed by our Lord Jesus Christ. Holy Matrimony is, by intention and divine purpose, to be a life-long, monogamous and unconditional commitment between a man and a woman. The Lambeth Conference 1978 and 1988 both affirmed 'marriage to be sacred, instituted by God and blessed by our Lord Jesus Christ'.

3. The New Testament and Christian history identify singleness and dedicated celibacy as Christian ways of living. The Church needs to recognize the demands and pressures upon both single and married people. Human beings define themselves by their relationships with God and other persons. Churches need to find effective ways of encouraging Christ-like living, as well as providing opportunities for flourishing of friendship, and the building of supportive community life.

4. We also recognize that there are among us persons who experience themselves as having a homosexual orientation. Many of these are members of the Church and are seeking the pastoral care, moral direction of the Church, and God's transforming power for the living of their lives and the ordering of their relationships. We wish to assure them they are loved by God, and that all baptized, believing and faithful persons, regardless of sexual orientation, are full members of the Body of Christ. We call upon the Church and all its members to work to end any discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, and to oppose homophobia.

5. Clearly some expressions of sexuality are inherently contrary to the Christian way and are sinful. Such unacceptable expression of sexuality include promiscuity, prostitution, incest, pornography, paedophilia, predatory sexual behavior, and sadomasochism (all of which may be heterosexual and homosexual), adultery, violence against wives, and female circumcision. From a Christian perspective these forms of sexual expression remain sinful in any context. We are particularly concerned about the pressures on young people to engage in sexual activity at an early age, and we urge our Churches to teach the virtue of abstinence.

6. All human relationships need the transforming power of Christ which is available to all, particularly when we fall short of biblical norms.

7. We must confess that we are not of one mind about homosexuality. Our variety of understanding encompasses:

i) those who believe that homosexual orientation is a disorder, but that through the grace of Christ people can be changed, although not without pain and struggle.

ii) those who believe that relationships between people of the same gender should not include genital expression, that this is clear teaching of the Bible and of the Church universal, and that such activity (if unrepented of) is a barrier to the Kingdom of God.

iii) those who believe that committed homosexual relationships fall short of the biblical norm, but are to be preferred to relationships that are anonymous and transient.

iv) those who believe that the Church should accept and support or bless monogamous covenant relationships between homosexual people and that they may be ordained.

8. It appears that the opinion of a majority of bishops is not prepared to bless same sex unions or to ordain active homosexuals. Furthermore many believe there should be a moratorium on such practices.

9. We have prayed, studied and discussed these issues, and we are unable to reach a common mind on the scriptural, theological, historical, and scientific questions which are raised. There is much that we do not understand. We request the Primates and the Anglican Consultative Council to establish a means of monitoring work done in the Communion on these issues and to share statements and resources among us.

10. The challenge to our Church is to maintain its unity while we seek, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to discern the way of Christ for the world today with respect to human sexuality. To do so will require sacrifice, trust, and charity towards one another, remembering that ultimately the identity of each person is defined in Christ.

[ends with following quote from "The St. Andrew's Day Statement," an examination of the Theological Principles affecting the Homosexuality Debate, 1995]

'There can be no description of human reality, in general or in particular, outside the reality of Christ. We must be on guard, therefore, against constructing any other ground for our identities than the redeemed humanity given us in him. Those who understand themselves as homosexuals, no more and no less than those who do not, are liable to false understandings based on personal or family histories, emotional dispositions, social settings and solidarities formed by common experiences or ambitions. Our sexual affections can no more define who we are than can our class, race, or nationality. At the deepest ontological level, therefore, there is no such thing as "a" homosexual or "a" heterosexual; there are human beings, male and female, called to redeemed humanity in Christ, endowed with a complex variety of emotional potentialities and threatened by a complex variety of forms of alienation.'

human sexuality: a report

lesbian and gay anglicans

from Some Member Bishops of the

August 5, 1998

Dear sisters and brothers,

three weeks deliberating issues of human sexual-ity, among many other vital issues facing our

mate of enormous diversity and have attempted both to articulate our views and listen carefully to

Within the limitations of this Conference, it has not been possible to hear adequately your

tion that has occurred because of this reality. This letter is a sign of our commitment to listen to you

on your lives and ministries. It is our deep concern that you not feel abandoned by your Church

support.

We pledge that we will continue to reflect, the Church. It is obvious that Communion-wide we are in great disagreement over what full inclu-

and admit, as the report of the Human Sexuality Sub-section of the Conference says, that there is

is an imperative of the Gospel and our faith that we seek such understanding.

(and in many places, begin) prayerful, respectful conversation on the issue of homosexuality. We

You, our sisters and brothers in Christ, deserve a more thorough hearing than you received over the

Faithfully,

Signed by 152 Bishops (including 8 Primates):

Australia (8)

Phillip Aspinall, Adelaide
Brian Farran, Perth - Northern Region
Ian George, Adelaide (Metropolitan)
Roger Herft, Newcastle
Peter Hollingworth, Brisbane (Metropolitan)
Richard Randerson, Canberra & Goulburn
Andrew St. John, Melbourne - Geelong
Ronald Williams, Southern-Region, Brisbane

Brazil (1)

Glauco Soares de Lima, Sao Paulo (**Primate**)

Canada (9)

David Crawley, Kootenay (Metropolitan)
James Cruickshank, Cariboo
John Hannen, Caledonia
Andrew Hutchinson, Montreal
Michael Ingham, New Westminster
Terence Finlay, Toronto
Michael Peers, Canada (**Primate**)
Ann Tottenham, Toronto - Credit Valley
Duncan Wallace, Qu'Appelle

Central Africa (2)

Khotso Makhulu, Botswana (**Primate**)
John Osmer, Eastern Zambia

England (36)

Jonathan Bailey, Derby
Paul Barber, Peterborough-Brixworth
Gordon Bates, York-Whitby
David Bonser, Manchester - Bolton
Michael Bourke, Lichfield - Wolverhampton
Ian Brackley, Guildford-Dorking
Michael Doe, Bristol - Swindon
Richard Garrard, Penrith - Carlisle
John Garton, Exeter - Plymouth
John Gladwin, Guildford
Laurie Green, Chelmsford - Bradwell
Christopher Hill, Lichfield - Stafford
Edward Holland, Chelmsford - Colchester
Rupert Hoare, Worcester - Dudley
William Ind, Truro
Richard Lewis, St. Edmundsbury & Ipswich
Christopher Mayfield, Manchester
John Nicholls, Sheffield
John Oliver, Hereford
John Richardson, St. Albans - Bedford
Henry Richmond, Derby - Repton
Roger Sainsbury, Chelmsford - Barking
Mark Santer, Birmingham

John Saxbee, Hereford - Ludlow
Colin Scott, Manchester - Hulme
Peter Selby, Worcester
Robin Smith, St. Albans - Hertford
Alan Smithson, Durham - Jarrow
David Stancliffe, Salisbury
Timothy Stevens, St. Edmundsbury & Ipswich - Dunwich
Humphrey Taylor, York - Selby
James Thompson, Bath & Wells
David Tuftin, Lincoln-Grimsby
Peter Vaughan, Bradford (A)
Dominic Walker OGS, Oxford - Reading
Frank Weston, Ripon-Knaresborough

Ireland (3)

Richard Clarke, Meath & Kildare
Robin Eames, Armagh (**Primate**)
John Neill, Cashel & Ossory

Japan (1)

James Uno, Kita Kanto

New Zealand (8)

Thomas Brown, Wellington
David Coles, Christchurch
George Connor, Waiapu
Penelope Jamieson, Dunedin
Murray Mills, Waiapu
David Moxon, Waikato
John Paterson, Auckland (**Primate**)
Waiohau Rue Te Harra, Aotearoa (North-ern Region)

Scotland (6)

Bruce Cameron, Aberdeen & Orkney
Douglas Cameron, Argyll & The Isles
Neville Chamberlain, Brechin
Michael Henley, St. Andrew's, Dunkeld & Dunblane
Richard Holloway, Edinburgh (**Primate**)
Gregor MacGregor, Moray, Ross & Caithness

South Africa (6)

Robin Briggs, Pretoria
Duncan Buchanan, Johannesburg
Geoffrey Davies, Umzimvubu
Njongokulu Ndungane, Cape Town (**Primate**)
Michael Nuthall, Natal
David Russell, Grahamstown

United States (68)

Frank Allan, Atlanta
Harry B Bainbridge III, Idaho (C)
Charles Bennison, Pennsylvania
Frederick H. Borsch, Los Angeles
David Bowman, Western New York
William Burrill, Rochester

1. The Resolution is not in accord with the Sub-section Report that it commends to the Communion.

(Both the Report and the Resolution are printed elsewhere in this edition of *the Voice*). The Report has official status as well as the Resolution. It was the result of serious dialogue among 50 bishops of widely different perspectives and was approved by them unanimously.

2. The influence of the American Anglican Council and its affiliates was enormous.

They produced mountains of paper the bishops received nearly every day. They paid for a major pre-Conference meeting of African bishops. They held seminars and barbecues throughout the Conference. Their Executive Director described their work as "facilitative." Indeed. One Nigerian bishop was quoted in the BBC as saying that there was an agreement for support on International Debt from American/English conservatives in exchange for support on homosexuality

pastoral signers...

Richard Chaing, Hawaii
 Michael Creighton, Central Pennsylvania
 Clifton Daniel, East Carolina
 Jane Holmes Dixon, Washington (S)
 Joe Morris Doss, New Jersey
 Christopher Epting, Iowa
 Richard Grein, New York
 Gary Gloster, North Carolina (S)
 Clark Grew, Ohio
 Edwin Gulick, Kentucky
 Ronald Haines, Washington
 Sanford Hampton, Olympia (A)
 Barbara Harris, Massachusetts (S)
 Donald Hart, Maryland (A)
 Dorsey Henderson, Upper South Carolina
 Robert Ihloff, Maryland
 Carolyn Irish, Utah
 James Jelinek, Minnesota
 Robert Johnson, Jr., North Carolina
 Robert Johnson, Western North Carolina
 David Jones, Virginia
 Charles Keyser, Armed Forces
 Rustin Kimsey, Eastern Oregon
 Chilton Knudsen, Maine
 Jerry Lamb, Northern California
 Edward Lee, Western Michigan
 Peter Lee, Virginia
 Alfred Marble, Mississippi
 Larry Maze, Arkansas
 Jack McKelvey, Newark (S)
 Mary Adelia McLeod, Vermont
 Rodney Michel, Long Island (S)
 Robert Miller, Alabama
 Robert Moody, Oklahoma
 Steven Plummer, Navajoland

Neff Powell, Southwestern Virginia
 Thomas Ray, Northern Michigan
 Creighton Robertson, South Dakota
 Hays Rockwell, Missouri
 Catherine Roskam, New York (S)
 Calvin Schofield, Jr., Southeast Florida
 Tom Shaw, SSJE, Massachusetts
 Richard Shimpfky, El Camino Real
 Mark Sisk, New York (C)
 William Smalley, Kansas
 Andrew Smith, Connecticut (S)
 John Spong, Newark
 William Swing, California
 Chester Talton, Los Angeles (S)
 E. Don Taylor, New York (A)
 Robert Tharp, East Tennessee
 Douglas Theuner, New Hampshire
 John Thornton, Idaho
 Martin Townsend, Easton
 Orris Walker, Jr., Long Island
 Vincent Warner, Olympia
 Catherine Waynick, Indianapolis
 Arthur Williams, Jr., Ohio (S)
 GERALYN WOLF, Rhode Island
 Stewart Wood, Michigan
 Wayne Wright, Delaware
 Stewart Zabriskie, Nevada

Wales (4)

Alwyn Jones, St. Asaph (**Primate**)
 David Huw Jones, St. David's
 Barry Morgan, Bangor
 Rowan Williams, Monmouth

9 reasons

by Africans and Asians. That had been obvious since the Dallas Statement. The *Church Times* reported after the Conference,

For once, the conspiracy theorists are right. A close relationship had been forged before the Conference between bishops in Africa, Asia and Latin America and conservative bishops in the US. Several overlapping organisations set up shop in the Franciscan Centre at the University in Canterbury to provide an alternative source of technical support and co-ordination to Southern bishops: hosting meetings, advising on strategy, distributing documents, schooling on procedure. As for the further charge that the Americans had bought the Southern vote, there appears to be a grain of truth in this, too. Though no cash changed hands at the Conference, as far as could be seen, the southern American states have offered to replace any money lent by the official Anglican bodies.

3. The decision-making process regarding the resolution was horrific.

The stated rules of order were not strictly followed. Four pre-filed liberal amendments disappeared. The one that appeared had to be forced into consideration. The amendment regarding "rejection of homosexual practice by the Scriptures" was not pre-filed as was supposedly required. The Chair allowed it on the floor as a "courtesy," placing it before all other amendments to be considered. Debate on that resolution lasted no more than 15 minutes. Again the *Church Times* reported,

During the homosexuality debate, the Southern axis was fully in control. They had managed to get the original motion changed, and extracted an apology from Bishop Duncan Buchanan for not consulting properly. They had done a deal early that Wednesday morning with Dr Carey to secure his support for the Archbishop of Tanzania's amendment that homosexual practice was contrary to scripture. In return, they calmly let several amendments fall.

why the lambeth resolution

has little credibility

4. **The Archbishop of Canterbury's interference in the process was divisive at best.** He let it be known to the Resolutions Committee that he wanted a clear statement of "orthodoxy." He participated in a deal as noted above. He voted on amendments from the podium in the clear sight of all. He spoke to support the final resolution as a clear statement of "Anglican orthodoxy" "which we all ought to be able to support," before the final vote was taken.

5. **At no time did the vast majority of bishops who voted against us speak with us, or even our supporters.** Our presentation to the sub-section was cancelled, although at least there was honest conversation within it. My estimate is no more than six bishops who eventually voted against us came to our open presentation. It is clear the African bishops in particular do not understand what we or our relationships are really like, and they were carefully protected from gaining any new understanding.

6. **The Conference is only advisory in nature.** Organizers took great pains in saying over and over again that this was not a legislative body. Then why vote on anything at all?

7. **Extremism surrounded the vote.** There was a severely nasty edge to the whole debate and its aftermath. Several bishops, including the Primate of West Africa, have attacked Desmond Tutu as being "spiritually dead" or " beholden to New York homosexuals who paid for his surgery." Many bishops and others have distanced themselves in word from the incredible actions of Bishop Chuwanga from Nigeria (see report elsewhere in *the Voice*), who many are calling a "renegade" even among the Nigerians. But no one tried to stop him.

8. **The resolution was primarily about scapegoating and involved a fair amount of hypocrisy.** A Ugandan bishop remarked to an American bishop in a bible study session, "This is about displaced anger. We are furious with the North about your lack of understanding and concern for us. We are striking back where you are most vulnerable." Bishop Jerry Winterrowd of Colorado was typical

of some moderate bishops' responses when he admitted to the *Rocky Mountain News* that he voted for the resolution because "the African church needed that vote to take back with them" even though "I don't believe that Scripture necessarily condemns homosexuality."

9. **The resolution masks a greater divide over the use and interpretation of the Scriptures.** It belies a "convenient fundamentalism" among many Anglicans that is as much culturally conditioned as anything else. No less than the Primate of Central Africa said two days after the debate,

The tone in which [some of our discussions] were expressed was devoid of the love of God. We have had tyrants using the Bible as armour, . . . I want to say here and now, I have resisted tyranny all my life and nor will I ever tolerate it from those who claim the love of the Bible over everyone else. Let not the intolerance of a variety of contexts inexorably lead us to intolerance, which, if I am checked, will find us with a band of vigilantes and fundamentalists.

Michael Hopkins and Colin Coward in the press room at Lambeth.

contrary to scripture?

by Tobias Haller

It is no more contrary to Scripture to bless a same-sex couple than to bless a couple one of whom is divorced or not baptized.

Once I tried to have a discussion concerning Scripture with a Jehovah's Witness. I soon learned that this was not possible, beyond a certain minimal level, because she insisted that parts of Scripture I thought of as literal were symbolic, and the bits I thought of as allegorical and apocalyptic were literal truth. For her, the Gospel was a symbolic drama, while Revelation was as literal as an Amtrak timetable.

I find myself in a similar situation now. A substantial majority of the bishops of the Anglican Communion meeting at Lambeth have gone on record "rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture." It is not my purpose here to address the accuracy of the bishops' opinion. Rather, I choose to hold the bishops to the same standard and assert that the church itself tolerates practices that are *no less* incompatible with Scripture. Indeed, while a prohibition on blessing same-sex couples and ordaining gay or lesbian clergy can only be inferred from Scripture, the practices tolerated by the church, and practiced even by some of the bishops themselves, are contrary to Scripture's express, literal word.

Remarriage after divorce

Scripture declares that the remarriage of a divorced man or woman is the moral equivalent of adultery. This assertion rests on the very highest authority, Jesus Christ himself (Mt 5.32, 19.9 – the "Matthean exception" being noted; Mk 10.11-12; Lk 16.18), bolstered by Saint Paul (1 Cor 7.10-11). This was the position of the church until well into this century, earlier Lambeth Conferences making their rejection of marriage after divorce abundantly clear. Yet the passage of time has softened their rigor, and the church now recognizes even civil divorce and allows remarriage with the stroke of a bishop's pen (Canon I.19.3.a), and offers annulment (itself a legal fiction unforeseen by Scripture) only as an option for those whose consciences may be troubled. (Canon I.19.2.a) Remarriage after divorce is contrary to Scripture, yet the church tolerates it and blesses it.

Mixed marriage

Scripture forbids a Christian woman entering into a marriage with a non-Christian man. (1 Cor 7:39. Note that the earlier passage, 1 Cor 7.13-16, refers to a couple *already married* at the time one of them was baptized. Paul allowed the Christian party to permit a "no fault" divorce in that exceptional case, though he recommended against it.) One early church father went so far as to declare mixed marriage to be a form of *sodomy* (Tertullian, *To His Wife* - 2.2, applying Jude 7 to mixed marriage). As recently as 1948, a Lambeth Conference committee urged that such marriages be "forbidden." However, the Episcopal Church now allows marriages in which only one of the couple is baptized (BCP 422; Canon I.18.2.d). Mixed marriage is contrary to Scripture, yet the church tolerates it and blesses it.

Ordination of bigamists

Scripture expressly states that a bishop, presbyter, or deacon must be "the husband of one wife" or "married only once" (1 Tim 3.2, Tit 1.6, 1 Tim 3.12). This prohibition is not directed against polygamist clergy (though it would cover them as well) but against the ordination of remarried widowers. Paul permitted such remarriage to youthful lay women (1 Tim 5.14), but forbade it to clergy, who are called to a higher standard. The early church took a dim view of second marriages by lay widows or widowers: but clergy were forbidden even to *attend* such a wedding (Neocaesarea 7). Second marriages by clergy are contrary to Scripture, yet the church tolerates it and ordains them.

Conclusion

It is no more contrary to Scripture to bless a same-sex couple than to bless a couple one of whom is divorced or not baptized. It is no more contrary to Scripture for a gay person to be ordained than it is one who has taken a spouse after widowhood. From the standpoint of the literal text, the former are, if anything, *less* contrary to Scripture. How many of the Lambeth bishops who voted with the majority on the resolution condemning homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture fall themselves under one of these three Scriptural incompatibilities? How is it that they are able to gloss over the hard bits that apply to themselves, while weaving iron-

[Integrity offers the following as one response local congregations can make to the Lambeth Conference Human Sexuality resolution.]

a response you can make

[Date]

To the Most Rev. George L. Carey, Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Rev. Frank T. Griswold, III, Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, the Rt. Rev. [Name], Bishop of [Diocese], and our Anglican brothers and sisters throughout the world.

We, the undersigned members of the [vestry/mission committee] of [congregation name] make the following statement in response to the Lambeth Conference Resolution "On Human Sexuality" passed on August 5, 1998:

1) With all due respect to the member bishops of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, we register our dissent from the above named resolution. In particular, we believe the Scriptures do not reject "homosexual practice" that produces "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control," which St. Paul calls the "fruit of the Spirit." "There is no law against such things," Paul says, nor do we believe there should be a "law" against lives that produce such things.

2) Recognizing that not all agree with us, we support a continuing process of prayerful and respectful discernment concerning the Church's teaching on the various expressions of human sexuality. We believe any such process must include the voices

contrary to scripture...

clad prohibitions out of the bare handful of strawy texts alleged against the faithful gay couples and clergy who have loved the church they serve, and served the church they love, in the face of such opposition? The bishops might argue that homosexuality is contrary to natural law. But we're not talking natural law here. We're talking Scripture: God's *positive* law. And on that score some of them are as guilty of *incompatibility* as any they assail. The bishops have taken up Scripture and used it as a weapon against their fellow Christians. Let them learn and know that "the word of God is sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides soul from spirit, joints from marrow; it is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart. And before him no creature is hidden, but all are naked and laid bare to the eyes of the one to whom we must render an account." (Heb 4.12-13)

Tobias S Haller, BSG, has frequently contributed to *The Voice of Integrity*.

o f
openly
lesbian
and gay
Angli-
cans.
W e
pledge
our sup-
port to
a n y
s u c h
p r o -
c e s s.

3) We
pledge
o u r -
s e l v e s
t o a
g r e a t e r
l e v e l
o f
a w a r e -
n e s s
o f

the cultural and spiritual contexts of our fellow Anglicans throughout the world, and a greater level of response where there is identified need. We ask for the same level of awareness and response to our own context by others in the Communion. We commit ourselves to strengthen the "bonds of mutual affection" that tie us together as members of the Anglican Communion. We do not, however, believe these bonds can be strengthened by the wholesale exclusion of any group of people.

Why this Response?

■ At the briefing following the passage of the Resolution on Human Sexuality, Archbishop Robin Eames of Ireland, who had chaired the plenary session at which it was adopted, pointed out that the resolution was "not the end of the story by any means." "Looking ahead, what the Lambeth Conference said today is to the Primates, 'Monitor this, watch this,'" he said. "Certain trends will develop." He said that it remains to be seen how this resolution will be received in the Communion, itself an **i m p o r t a n t p r o c e s s .**

■ The Lambeth Conference includes the voices of only one order of ministry. They have spoken a word in time. It is the responsibility of the rest of the Church, especially of those who think differently, to do so as well.

■ The Resolution asked the Primates Meeting and the Anglican Consultative Council to monitor the conversation in the Communion. The collective voice spoken by hundreds, perhaps thousands, of congregation around the world can make a difference. We need to say, "Wait, it's not that easy."

What will happen to this Response if we sign it?

Integrity (and our partners in the Alliance of Lesbian and Gay Anglicans [ALGA] throughout the world) will be keeping a list of congregations who make this response. The list will be kept current on the worldwide web at <http://members.aol.com/natlinteg>, and will be published periodically in *The Voice of Integrity* and released to church media. It will also be passed on periodically to the Primates and the ACC.

Although Integrity and ALGA are facilitating this response and keeping the list, being on the list will not constitute any endorsement of these organizations and this will be made clear whenever the list is published.

Please send a written copy of your response to: Response to Lambeth, Integrity, Inc., PO Box 5255, New York, NY 10185-5255. You may also fax: 800-238-1592.

analysis of lambeth — how,

by Kim Byham

Those of you on Integrity Lightspeed may have read my post the day after the vote on the Homosexuality Resolution at the Lambeth Conference. That post, entitled “A Little Distance” gave a brief analysis of why the Conference ended up with such a negative resolution. My political analysis remains essentially unchanged with more distance and having read the viewpoints of perhaps two hundred others, from bishops up. I will expand upon that analysis in this report.

A political analysis, however, never tells the whole story, or even the most important part of the story, about a vote by a church body. As Christians, our primary concern is discerning how the Holy Spirit worked among the voters. How was the will of God expressed? It is simply too early to know the full answer to that. I suspect that it will take about two years for all the bad impacts to manifest themselves, and I can’t even speculate how long, and how, the Spirit will use this vote in a constructive way.

What impact will it have?

One major positive result of the intense and nasty confrontation at the Lambeth Conference became apparent even before the vote on Wednesday, August 5. That is that numerous moderate American bishops became energized in support of the full inclusion of lesbians and gay men in the Episcopal Church. One example was the Rt. Rev. Clark Grew, Bishop of Ohio, who said in a pastoral letter paper upon his return,

“For the first time, I could really understand the fear with which some gay and lesbian people live every day, and I return to Ohio more deeply committed to having our Church be truly inclusive, a Church where no person is excluded or oppressed because of a particular biblical interpretation.”

It amazed me in Canterbury that I was so often approached with warm words by American bishops who had never previously expressed support for Integrity. Take a look at the list of bishops who signed the pastoral statement.

The next positive result is directly related to this one. Michael Hopkins and I (Integrity’s entire del-

egation, although there were several other Integrity members at the conference in other capacities) were interviewed by Andrew Carey the day after the vote. It is easy to over inflate Andrew’s importance. He is deputy editor of *The Church of England Newspaper*, which is in danger of insolvency and which, as a result, has catered to the ultra-right-wing in order to give itself a market niche. But he is the son of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and I have the impression that their thought processes are similar. Andrew, who spent his time mostly with the American right-wingers, had a very misguided view of the impact of the vote. First, he thought the right-wing element in the American Church [it’s taken me longer to drop this affectation than it did calling bishops “My lord.”] was much larger than it is, and second, he thought the vote would push moderates to the right. I know he didn’t believe us when we told him the opposite was true.

That’s the third positive result — the right wing is overconfident and that will inevitably lead to sloppiness on their part. It may also exacerbate the fissures which, thanks be to God, always appear in the right wing. Some are anti-Prayer Book, some anti-women’s ordination, others merely anti-gay; some are charismatic, some are Anglo-Catholic, some are ultra-Evangelicals. These are folks who define themselves primarily by what they are NOT, and of course, they are NOT what most of their allies are.

The negative impacts are more obvious. This V-I-C-T-O-R-Y, as the right-wingers chanted as they left the plenary session, has energized them. It will help their fundraising. It has proven to them that they can successfully organize, something they have never been able to do at General Conventions. It probably will make a very few bishops more reluctant to ordain openly lesgay folk, but these will be few. [That doesn’t make it any easier if you’re the one denied ordination.]

There is, however, no danger that General Convention in 2000 will turn back the clock. Convention has consistently rejected anti-gay legislation since 1979 and it will continue to do so. It bears repeating that the Lambeth resolution is merely advisory. Right-wingers in the Episcopal Church have no qualms about ignoring resolutions and even canons approved by General Convention, so their entreaties to “obey”

why, and what effect?

this resolution will fall on deaf ears in Denver in 2000. (It remains to be seen whether the Rwandan bishop who claims oversight of a parish in Little Rock will abide by another resolution which reiterates traditional Anglican polity on geographic dioceses.)

However, immense damage has been done. Bishop Catherine Roskam of New York hit it on the head when she predicted the resolution, as amended, was “evangelical suicide.” At least, I suspect the damage in America is limited. A few lesbians are leaving the Church, no doubt. But most of us are highly resilient. (As Louie Crew said recently, we are often viewed with suspicion by secular lesbians because we seem to be enablers for the bashing of the Church. Lesbian Episcopalians largely ignore things like this resolution, focussing instead on the positive aspects of church life.) One real impact, as I told Andrew Carey and has been shown to be true, is on recruiting new lesbian members to the Church.

This is the first time the Episcopal Church has been seen to be openly anti-gay. It may be guilty by association, but if you belong to a club that discriminates, you deserve some blame. The Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in the U.S. have both promulgated sharply worded statements that say that homosexuality or homosexual practices are incompatible with Scripture. This has affected their evangelism, to be sure, but there are still self-respecting lesbians who belong to those denominations.

The damage, I suspect, in England is going to be much more severe than on this side of the pond. I would guess that the average age of a CofE congregation is at least 15 years older than for the Episcopal Church (and our average is far from young). England was bombarded with front-page newspaper articles and extensive coverage on radio and television which showed a church so tied to “TRADITION” that it doesn’t care what happens to a large part of the population. The straight students at Kent University were appalled by what they saw. Homophobia among the young in the U.K., as in the U.S., has not been eliminated but it is greatly reduced. This is especially so among the educated young folks who would seem to be the natural targets for Anglican evangelism.

If I had been advising the Archbishop of Canterbury, I would have told him to clearly denounce

the tactics of Bishop Chukwuma in attempting to exorcise Richard Kirker. Silence indicates assent. Some short-term peace within the CofE, if this resolution has even bought that, which I doubt, will come at a terrible price in killing outreach to the young of Britain. Not all bishops in the U.K. were blind to the impact, which is perhaps why the Primates of Wales, Scotland and Ireland all joined in the Pastoral Statement. I pray this helps offset the damage done by Archbishop Carey.

Why did it happen?

Let me begin with a definition of terms. There has been much talk about the role of “Africans” at Lambeth. Africans did not compose a unified voting block. There are eleven provinces in sub-Saharan Africa (12 if one counts the Province of the Indian Ocean, which includes Madagascar.) One of the largest, Southern Africa, included several key bishops who worked to fully incorporate lesbians in the life of the Church. This included Archbishop Tutu’s successor as Primate and the Bishop of Johannesburg. In Central Africa, which includes Zimbabwe (notorious for its President’s and bishops’ homophobia), the Primate also signed the Pastoral Statement. The more northerly provinces were nearly uniformly negative, but even from those countries there were variations of opinion. What the more northerly provinces have in common is that they were evangelized by the Church Missionary Society (CMS), or, in the case of the French-speaking provinces of Congo, Rwanda and Burundi, by Africans trained by CMS. CMS has always been “evangelical” in a sense that is hard for most Episcopalians to even imagine — a somewhat liturgical Southern Baptist is probably closest. For that reason, I will refer to “evangelical Africans.”

The allies of the evangelical Africans were a very mixed bag. They certainly didn’t represent all of the churches south of the Equator, as Archbishop Tay of Singapore would have had one believe. The Brazilian Church, for example, has been very supportive, the Primate signed the Pastoral Statement, and he was quoted as saying he thought the sexuality resolution would have a negative impact on evangelism in Brazil. The Province of the Southern Cone (Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, Peru and Bolivia), on the other hand, was also evangelized by CMS and

analysis of Lambeth

its affiliate, the South American Missionary Society and it reflects anti-lesgay views. The Asian churches reflect a similar division: if evangelized by Americans or “high church” Britons (the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts), they tended to be more open minded than those evangelized by the CMS.

As many observers have rightly noted, the fundamental division is on how the Bible is to be interpreted. Of course, there are non-fundamentalist homophobic bishops, especially in the U.S. and the U.K., but there are few if any fundamentalist bishops who are open to the full inclusion of lesbians and gay men in the life of the Church.

Did the disease originate in Africa or did ‘Westerners’ bring it there?

As with American Indian tribes, the treatment of lesgay people in pre-colonial Africa varied. As previously discussed, the arrival of English missionaries in the last century had a profound impact in what we are calling evangelical Africa. There can be no doubt that the evangelical Africans were strongly opposed to homosexuality well prior to the Lambeth Conference. Probably everyone would agree to that. But what made this become such a vital issue to the evangelical Africans that they brought it up at every opportunity at the conference?

The pre-meeting polling by the conference organizers to solicit issues of concern to the bishops revealed relatively little interest in homosexuality.

Indeed, the evangelical Africans said time and again that there are no homosexuals in their countries, always implying and sometimes saying that it is a European “disease.” [There were very frequent contradictions, as noted above.] Some said that it should not even be discussed at the conference. Yet, they did so over and over.

Only one indigenous reason was offered why homosexuality was alleged to be a concern for evangelical Africans. It applied only to those on the border between predominantly Moslem and predominantly Christian areas of Africa, affecting Nigeria, the Sudan, and West Africa. The concern was that Moslems use pro-lesgay statements and actions by Anglicans to gain an evangelical edge in

the struggle for converts. I had heard this same claim made by the Coptic Church at the National Council of Churches meeting a few years ago in opposing membership for the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches. Thus it wasn’t an original claim, and probably has a grain of truth, but it does seem bizarre. Any validity that it has would be applicable only to a misogynist society, and in Africa, as elsewhere, misogyny is dying.

Right-Wing Conspiracy?

Yes, Virginia, there is a right-wing conspiracy to take over control of the Episcopal Church — or they would say, the soul of the Episcopal Church. Some people think that because it’s out in the open, it can’t be a conspiracy. Not true, check the dictionary. Some people think that because this is a church and those involved are Christians, it can’t be a conspiracy. Not true, check a history book. Some people think that the right wing is too internally divided so they can’t pull off a conspiracy. Not true, and to paraphrase Mark Twain, I not only believe in a right-wing conspiracy, I saw it.

I do not, however, have any reason to think the right wing used any clearly immoral tactics such as bribes to influence votes. It was much subtler than that.

The organization that coordinated the right wing activities at the Lambeth Conference was the American Anglican Congress (AAC). The AAC, which is headed by Bishop James Stanton of Dallas, where it is headquartered, includes Episcopalians United, Episcopal Synod of America, and

a number of other, smaller right-wing organizations.

I visited the AAC headquarters at the Franciscan Center just off the university campus. I couldn’t help but be impressed with the scope of their operations. They essentially had the entire Franciscan Center, a very large and well-appointed space. Conveniently for them and not coincidentally, the Human Sexuality Sub-Section also met at the Franciscan Center. The sub-section wasn’t originally scheduled to meet there, but moved there at Bishop Stanton’s invitation. Very convenient.

Roger Boltz, AAC’s chief of operations, told me that much of what they do is a “servant ministry.” They type and copy things for evangelical African, Asian and South American bishops, and they run er-

Yes,
Virginia,
there is a
right-wing
conspiracy
to take
over
control of
the
Episcopal
Church

analysis of lambeth

rands for the bishops and their wives. Although Boltz didn't mention it, the AAC also made cellular phones available for various bishops. They also sponsored several dinners, although as one evangelical African said, he could not be bought for the price of a meal since his meals were already provided for in the university cafeterias.

How much did all this cost? AAC operations at Lambeth alone had to cost in excess of \$250,000. There was not only the cost of flying 30 people from the U.S. and housing them, there was the rent on the Franciscan Center, rental of equipment, food, etc.

There were also two rounds of pre-Lambeth meetings, held in Dallas. The cost of flying bishops there from around the world had to be very high. The total expenditure, therefore, had to be at least \$400,000. It could have been significantly higher than this, but I don't see how it could have been much less.

But lest we blame all that is bad in the Communion on the American right wing, we should note that the British have their own right-wing groups, including Forward in Faith. They worked with the AAC.

I was mildly shocked and then amused that in various posts after Lambeth that Andrew Carey and other right-wing writers took issue with my claim that there were about thirty lobbyists and support staff from the AAC. I counted the mail slots when I visited Roger Boltz. It wasn't great sleuthing. I was waiting for Boltz in the hall where they were; I was looking for something to occupy my time. It turns out that I didn't need to count — in the AAC Website, they acknowledge having about 30 volunteers. Andrew Carey worked in the same building. He saw the folks. He could have read the Website. Was his attack intentional disinformation? It seems strange when his claim is so easily disproved.

It couldn't have just been money

The AAC deserves full credit. They got what they paid for. If they felt that a Lambeth resolution supporting their position was worth \$400,000, they won. And it was not just money — they did have lots of volunteers who worked very hard and very effectively. That is what the right wing has never had at General Convention. They have outspent Integrity ten to one, but they lacked dedicated people, like ours, who worked effectively. At Lambeth, they achieved this.

A tactic that I correctly suspected they would use was the "ex-gay" card. My suspicion was not based on the recent ads that appeared in the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and *U.S.A. Today*, but rather on the research I've done in anticipation of someday doing a book on the 'ex-gay' phenomenon. The problem was, despite my premonition, we were unprepared. At General Convention in 1991, when it was obvious "ex-gays" were becoming a tool for the right-wing, we had Michael Bussee, one of the founders of Exodus (and coiners of the term "ex-gay," which was originally meant to indicate that such folks DIDN'T become heterosexuals) who left and exposed the hypocrisy of the movement. In 1994, we had a leading psychiatrist, Dr. Michael Isay, who was an expert in so-called "reparative therapy," the secular equivalent of healing ministries. But at Lambeth, all we had were a few disks with my collected research.

The right wing had one session, open only to bishops, with four "ex-gays." AAC gave each bishop approximately \$40 worth of books on the subject. Of course, as happens when we encounter them in the U.S., none of the "ex-gays" were active in (or even stated members of) Anglican parishes. While few were convinced by them, many bishops who already thought that one could change one's orientation had their prejudices reinforced.

The "ex-gay" claims were especially frustrating to me because I knew that if we had had the resources, we could have easily refuted their position.

continued on page twenty seven

Stephen Coles at the open forum.

fred Phelps disguised as an anglican bishop!

by Kim Byham

Fred Phelps, the incredibly homophobic independent Baptist minister (and disbarred lawyer) from Topeka, has twice picketed General Conventions. He and his followers (most of whom are his relatives) carried a variety of signs, including "Fag Tutu," "God hates fags," "Sodomite Church," and "Fags are worthy of death." If Phelps' intent was to affect legislation, he certainly did. A number of moderate Episcopalians stared unbridled homophobia in the face as all lesgay people have done — and they were scared and repulsed.

Unfortunately, when Phelps' ideological twin appeared at the Lambeth Conference in the form of (the Rt. Rev.) Emmanuel Chukwuma, Bishop of the Diocese of Enugu in Nigeria, very few bishops seemed to care.

Bishop Chukwuma, 45, a bishop since 1990, was educated in Nigeria and became bishop of Enugu this year. Enugu is in the mostly Christian south-eastern part of

Chukwuma had four separate confrontations with three different people outside the plenary hall on the Kent University campus on Wednesday, August 5, the day of the vote on the sexuality resolution. He seemed anxious to take on all comers, even if he only suspected they disagreed with him.

Rounds 1 and 2 involved Chukwuma and (the Rev.) Richard Kirker of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement. Round 3 was between the bishop and a reporter for *The Independent*, Clare Garner. Round 4, which was the most revealing of Bishop Chukwuma's views, involved another bishop, (the Rt. Rev.) David Russell, Bishop of Grahamstown, Province of South Africa.

It began at the conclusion of the morning plenary session. While the small number of lesbians and gays present were handing out cards with Biblical or other quotations, and two LGCM members were holding up their banner saying "We're praying for an Inclusive Church," Kirker somehow was singled out by Bishop Chukwuma. Chukwuma was screaming at the top of his lungs at Kirker, telling him that he is a sinner because he is a homosexual. All Kirker could get in were frequent requests to be heard.

"Repent of your sin. You have no inheritance in the Kingdom of God. You are going to hell. You have made yourself homosexual because of your carnality," shouted Chukwuma. Sweat was pouring off his face as he continued his chant, "Repent, repent. We have overcome carnality just as the light will overcome darkness."

Chukwuma's other major theme was repeated perhaps 25 times in round 1: "Your Church is dying in Europe because you condone immorality."

"God created woman for man. You make yourself homosexual. God did not create you as a homosexual. That is our stand."

"You are killing the Church. This is the voice of God talking. Yes, I am violent against sin. Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed."

Nigeria. His previous diocese, Bauchi, was in the largely Muslim north; Chukwuma served as chair of the interdenominational Christian Association while there.

**Our
very
own
Fred
Phelps!**

Whenever Kirker began to speak, Chukwuma raised his voice, while his wife echoed his comments with "Alleluia".

The media loved it. There were numerous television cameras. The confrontation was the most televised portion of the Lambeth Conference, with extensive radio coverage as well. For the average Briton, and for many in the rest of Europe, this confrontation was the Lambeth Conference.

Round 2, following lunch, was even more bizarre. Bishop Chukwuma continually tried to lay his hands on Kirker's head. Kirker is at least six inches shorter than Chukwuma, so the bishop succeeded a few times despite Kirker's steadfast resistance. He continued to scream that Kirker was a sinner. A television newsman kept saying to them both, "Do you see any way in which you will be able to reach agreement on this issue?" After he had asked it ten times, even the rest of the media laughed out loud.

"Father, in the name of Jesus, deliver him. Father I pray to you, make him a Christian, in the name of Jesus. Hallelujah, hallelujah," roared Chukwuma, during his hand laying efforts. Kirker responded, "May God bless you and deliver you from your prejudice against human creation."

After about ten minutes of Round 2, Kirker finally launched his torpedo. He had, he reported, been born in Nigeria and grew up there. This got the bishop's attention and he briefly quieted down. Then Kirker said, "The first person I ever had sex with was another Nigerian boy when I was 16."

"You brought it in!" said the bishop, resuming screaming.

What wasn't clear was how Kirker "brought it in" since he was born there. If, on the other hand, it was in-born in Kirker (as a European), then that would contradict the bishop's expressed theology that homosexuality is chosen and that one has merely to give it up.

The reporter who tussled with the bishop best tells round 3. In a front-page article, entitled "How I felt the wrath of a bishop," Clare Garner wrote:

"Perhaps it is a little unwise to tell a bishop that his use of Bible quotations is selective. Without warning, the chubby finger complete with huge square-cut purple amethyst came jabbing towards my face.

"Do you know the wording of Corinthians?' the Right Rev. Emmanuel Chukwuma, Bishop of Enugu, Nigeria, shouted accusingly. When his question happened to be answered in the affirmative, he was momentarily wrong-footed. And changed tack. 'Are you a lesbian?'"

"Perhaps I should have turned

the other cheek, but I'm not in the business of being a martyr. When he persisted in pushing his finger in my face, I physically attempted to lower it myself. The more I tried to remove the bishop's thrusting hand, the harder it came pushing back.

"The farcical scene came to an end when, with a cry of 'You're a devilish woman', he turned on his tail and stormed off in a flush of episcopal purple."

Round 4 followed hard on Round 3. Bishop Chukwuma had a sign from an anti-gay group that had been on campus several days. He went over to other lesbians and gays standing outside the plenary hall. Bishop Russell followed Bishop Chukwuma. He said, "That kind of attitude will never bring anyone over to your position."

Chukwuma: "How would you know, you are a sinner?"

Russell: "Yes I am a sinner, but you are one as well."

Chukwuma: "No, I am not a sinner."

Russell: "He's says he's without sin!"

Chukwuma: "At least I am not as bad a sinner as you. You are a homosexual." [It was obvious that Chukwuma didn't realize that Russell was a bishop since he was not wearing a purple shirt. It

continued on next page

Chukwuma goes in for the heal while Kirker parrys.

was a hot day and many bishops were informally dressed.]

Russell: "No, I am a heterosexual in a very happy marriage."

Chukwuma: "Your Church in Europe is dying."

[Does he realize that the French Roman Catholic Church is dying at an even faster rate than the CofE despite its notorious homophobia?]

Russell: "I'm from South Africa. Archbishop Desmond Tutu supports the inclusion of homosexual persons in the Church."

Chukwuma, as he headed into the plenary hall: "Desmond Tutu is dead spiritually."

This latter comment shocked even Andrew Carey, the Archbishop's son and deputy editor of the ultra-rightwing "Church of England Newspaper," who allowed that Chukwuma is "regarded as a maverick by the other Nigerian bishops."

After the vote was over, Chukwuma posed with Kirker for photographs outside the plenary hall "I am very pleased," he said of the outcome of the vote.

The British press reacts

While the major impact of the Chukwuma "debates" was on television and the radio, the press didn't ignore it. The liberal papers, such as *The Scotsman*, called Chukwuma "haranguing." Even the conservative *Church Times* said:

"During the homosexuality debate, the Southern axis was fully in control. They had managed to

get the original motion changed, and extracted an apology from Bishop Duncan Buchanan for not consulting properly. ... They successfully fought off a wrecking procedural motion. They scored a couple of bonus points, closing a possible loophole for the liberals; and they swung a convincing majority of the bishops behind the final resolution, preventing the sort of split vote that would have undermined the result. If they had managed to keep Bishop Chukwuma away from Richard Kirker and the cameras, it would have been a day of unalloyed triumph."

Most of the conservative press, however, viewed the confrontation differently. The *Birmingham Post* labeled a picture "Clash: Gay activist Richard Kirker buttonholes Bishop Emmanuel Chukwuma at Wednesday's conference"! The ultra-right -wing *Daily Telegraph* even brought back its long-retired religion columnist, Tom Utley, to cover the day's activities. His take on Rounds 1 and 3:

"A magnificent argy-bargy was brewing in the sunshine between Richard Kirker, general secretary of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement, and Emmanuel Chukwuma, the no-nonsense Bishop of Enugu, in Nigeria. 'You will go to Hell,' the bishop roared. 'Oh good,' smirked Mr. Kirker, adding as he turned to reporters: 'Have you got that? I'm going to Hell.' 'Repent now!' the bishop bellowed, 'otherwise you are punished!' Off he stomped in a rage.

"The Rt. Rev Emmanuel Chukwuma will have gone to bed a happy man. In the eyes of the Church, Mr. Kirker is perhaps still on the road to Hell."

Chukwuma for ABC?

Perhaps the most absurd piece in the always-strange British press is the following from a columnist for *The Evening Standard* :

"Most of us are sick to death of the boring homosexuality 'debate'. What is there to debate? But if you're going to have Christianity, have it undiluted. We look with eyes of yearning to the Rt. Rev. Emmanuel Chukwuma - the one who had the slanging match with the gay vicar (sic) and wonder if he could be made Archbishop of Canterbury as a replacement for our own rather charmless Mr. Blobby. It would make a change to have an archbishop who openly told his opponents that they were going to hell."

For an in-depth, blow-by-blow account, see page 37.

analysis of lambeth...

I am very hopeful on this issue, however. The “ex-gay” claims have for years been sustained by staying in the shadows. The recent ads, which resulted in a cover story in *Newsweek* and other stories, will shine the light on their false claims. Once reporters start following up on conversion rate claims the tissue of lies will be pierced.

Our own worst enemies?

Many have concluded that the vote on the homosexuality resolution represented a total failure of the liberal leadership of the Anglican Communion. In 20-20 hindsight, the liberals got taken, and they were totally unprepared for it. Those on the Sexuality Sub-Section unanimously agreed to a resolution that was just on the cusp of being acceptable. It represented a reasonable compromise, however. Then, when evangelical African voices objected, the Sub-Section went back to the resolution and made it considerably less gay-friendly. This action, too, was apparently unanimous. Now did they do this because they thought this would buy off the evangelical Africans? By the time the substitute was submitted, there were already considerably more right-wing alternatives submitted. If the Sub-Section thought that their changes would buy peace, they apparently failed to negotiate this.

Then came the debate. The gay unfriendly substitute was adopted and then began a series of amendments to make it even less friendly. Here the almost complete disorganization of the liberals became even clearer. They had not signed up to speak against the amendments, and, amazingly, they failed to speak even when the Chair called upon folks who had not signed up. Did they think that the conservative tide could be turned without any effort? They already had proof to the contrary.

Only two Americans spoke against the chief amendment, adding, “while rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture.” Nor had the liberals planned before hand what to do. They met (which included several not previously in the liberal camp) but they could never agree on anything. Few of them appreciated the scope of the right-wing organization.

Not only did the Primate of the American Church (I’ll have to break myself of that) not do anything to moderate the resolution, he didn’t even vote against it in the end – he abstained!

Lest anyone think I am blaming the liberal bishops, I am not. I am merely explaining what happened. The only way the resolution could have been moderated, perhaps keeping it about at the level of the sub-section substitute (i.e., barely acceptable), would have been with a substantial effort by Integrity. We erred in relying on the Britons who have infinitely less “lobbying” experience than Integrity. While Lambeth was not like General Convention, it was more like it than it was like an English General Synod. Richard Kirker was quoted in the press as saying he had “tricks up my sleeves” that would turn the tide, but none materialized.

We were outspent and out organized. Yes, in a church, people should do the Christian thing without regard to “lobbying,” but the Holy Spirit works through the hands of “lobbyists.” “Trust in God but don’t take your hands off the steering wheel.” At Lambeth we never even got our hands on the wheel. The vehicle careened over the cliff. While I think we can ultimately get the car running again, there were lives lost. For that I grieve.

The Voice of Lambeth, 1908

A further evil with which we have had to deal is of such a kind that it cannot be spoken of without repugnance. No one who values the purity of home life can contemplate without grave misgiving the existence of an evil which jeopardises that purity; no one who treasures the Christian ideal of marriage can condone the existence of habits which subvert some of the essential elements of that ideal. In view of the figures and facts which have been set before us, we cannot doubt that there is a widespread prevalence amongst our peoples of the practice of resorting to artificial means for the avoidance or prevention of childbearing. We have spoken of these practices and endeavoured to characterise them as they deserve, not only in their results, but in themselves; and we would appeal to the members of our own Churches to exert the whole force of their Christian character in condemnation of them. —*Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference 1908*

We have to report on the question of the Artificial Restriction of Population. In every Western country there has been a decline in the birthrate; but this decline has been most marked among the English-speaking people, once the most fertile of races... Many causes have been alleged for this decline... but it is admitted beyond all power of dispute that it is largely due to the loss of the sense of responsibility to God for the fruits of marriage resulting in deliberate avoidance or prevention of childbearing.

“Preventive abortion has taken the place of direct abortion, and is daily growing more frequent in England and America.” Medical men are

Lambeth, 1908...

constantly consulted by those who desire to avoid the burden of a family; the old reserve of modesty has largely disappeared; ...not only was restriction practised, but that the habit of it was regarded without shame or abhorrence; the Malthusian Society openly advocates the practice; newspapers contain advertisements in which appliances for the purpose are offered for sale, and in which experts seek public patronage by announcing the number of their successes in this malpractice... The moral evil of this habit claims our first attention. We are glad to notice that the New South Wales Commission commented on "the grave immorality of deliberately preventing conception." The habit, in the view of the Commission, tended to "undermine the morality of the people, to loosen the bonds of religion, and to obliterate the influence of those higher sentiments and sanctions for conduct with which the development of high national character has ever been associated."

Abstention from marriage is within a man's moral right; self-restraint in marriage is within his right; but to marry with the deliberate intention of defeating one of the chief ends of marriage is to deprave the ideal of marriage. The verdict of Nature appears to endorse the moral instinct which condemns these practices, for there is good reason to believe that the use of artificial methods of prevention is associated with serious local ailments. In the view of many eminent physiologists the ill-effects of the habit resemble those of self-abuse, and nervous enfeeblement follows.

The mental and moral vigour may become impaired and the question has been asked whether the increase of insanity may not be closely connected with these habits of restriction.... The dangers of the practice are to us sadly and clearly evident. There is the danger of the loosening of home ties, for, to use the language of the Pastoral Letter of the Australian Bishops, this habit, which degrades the holy estate of matrimony, "is a fruitful source of discontent, unfaithfulness, and divorce." There is the danger of physical ills, and there is the worse danger of character enfeeblement – and character is, far beyond riches, the best asset of nations. There is the danger of deterioration whenever the race is recruited from the inferior and not from the superior stocks. There is the world-danger that the great English-speaking peoples, diminished in number and weakened in moral force should commit the crowning infamy of race-suicide, and so fail to fulfil that high destiny to which in the Providence of God they have been manifestly called. The Committee, moved by these considerations, desire to recommend that wherever possible legislation should be promoted to secure — (a) The prohibition of so-called Neo-Malthusian appliances, and of patent drugs, and corrupting advertisements. (b) The prosecution of all who publicly and professionally assist preventive methods. — *Report of the Committee on Marriage Problems, Lambeth 1908*

— Compiled by Tobias S. Haller, BSG.

λ	<h3 style="margin: 0;">Membership Form</h3> <h2 style="margin: 0;">INTEGRITY, INC.</h2>
<p>P.O. Box 5255, New York, NY 10185-5255</p>	
<p>I want to share in Integrity's work for justice for lesbians and gay men. Please enter my membership as checked below and begin my subscription to <i>The Voice of Integrity</i>.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual annual membership \$25</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Couple annual membership \$40</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Low Income/student/sr. citizen \$10</p>	<p>Mr./Ms./Miss _____ Mrs./Rev./Dr. _____</p> <p>Address _____</p> <p>City _____ State _____</p> <p>Phone _____ Zip _____</p>
<p>Please mail with your check or money order to: Integrity, Inc., PO Box 1246, Bayonne, NJ 07002-6246</p> <p style="font-size: 0.8em;">All contributions are tax deductible to the extent permitted by law.</p>	

pb abstains, then says why

August 14, 1998

A letter to the Episcopal Church

My brothers and sisters in Christ:

As your Presiding Bishop and Chief Pastor I write you as the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops has just concluded in Canterbury, England.

On one of the final days of the conference, I called together our House of Bishops for a time of prayer. Our chaplain, the Rev. Martin Smith, Superior of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, observed that it is as if the bishops have each taken mental photographs of the conference that have yet to be placed in the developing solution. Our negatives must be processed. During these next days of quiet I will begin to put in perspective and process in prayer the gathering of bishops. I will have more to say in the autumn, and also look forward to sharing impressions with other bishops after they too have had time for reflection.

However, I write now with a pastoral word, knowing that many in our church are concerned about the vote of the conference on sexuality. I want to assure you all of my continuing concern for and commitment to all members of the Episcopal Church who recognize themselves as gay and lesbian.

For me, homosexuality is not primarily a cause or an issue: it is a matter of men and women I know, respect and love, and whose lives bear ample witness to the fruits of the Spirit as enumerated in Galatians 5:22. It is about people with whom I have shared ministry and friendship, whose many gifts have enriched my life and continue to bless and upbuild the Church.

Though the Lambeth Conference is not a legislative body, each of the four subject "sections" brought forth "resolutions" which were debated and voted in plenary. A resolution on sexuality was brought forward by the section working on this topic.

Their resolution was based on the careful report they had crafted over more than two weeks of intense conversations. This group of persons of widely diverse opinions opened themselves to show one another the deep sense of the action of God in their lives and particular circumstances, and offered to the conference the fruits of their efforts. Their

resolution was amended during the plenary discussions.

I chose to abstain during the vote. I did so because I found parts of the resolution positive both in tone and content, particularly when considered in relationship to the nuances of the report on which it is based. At the same time, I took exception to other parts and believe that we must explore more fully the whole question of what is compatible and "in-

compatible with Scripture." It must be noted that faithful persons in our church, who see themselves as under the authority of Scripture, do not all interpret the Bible in the same way.

It is my hope and prayer that the Lambeth resolution commitment "to listen to the experience of homosexual persons" will lead to a broader conversation which will more fully reveal God's lived word of grace at work in the lives of gay and lesbian Anglican Christians.

In the days ahead, I will do everything I can to foster a climate of frank and respectful conversation which will allow different points of view to address and hear one another, not only within our own Episcopal Church, but more widely in the Anglican Communion.

With the prayer that the Spirit of Truth will guide us, and with gratitude for the life we share as members of Christ's risen body, I am

Yours in Christ,

Frank T. Griswold
Presiding Bishop and Primate

*The
Presiding
Bishop (c),
moments
before
the vote on
sexuality.*

The following are excerpts from reactions in the week following the Lambeth Conference:

From the Rt. Rev. William Swing, Bishop of California, in a statement issued after the Conference;

When all is said and done:

a) The feeling level in the debate was actually a lot worse than the final resolution. It was worse than liberal vs. conservative; it was black vs. white, imperialists vs. the natives, North vs. South. It was raw.

b) There was a sense of being hijacked. Leadership was in the hands of the bishops of Section One, and they gave every indication that a workable compromise was unfolding. At the last second a questionable procedure allowed the amendment [re the Scriptures] to come forward with the backers well prepared for it and its detractors off guard.

c) The Archbishop of Canterbury did not rise to the occasion of being a symbol of unity afterwards. He was content to bask in the victory and announce that we can 'get on to important matters.'

d) The experience will force the American Church to become clearer on its biblical approach, rather than to rely so heavily on experiential insights.

Personally it was a draining, deeply sad and isolating experience. I know that what we do in the Diocese of California is right according to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And most important, the bishops in my daily Bible Study do not agree with me but they trust me to do the best that I know how to do. The Anglican Communion holds together because of this kind of trust, not by resolutions.

My message to you: Do not be discouraged. Real life always wins at last. You are cherished in this Church, and together we will keep moving forward.

From the Most Reverend Khotso Makhulu, Bishop of Botswana, and Archbishop of Church of the Province of Central Africa, in a sermon preached at Evensong at the Lambeth Conference, Friday, August 7, 1998:

Those we have encountered in the presence of God, those who encounter the presence of God, are invariably moved to repentance. I am not doing an 'evaluation form' from the pulpit of what

lambeth

this conference is about, but I am doing a number of things. First of all I thank God for the opportunity of having shared in the worship, of having been reminded that I belong to a wider community of believers and worshippers. But, equally, I am reminded that on this occasion a variety of things have happened, and if we are to be called to repentance, we have to be agents of reconciliation. The tenor of some of our discussions can only be described as 'frenzied'. The tone in which they were expressed was devoid of the love of God. We have had tyrants using the Bible as armour, and words spoken from this very spot that were aimed to wound and to win score debating points.

I do not believe that this is the economy of the community of the Trinity. I do not believe that this is the basis of our Lord Jesus Christ. In our confusion He comes in order that He may shed light upon us. In our perplexity He comes that we may have comfort. In our bewilderment He sheds a light, a comforting light, so that we may truly be representatives of His.

There were those in this conference who have power, those who want it and want it badly, those who want to use it - whether by being utterly articulate or experts at procedural devices - those who have the 'lollie' [money] and know exactly how to use it to best advantage.

Sadly, we have equally had those who have been marginalised in our midst — some are confused and others remain wounded. From my background, I want to say here and now, I have resisted tyranny all my life and nor will I ever tolerate it from those who claim the love of the Bible over everyone else. Let not the intolerance of a variety of contexts inexorably lead us to intolerance, which, if I am checked, will find us with a band of vigilantes and fundamentalists.

I pray to God that the spirit of Anglicanism will survive, that we shall come to engage each other and find the best way forward. May God forgive us our wrong doings and our failure to strengthen His fellowship. I heard the Cross mentioned, and at times one got the impression that that Cross was not the life-giving Cross but was almost some kind of whip to whip those who were sinners.

reactions

The Greeks talk of the 'life giving spirit', because, when we go to Calvary, Jesus has borne our sins there. When we go to Calvary we take our own [sins] and not become surrogates of heaven while crushing those who are overburdened by sin. As we leave this place we still remember whence we came, we came from God, we have engaged in the presence of God and now we must go back whence we came. It is there that we should render service and therefore, in line with some of the resolutions that have been passed here, I would say 'Love God and love the brethren', 'Proclaim the truth in season and out of season', 'Stand for what is right in the spirit of love, not self-righteousness', and 'Serve those whom God has loved, even unto the end'.

From the Rev. Michael W. Hopkins, President-elect of Integrity, a sermon preached the Sunday after Lambeth at St. George's, Glenn Dale, Maryland:

I am confused, hurt, and angry. This Church seems to have said that I do not belong. Oh, it said that I am "a full member of the Body of Christ," but that statement is not only deeply ironic. It is a cruel lie, because it said at the same time that neither my relationship with John nor my priesthood are legitimate. My relationship has been labeled "sin" and my priesthood "apostate." I am, at best, a bastard child of this family.

What happened last week has happened over and over again in the life of the Church, and, indeed, happened to Jesus himself time and time again in his life, and ultimately caused his death. What happened last week was part of the great struggle of which the Bible speaks, and that our baptism signs us up to be a part of, whether we want to be or not.

This struggle is not the struggle between good and evil, although it masquerades as such. This struggle is between grace and the law, between faith and despair, between the good news of the kingdom of God and the bad news of the kingdom of fear.

It is not about the works of the law. It is about believing what you heard. Of course, one of the problems with this Lambeth Conference, and why the resolution that was passed has no

credibility whatsoever (and I believe I say this on biblical grounds) is that the bishops "heard" nothing. They refused to hear anything about or from the very people they condemned. "I will never speak with a practicing homosexual," a Ugandan bishop said to a newspaper reporter.

Of course, the irony is he already had. That particular bishop had, several years ago, been in Washington and participated in a confirmation service at the Cathedral, and I was his chaplain.

I didn't tell him then I was gay, of course. I wish I had. Folks wonder why people like me have to "say they're gay" all the time. Why? Because at this point in time if we do not it is assumed that we do not exist and people like that Ugandan bishop will make decisions based on that assumption. And things will happen like what happened last week.

It would have been uncomfortable for me to have told him. Especially if he reacted badly, I probably would have gotten in trouble with folks at the Cathedral and maybe even our bishops. But because I didn't an opportunity for faith was lost and that man went on to participate in an un-faithful decision, un-faithful not so much because of the way he voted, but because of why he did so.

I am here today, we are here today, and I will continue to be here, despite my better judgment, and we will continue to be here because of faith. Faith alone. And if I and we didn't know that before we certainly know it now. Because we have precious little else to go on, bastards and apostates that we are.

It is extremely hard for me to be here today. I am exhausted. I am bruised. I don't know if I belong here.

But I am not going anywhere. And I trust we are not going anywhere. No number of bishops can decide for God what pleases her to do, and I still have faith, we have it together, that God is doing much in our midst, bastards and apostates that we are.

From the Rt. Rev. Carolyn Tanner Irish, Bishop of Utah, in an interview with the Salt Lake City Tribune after the Conference:

An "undercurrent of fearfulness concerning homosexuality" overshadowed all the other discussions about complex social and moral issues at the recently concluded Lambeth Conference of Anglican and Episcopal bishops, said Utah's Episcopal Bishop Carolyn Tanner Irish this week.

Lambeth

"This grieved me more than I can say," Irish said in a prepared statement. "It is unimaginable to me that God would exclude a whole category of persons from his grace and gifts, the more so as many thousands of homosexual persons have served the church faithfully for so long."

When she baptizes or confirms people as members of the Episcopal Church, Irish said she asks them: "Will you seek and serve Christ in all persons, loving your neighbor as yourself?" and "Will you strive for justice and peace among all people and respect the dignity of every human being?"

Jesus would not exclude anyone, Irish said, and neither will the Episcopal Diocese of Utah.

"We welcome you, whoever you are, wherever you come from," she said.

From the Most Rev. Michael Peers, Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada, in a statement at the end of the Conference:

Canada's 1995 General Synod acted to "affirm the presence and contributions of gay men and lesbians in the life of the church and condemn bigotry, violence and hatred directed toward any due to their sexual orientation."

This message obviously contains a considerably stronger affirmation of gay and lesbian Christians than the Lambeth text. Even so, much of the content of the Lambeth statement, strictly speaking, is broadly in accord with the current policy of the Anglican Church of Canada. (Canada's policies remain in force since the Lambeth Conference has only advisory, not legislative authority.)

However, I must disassociate myself from any who perceive this action as a "victory." Canadians generally will have been scandalized by some of the reported comments, as were Canadian bishops here. The debate was marked at times by outright condemnations of homosexual persons, sometimes phrased in viciously prejudicial lan-

guage. This is not consistent with the gospel of Jesus Christ as I understand it.

From a Personal Statement by the Rt. Rev. John Shelby Spong, Bishop of Newark, after the vote:

In the light of the negative resolution passed today by the Lambeth Conference regarding gay and lesbian people I want to send this personal communication to my homosexual brothers and sisters in Christ the world over.

First, I want you to recognize that this resolution was far from unanimous. Be assured that

lambeth reflected by Elizabeth Kaeton+

I am in the midst of a wonderful two week vacation. At the present moment I am writing in the very early hours of a magnificent morning by the ocean at Rehoboth Beach, Delaware. The sun has just made a most glorious appearance, ushered in by a gentle southerly breeze, while Bottle-nose dolphins leapt for joy and sea gulls shouted their hosannas and alleluias to our God.

All of this is to say that I have found my place - once again - in the midst of creation. And so, I am healing - slowly but well - from the surprising brutality and unexpected betrayal I experienced at Lambeth.

I've come to realize that the "pay off" for the African bishops is not the promise to work for the retirement of the International Debt. It is also more than barbecues, cell phones, fax machines and first class airfare. That's not only naive, but insulting to the intelligence and integrity of the African bishops.

No. It has to do with the benefits of pointing to the sliver in someone else's eye while they - and you - ignore the log which obscures reality.

The plan is simple: keep the conversation going about "immorality and the western disease of homosexuality" and you completely avoid a discussion about the immorality of polygamy or the incidence of rampant (heterosexual) promiscuity, and the link between these two common practices to the disease of AIDS which is devastating one quarter of the population of most countries in Africa.

Get a German . . . "scientist" . . . to discuss the dubious claim of an "early death rate for gay men" and no one has to talk about the recent indisputable evidence of genocide and ethnic cleansing in parts of Africa.

Keep the focus on homosexuality as demon possession (even offering exorcism) and you never have to face the evils of female circumcision and genital mutilation.

And, for an additional twist of irony, mention frequently that all this talk of homosexuality is frivolous and not important. Indeed, compared to polygamy, promiscuity, AIDS, genocide and female genital mutilation, that is an accurate assessment.

reactions

today's minority will inevitably be tomorrow's majority.

Secondly, no resolution can ever diminish the fact that you are created in God's image, loved by Jesus Christ just as you are and called to the fullness of your humanity by the Holy Spirit.

Thirdly, this debate has placed the issue of homosexuality on the agenda of every province of the worldwide Anglican Communion. Once prejudice is examined publicly it is never able to be suppressed or denied again and homophobia and destructive stereotypes about gay and lesbian people are doomed. Please rejoice in that.

Fourth, the resolution sought to justify its prejudice by appeals to the authority of Holy Scripture. That tactic was employed in the church's attempt to justify slavery, segregation and apartheid. It failed then. It will surely fail on this issue.

I pledge to you that I will continue to do all I can to make the Christian Church a safe, open and loving community that will welcome and encourage all people in their journey into wholeness. I am confident that the church of Jesus Christ will some day reflect the fullness of God's creation.

If memory serves me correctly, however, we never did discuss any of those issues. Which, of course, is exactly my point.

In truth, who could fault such a plan? It's enough for these African bishops to have to deal with the horrid reality of racism. They know only too well of the institutional racism perpetuated by many of their Caucasian brothers - on both sides of the pond.

How many people of color are in positions of leadership in dioceses - in my country and the U.K. - which describe their leadership as "orthodox" or "traditional"? How many people of color are ordained and serve as Rectors or Vicars in these places? What is being done to actively recruit/evangelize among the African or Afro-Caribbean communities?

They know. They see. By playing into one of the many prejudices of the Caucasian bishops they have, in effect, blunted the prejudice which most directly affects them.

Brilliant, actually. Brokering turned back on itself. It's no wonder that so many African bishops were grinning like Cheshire cats all over Lambeth. They know that what lurks in the darkest recesses of the enterprise known as "Western Civilization" is far more perilous than any danger contained in the wilds of an African jungle. Ghandi once said to a reporter who asked his opinion of Western Civilization, "I think it's a good idea". Lambeth left me with a deeper appreciation of that remark.

What is absolutely fascinating to me is the distancing now going on with the bishop of Nigeria. "A bit of a maverick" is he, now? Is that what many of his brother bishops are saying about him? No apology for his outrageous behavior? Just distance? Point a finger. Shame and blame. Most brilliant!

This supports what I have learned: all that is necessary for evil to flourish (besides good people doing nothing) is to know a few cheap tricks that always work.

I've also come to understand that all that was said and done at Lambeth is not a reflection on the state of my soul. Rather, it is a reflection of those "princes" of the church who said what they said (or didn't) in direct disobedience to the sacramental vows of their baptism and ordination.

I am absolutely convinced that in future Lambeth Conferences, our children and grandchildren will look back on the

1998 Lambeth Conference with the same sense of humiliation and shame with which we now view the racism and sexism of previous Lambeth Conferences.

As for my own sense of betrayal, I have come to understand on a deeper level, the lessons of a Judas experience: putting faith in human justice is an error. Rather, it is to trust that the hand of God is in this, even though I am unable to see it, and that the Divine justice of God will, ultimately, prevail.

It is to move from bitterness, through the sense of victimization, to the realization that I am being challenged to evaluate where I place my faith.

I have learned lessons I could not have learned any other way, and I find that, strange as it may sound, I am deeply, profoundly grateful to God.

I find, now, that I can pray with authenticity for that 80% who voted as they did - and even for those who abstained. I pray also for your father as I pray for my own Presiding Bishop. To be responsible for unity within the institution at the cost of injustice for the individual must be a terrible burden for their souls to bear.

Lambeth '98 has given us unending reason to pray without ceasing. I thank God that while I had once become complacent about praying the "Anglican cycle of Prayer", I am once again up to the task.

Here, at the beach, the tide is now changing and the ocean is responding in violent spasms of crashing waves. The dolphins have returned, making great sport of dancing on the shifting tide.

It's a wonderful metaphor and image for the work which awaits me when I return to Newark - Dancing on the Shifting Tide. It seems a wonderful answer to my most recent, fervent prayer "Well, what are we supposed to do now?" I imagine it to be the same question the disciples asked as they waited in that upper room after the betrayal, crucifixion, death and resurrection of our Lord. Then, they ventured out, and, living into that question, brought the world to Christ with deep, irresistible joy! — *The Rev. Canon Elizabeth Kaeton is Canon Missioner to Oasis - Newark*

Lambeth

From the Rev. Mark Harris, Rector of St. James', Wilmington, Delaware:

But surely we know what "full inclusion," means. Surely those who held the day at Lambeth knew. As a white, heterosexual, western, adult and not yet totally over-the-hill male, I know what it means. "Fully included" is what I am. "Full inclusion" for others means that people not like me can aspire to every role, function and ministry in the church that I can. In whatever way I can be included in the life of the Church, so can they. What part of the phrase "full inclusion" has not been understood? The impolite questions at hand in the Lambeth Conference resolution on sexuality is this: (i) whether being a Christian requires that one never start, or quit, practice that might result from a particular sexual orientation, and (ii) whether those who will not or can not quit are to be considered less than fully included until they are changed by "God's transforming power." (That last being a phrase that stuck out in the Lambeth resolution. See section c.) This resolution is primarily about the maintenance of a purity code.

. . . those who voted for the resolution were less than truthful. It turns out that, contrary to the statement made in section (c), only some baptized persons are full members of the Body of Christ. Those who are not married or homosexual and who know their sexual orientation through practice are, so long as they practice, not full members. They remain or become unblessed, unlicensed, and disempowered, and for sure they are not wholesome examples. (That sure sounds like less than full membership to me.) They sit there damned until they stop. This is why the Pastoral Statement is very important, for it at least acknowledges the disempowerment of the Resolution.

So where are we? Lambeth seems to have decided that being homosexual is not the issue, acting on it is. Lambeth is against homosexual practice, and does so claiming it is incompatible with scripture. The bishops who wrote the Pastoral Statement have decided homosexual persons need to be supported, respected and heard and do so claiming such care is compatible with scripture. But the Statement does not clearly come out for the normalization of homosexual practice, by which I mean opening out to the possibility of committed and affirmed same sex relationships whose health should be encouraged and sustained by blessing. Perhaps that was too much to ask for.

What is missing, of course, is the word "advocate." Lambeth will not, and the Pastoral Statement does not, advocate for homosexual practice as a possible means of the expression of purity of heart, that is as a way of expressing the love for one another that is holy and of God. (We all know some bishops who are advocates, and their names will be remembered with joy.) Advocacy is one of the many attributes we ascribe to Jesus. It is one we ascribe to some of his followers. It moves beyond hearing, supporting and respecting. It requires standing for and with the shunned and cast out.

But for now this is all a sad turn of events. Taken as a whole, there is no inclusion in this church, and no advocacy by this church. It is not just that we are not for full inclusion, at the moment we are not for inclusion at all.

In the Church, the only way to make inclusion happen where there is hardness of heart is to identify with the excluded. Jesus surely modeled that. Too old to learn new practice, I guess I will just have to be a white, heterosexual, western, adult and not yet totally over-the-hill male whose sexual orientation is nobody's business. I am who I am. But if gay and lesbian friends will have me among them I'm in. And, if in, if asked, I'm gay.

From the Rev. Canon Douglas E. Williams, preaching at Trinity Cathedral, San Jose the Sunday after Lambeth:

With all due apologies to 526 bishops, this simple priest can see no way of approaching Holy Scripture that permits one to declare that homosexual practices are incompatible with Scripture, end of message, without opening the floodgates of viciousness and repression in many other areas of life.

The Holy Scriptures are part of the bedrock of the Christian Faith. But if small details in the cultural conditioning of its authors are to become for us binding admonitions, then we are indeed the sorriest of people.

For myself, however, I cannot walk a middle ground on this issue, any more than I could in the 1960s over the issue of racial civil rights. In the early 1960s, the law was still being used in the South to enforce segregation between blacks and whites, and to prevent blacks from voting. Such use of the law brought the law itself into disrepute. Such legislation by lawmakers was intolerable. In the late 1990s Scripture is still being used to deny the reality of our gay and lesbian brothers

reactions

and sisters. Such use of the Scriptures brings the Scriptures into disrepute. Such Biblical interpretation by bishops of the Church is intolerable.

From the Rev. Tom Scott, Rector, St. Mark's, Evanston, Illinois, preaching the Sunday after Lambeth:

Some of us in this congregation, I know, are delighted with the vote and the clarity of the bishops' views on the matter. Many of our lesbian and gay members and friends, on the other hand, are devastated. Some here are like me, straight but not narrow as the saying goes, and we are troubled and heartsick at what has happened in our beloved Church. We are eager to make some headway in witness to the gospel promise that Christ has opened the kingdom of heaven to all who believe in His name, and that every couple in the world is precious because, as couples, they build the lives of people and offer hope to the rest of us, because joy conquers despair and forgiveness heals guilt. The great witness of the prayers offered in the marriage liturgy is that the bond of love is a source of hope and grace to the two themselves, to the community they live in, and to the world that encounters them as individuals and as a couple in every dimension of life..

To each and all of us, I have three visual aids for suggesting a way ahead. The first is my fool's cap. (I put on my cap) The fool, you remember, was the person who was designated to tell the truth and raise questions and be a conscience for the person/people in authority. The fool reminds those who have authority that the truth is not in us, the truth is among us, the truth is Christ come among us saying that no one who comes to Him is rejected, and those who deny Christ and His benefits to others will find themselves put away.

The second is familiar perhaps to older people here, at least. It is the gold star of David that Jews had to wear during the nazi era in Europe. My aunt Miriam wore one like this (I put it on). Some of you also know the story of how Christians in the Netherlands would wear the star also as a sign of solidarity with their brother and sister citizens who were Jews and as a protest against such false and hateful teaching as it represents.

The third comes from a suggestion made by one of the priests who married Dorothy and me 20 years ago, after he read that many lesbian and gay people and their straight friends had come to feel like the lepers of Lambeth. Our friend, Dick Gressle,

rector of Grace Church, Nyack, New York, proposes that those of us who feel like the lepers of Lambeth and those who want to show solidarity with them use the medieval lepers bell to signal our presence to the world and each other. In the old days, you see, the leper bell was not only a warning, but a welcome. We Are Here!, it said, (ring bell). Those who were lepers and those who cast their lot with them as family and friends, could make community with those bells as an invitation. (Ring bell).

My visual aids this morning, and the bell symbolism, (ring bell) may strike you as romantic posturing, even sophomoric. But I'm willing to risk that for the sake of helping every person to see that Christ calls us into life with Him and expects us to work things out with the others whom He has called in the spirit of gratitude for having been included ourselves. For as we heard in the epistle for today, God is not ashamed to be our God, and we must not be ashamed of the gospel!

From the Rt. Rev. Richard L. Shimpfky, Bishop of El Camino real, in a statement to gay and lesbian members of the diocese on August 5, 1998:

To our brothers and sisters demeaned in the resolution I can only say that, while this is hurtful beyond words, the struggle is righteous and will go forward. I date us in Canterbury today with the Council of Southern Africa that last justified apartheid on the basis of the words of Scripture. Please remember, in this action of Lambeth, that you are created in God's image, loved by Jesus Christ (and by your Bishop) just as you are called to the fullness of humanity in the Holy Spirit. Right will prevail! You will hear often in the next few days that what happened here today served best to guarantee that homophobia and homosexuality will now become part of the discourse of the whole church around the world, and not just a conversation in the North American and "English world". This is a good outcome of a bad moment and I pray that all of you will recognize the importance of what I am saying. Please know that I will do all in my power to advance the day when your place in the church and society is at least as secure as that of the former slaves of apartheid. Nine years ago I marched in the San Jose Gay Pride parade to express my outrage against the then frequent acts of violence against gays and lesbians. The action today in Lambeth stirs in me the same outrage and commitment to action.

lambeth: a modest proposal

by Ted Mellor

Let's be clear on one thing. Nothing has been "settled" at Lambeth. Nothing and nobody has been "decisively rejected."

The Lambeth Conference is an advisory meeting with no juridical authority whatsoever. It does not legislate. It offers advice. It's a kind of purple-frocked, hydra-headed Ann Landers. Individual Anglicans and national churches are quite free to take its advice or to tell the bishops (politely) to get stuffed. Those of us who take the latter course are entirely within our rights and, indeed, have a moral obligation to do so when that advice conflicts with our own informed Christian conscience.

The conference meets every ten years. Does anyone remember what advice it handed out ten years ago? Twenty? Forty? I don't. I am really getting tired of the whole myopic "sexuality" discussion. In a month or so I will be sixty years old and that is too damn long to hang around the doors of a musty old church while the folks inside loudly debate whether they want you or not. I am getting to the point where I no longer care. So I propose a simple solution based on past history:

There are as many references in Scripture to the sin of usury as there are passages which may (or may not) refer to homosexuality. As for tradition, virtually every Council of the Church, beginning with Nicaea, defined usury as the taking of any interest whatsoever and forbade it to Christians under any circumstances as a mortal sin. As Roger Fenton wrote in 1612, "This hath been the general judgment of the Church for above this fiftene hundred yeeres, without opposition, in this point. Poor sillie Church of Christ, that could never finde a lawfull usurie before this golden age wherein we live."

And it was not considered a light offense. The 16th Century Bishop of Salisbury, John Jewel, thundered "If I lend 100 pounds and for it covenant to receive 105 pounds, or any other sum greater than was the sum I did lend, this is that, we call usury; such a kind of bargaining as no good man or godly man ever used; such a kind of bargaining as all men that ever feared God's judgment, have always abhorred and condemned . . . It is the overthrow of mighty kingdoms, the destruction of flourishing

states; the decay of great cities; the plagues of the world and the misery of the people. It is theft, it is the murdering of our brethren, it is the curse of God, and the curse of the people. This is usury, and by these signs and tokens ye shall know it."

A few hundred years later investing at interest is considered a virtue and nobody, but nobody, in the self-proclaimed bible-believing, tradition-loving, morality-upholding brigade so much as raises an eyebrow. They're raking it in right along with everybody else.

What happened? It was John Calvin, that dreary despot dear to the evangelical heart, who found the way out. Breaking with 1500 years of Catholic social teaching, he simply redefined usury to mean only EXCESSIVE interest, and what's more, announced that that is what it had always meant. The burgeoning financial world of nascent capitalism breathed a great sigh of relief and within a couple of hundred years they had everybody believing it.

So I suggest we take a leaf out of the old reformer's book and simply proclaim that "homosexuality" really means "EXCESSIVE homosexuality" and that while EXCESSIVE homosexuality remains a sin, plain old ordinary homosexuality is just an every-day event and always has been. It really would be a splendid compromise. The Geneva busybodies could have a grand old time defining what is or is not excessive (once a week? every three days? quarterly?) and the rest of us could get down to the business at hand:

"I [am] frightened by the possibility of being numbered among the goats on the left hand of the Sovereign Judge who will hurl his condemnations; and this not because they have robbed or committed sacrileges or adulteries, nor because they have done something forbidden; nothing of the sort attracts condemnation on them, but their having failed to care for Christ himself in the person of the poor." — St Gregory of Nazianus.

Ted Mellor was for many years Liturgy Planning Coordinator at the Church of St. John the Evangelist in Boston and now divides his time between working at a local university and indulging his interest in the history of the Anglo-Catholic left.

showdown at the lambeth corral

by Jan Nunley

Synopsis: Before the afternoon plenary session commenced on August 5, there was a tense confrontation between Bishop Emmanuel Chukwuma of the Diocese of Enugu in Nigeria and the Rev. Richard Kirker of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement. Chukwuma was being interviewed by Clare Garner, writer for the Independent, outside the plenary hall where bishops were being individually photographed. A knot of reporters and photographers formed around the two men. When Chukwuma declared that the Biblical book of Leviticus calls for the death penalty for homosexual acts, Kirker challenged him, "Would you be prepared to stone us to death?"

Chukwuma answered, "Because of the grace of Christ, you would be counseled, you would be prayed for, and you would be delivered out of your homosexuality. And I'm going to lay my hands on you and deliver you to become a total and dedicated Christian—" At that point Chukwuma extended his hands towards Kirker's head, chanting repeatedly "I can deliver you, God want to deliver you in the name of Jesus, Father, I pray that you deliver him from homosexuality in the name of Jesus, Father, I pray. . .", as Kirker attempted to block the bishop's hands.

"Many have tried to lay their hands on me and exorcise me in the past but I'm glad to say that God has seen fit to reject such attempts to alter my sexual orientation," Kirker told Chukwuma. "May God bless you, sir. And deliver you from your prejudice against homosexual people."

The two appeared to find common ground when Kirker revealed that he had been born in Nigeria, near Chukwuma's diocese of Enugu. "I also had my first sexual experience with a Nigerian boy. Any claim that you will make that there is no homosexuality in Nigeria is entirely untrue," Kirker challenged. Chukwuma replied, "Well, if you did that—you brought it in." The sparring continued for another ten minutes before Bishop Chukwuma turned and left.

The tape picks up near the beginning of the confrontation between Chukwuma and Kirker.

CHUKWUMA: . . . is to repent. Because God himself condemned homosexuality in the Scriptures. And the Scriptures is the base for the faith of Christians. So if you are a Christian, why not go to what does the Scripture say about gay, and about homosexuality? That's my point. This issue was in the early church before, and it was addressed in First Corinthians chapter six verse nine and ten. Why [?] to that? And again in First-Romans, chapter one. Romans chapter one, verse 27 says even those who support homosexuals, and those who are involved in it in lustful carnality with man of man, will be punished.

GARNER: But isn't that a very literal interpretation of a few passages in the Bible?

CHUKWUMA: Which passages?

GARNER: Well, the 1 Corinthians 6:9-10. I mean the Bible could be, could prove anything . . .

CHUKWUMA: No, no, no, no! No, no, no! I think that that's one out of many. Then look at one—look at Romans, chapter one, verse 27, following to the end.

GARNER: But then as we look at—we—

CHUKWUMA: Then look at Old Testament, there in Leviticus, it says those boys should be stoned to death. And also—Genesis chapter two—

KIRKER: Would you be—would you be prepared to stone us to death? Would you be prepared to stone us to death?

CHUKWUMA: Because of the grace of Christ, you would be counseled, you would be prayed for—

KIRKER: Thank you.

CHUKWUMA: —and you would be delivered out of your homosexuality. And I'm going to lay my hands on you and deliver you to become a total and dedicated Christian—

KIRKER: No—no—no—many have tried to lay their hands on me and exorcise me in the past but I'm glad to say that God has seen fit to reject such attempts to alter my sexual orientation.

CHUKWUMA: Yes—yes—

KIRKER: —but if you wish to lay your hands on me in the expectation that I will become a heterosexual—

CHUKWUMA: I lay my hands on you in the name of the Lord—Father, in the name of Jesus, I lay my hands on him—Father, I tell you in the name of Jesus, deliver him—

KIRKER: I'm not giving you permission—I think you should avoid—

CHUKWUMA: I can deliver you, God want to deliver you in the name of Jesus, Father, I pray that you deliver him from homosexuality in the name of Jesus, Father, I pray. . . [unintelligible]

KIRKER: (fending off Chukwuma) Right, right . . . Our hands, our hands are united (laughing), thank you, thank you. . .

CHUKWUMA: (shouting) In the name of Jesus, Father, I deliver him out of homosexuality, out of gay, that he become a Christian, a genuine Christian, a devoted Christians, in the name of JESUSSSS! Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!

KIRKER: I don't think he's got any evidence to substantiate this claim, ladies and gentlemen . . .

CHUKWUMA: I pray God to forgive you, for God to deliver you out of your sinful act, out of your carnality, in the name of Jesus, alleluia, alleluia (breathless). . .

KIRKER: I don't think actually you were engaged . . .

CHUKWUMA: May God bless you, may God bless you, may God bless you . . .

KIRKER: May God bless you, sir. And deliver you from your prejudice against homosexual people.

CHUKWUMA: God bless you, God bless

you. Don't destroy your creation. God intended a man to marry a woman. Why should you marry a man? Why should be in love with a man? That is sinful. That is carnality.

KIRKER: I've tried that, and been there, and done it and it didn't work. (crowd laughs) I'm much, much, much . . .

CHUKWUMA: May God help you. May God help you to walk. You need to pray more. You need to pray so that [unintelligible]. You need to pray more for that God has deliver you from that. You tried to do what? Because you are not spiritually minded. And you—where's a Bible? where's a Bible? where's a Bible? Where—is—your—Bible, as a Christian, as a gay Christian? Where is your Bible? The Bible is [unintelligible], the Bible is [unintelligible], where is your Bible as a Christian? You are not a genuine Christian . . . [unintelligible]

KIRKER: I am not a genuine Christian?

MALE REPORTER: Are you two ever going to reach agreement?

KIRKER: I would hope—

CHUKWUMA: No—

KIRKER: If he allows me a word in edgewise—

CHUKWUMA: As a Christian—as a Christian—I want you to read the Bible—

KIRKER: If he allows me to answer the question—

MALE REPORTER: Do you accept him for what he is?

CHUKWUMA: I accept him as a human being, not as homosexual.

KIRKER: I am a homosexual human being, I cannot be divided into two different people—

CHUKWUMA: Nooooo! God did not make you to be homosexual, he made us heterosexual. You can be delivered out of homosexuality in the name of Jesussssssss . . .

KIRKER: Thank you very much. I believe that God has created us to be homosexual .

CHUKWUMA: NOOOO! That is heresy—

KIRKER: Ah—YES!

CHUKWUMA: That is heresy, that is heret—that is heretical. That is heresy, that is half

truth. And if you go to the Scriptures, in the last word of Revelations say if you remove or twist the Bible, then know be removed in the Book of Life. May God forgive you for becoming heretical.

KIRKER: Well, I may be a heretic, but I doubt it.

CHUKWUMA: No church will grow, no church will grow, in this bit of homosexuality. No church will grow. We are indicative of evangelism, and we're out to promote Christ Jesus as the Lord and Savior. May he deliver you . . .

KIRKER: Your body language tells me that you have a deep distress about dealing with a homosexual per—

CHUKWUMA: (bellows) YEEEESSS! Because it's sinful, it's sinful, God, God does not allow—

KIRKER: Are you unable to have a conversation without raising your voice? Or putting your hand over me in a rather threatening, intimidating way?

CHUKWUMA: Yes! Because you have refused to change! You tried to marry, you couldn't make it. Then you have become a stubborn, and I shall have to ask for you, to deliver from your stubbornness, in the name of Jesus!

KIRKER: Yes, well—

CHUKWUMA: I'm an African.

KIRKER: I was born—I was born not too far away from Enugu, I might have you know. I was born in Inoren [sp?] in Ibadan—Ikabo—ah, we've found some common language, right. I was born in Nigeria, I lived there until I was in my mid-teens.

CHUKWUMA: Yes.

KIRKER: I also had my first sexual experience with a Nigerian boy.

CHUKWUMA: Ohhhhhh!

KIRKER: Yes! Any claim that you will make that there is no homosexuality in Nigeria is entirely untrue!

CHUKWUMA: Well, if you did that—you brought it in!

KIRKER: (roars) I BROUGHT IT IN! (laughs)

CHUKWUMA: You are polluting—you are polluting the genuine Christian—I will say no—

MALE REPORTER: Gentlemen, is there any room for compromise on this issue?

CHUKWUMA: There is no compromise for sinfulness. There is no compromise for a sinful act. As far as I'm concerned, God has said we should not allow homosexuals, they will not inherit the kingdom of God. You see the problem is that—

MALE REPORTER: How do you, Mr. Kirker, reconcile Christianity with homosexuality?

KIRKER: I believe that God created everybody, men and women, black and white, homosexual and heterosexual—

CHUKWUMA: Noooooooo—Nooooooo—

KIRKER: —equal, equal in the sight of God. To say anything else implies that God made a mistake and that is blasphemous.

CHUKWUMA: How can God make a mistake? You—

KIRKER: Well, he made me so he didn't make a mistake. He made you, he didn't make a mistake.

CHUKWUMA: But you make a mistake! You made a mistake by telling us how to be homosexual. You will regret to decide to be homosexual—

KIRKER: This isn't some button I've pressed!

CHUKWUMA: You're pressing the wrong button!

KIRKER: My default—

CHUKWUMA: Jesus is the right button, and press Jesus and you'll be transformed!

KIRKER: I've been devoted to Jesus—

CHUKWUMA: I want you to be transformed—

KIRKER: I've been devoted—

CHUKWUMA: —and I want Jesus to change you. You said you tried to be, to, to marry, you couldn't marry, you couldn't sustain it, you couldn't manage it. Why don't you try again?

KIRKER: No, no, no, no, no. I think you've completely misunderstood what I've said about my brief—

CHUKWUMA: You had a wife? You had a wife? You had a wife? You had a wife?

KIRKER: –my brief, my brief encounter–

CHUKWUMA: You had a wife?

KIRKER: –my brief encounter with heterosexuality–

CHUKWUMA: You had a wife?

KIRKER: –was mutual but it was ended by consent on both parties, because I was not giving my girlfriend at the time the physical and emotional support which she would have needed, and I was unable to receive hers. It was entirely inappropriate. She was a heterosexual, I was a homosexual, then as I am now–

CHUKWUMA: Then you are just–

KIRKER: And she’s very happily married–

CHUKWUMA: Then you have a problem.

KIRKER: –and we are good friends.

CHUKWUMA: You have a problem. You have a problem which is spiritually problem. And I hope you delivered from that problem, my friend.

KIRKER: The only problem I have is people who try and persuade me that I am not a homosexual or should not be a homosexual. I’m a Christian

CHUKWUMA: You should not be homosexual–you should not be homosexual–I pray that God would turn your heart my brother. Because if you want heaven, if you’re a Christian you want heaven, you should destroy yourself if you continue with homosexuality, but if you leave homosexuality, you will be part of the heritors [sic] of heaven. God says no homosexual–

KIRKER: In other words, I’m going to hell.

CHUKWUMA: No homosexual–you go to hell.

KIRKER: Ah, that’s it. Thank you. Have you got that on the record? I’m going to hell.

MALE REPORTER: But you two are never going to agree over this–is this now going to divide the Anglican movement for good?

KIRKER: I hope that the Anglican Church will unite around a belief that all people are created equal. The only solution to the divi-

sions on homosexuality, as with any other in the past, has been to acknowledge that God created a diverse range of people, amongst them men and women, black and white, heterosexual and homosexual. And–

MALE REPORTER: But he says you can’t be a Christian and gay at the same time.

KIRKER: Well, but he’s entitled to that opinion. I feel it is wrong–

CHUKWUMA: The Bible is [unintelligible]. And what I’m saying that when this case arose in the early church, it was treated and it was then that they said in First Corinthians the sixth verse nine and ten that no fornicators, even–look–at those who have been homosexuals, even fornicators, adulterers, sodomites, and evil homosexuals will inherited the kingdom of God. It was said in the Scriptures, and even Sodom and Gomorrah was destroyed because of this type of homosexual. Not in the sight of God–God made you a [?], but you turned to the sin of homosexual. It is sinful, and cannot be taking over the church. And church cannot allow calamity to rule the church, the church is indicative of evangelism, we are out for spirituality, and I want you to repent. Repent as with one now, otherwise you will perish.

MALE REPORTER: Didn’t Jesus accept everybody?

CHUKWUMA: He did not accept, he only pleaded that those who are homosexuals will change. He said, repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand. And this will not be a part of the kingdom, it is a part of your sin. And one of the sins that we are condemning is homosexuality. And if that is the case, why should homosexuals continue in their sin? You cannot be sin, and expect because of God to uphold! In this Decade of Evangelism–this will destroy evangelism!

KIRKER: Could I maybe go back then, if it means–

CHUKWUMA: Homosexuality will destroy evangelism–

GARNER: Can I just ask you about other passages in the Bible, such as these–

CHUKWUMA: You know Greek?

GARNER: Yep.

CHUKWUMA: You know Greek?

GARNER: Yep.

CHUKWUMA: Now. Tell me now, I will floor [?] you down now, if you don’t know Greek don’t talk, because I know Greek and I will ask you a question, what does what you want to put out to me mean in Greek. I want to ask you right now. What do you want to talk about?

GARNER: What do I want to talk about?

CHUKWUMA: Yes.

GARNER: I want–yes, okay. I want you to just look at these passages that Richard Kirker’s handing round–

CHUKWUMA: Who–who–who is writer of this?

KIRKER: These are words from the Bible.

CHUKWUMA: Who provide this one?

KIRKER: The Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement.

CHUKWUMA: Well, you are a lesbian. Are you aware that some people are twisting the word of God to suit their carnality? Are you aware of that? Because I’m trying to state my point–

GARNER: Don’t point at me–

CHUKWUMA: Are you a lesbian?

KIRKER: No, no, that is quite inappropriate as a question, quite inappropriate.

GARNER: I’m a journalist.

CHUKWUMA: As a journalist, I’m very much, I’m very much brutal about just [?] who done with the truth. You shall know the truth and truth will set you free! [?] get out of here.

KIRKER: I think that is abusive.

CHUKWUMA: If you care to take my view, I tell you, listen, I’m an African, I don’t [believe in this?] nonsense.

KIRKER: I think you’re being quite abusive.

CHUKWUMA: I stand by the Bible and Bible is my basis . . . base on Bible, they’re not catholic! [Unintelligible–walking away]

KIRKER: Well, I think we’ve heard all we want to hear.

that we may be one

by John Clinton Bradley, Mark Kozielec,
and Scott Larsen

The joint conference of Integrity/Lutherans Concerned was held July 16-19, 1998 at the Holiday Inn - O'Hare International, in Rosemont, just outside of Chicago, Illinois. Nearly two hundred participants gathered for a weekend of prayer and worship, work and fun, a keynote address by the eminent feminist theologian, Carter Heyward, and various workshops. Lutherans Concerned held their biennial national meeting during the weekend, at which policy and officers were voted on. Integrity held its annual business meeting (held during non-General Convention years), which is informational and informal in nature. Thanks go out to The Rev. Deacon Ciritta "Cricket" Park, who worked as the event coordinator for the conference.

David Sumner, an associate professor of journalism, and a frequent contributor to the *United Voice*, the official publication of Episcopalians United, reported the event for that organization. His coverage of the conference, as well as his interview with Carter Heyward, can be found on page 44.

Opening Eucharist

The liturgy for the opening Eucharist (mostly planned by members of Lutherans Concerned) drew from many different contemporary sources. A number of participants came together earlier in the day to form a large choir. A rainbow flag was hung behind the altar and rainbow banners were suspended from the ceiling.

Integrity President Fred Ellis read the first lesson and LC Co-Chair Tim Eudy read the second lesson. The Rev. Michael Hopkins, Integrity's president-elect, presided and the Rev. Ralph Wushke, a Lutheran pastor from Canada, assisted. The Rev. James Robertson, a member of Integrity/Philadelphia, deaconed. Ms. Anita Hill, a Lutheran lay pastor from Minnesota preached—expanding on the assembly's theme of oneness.

She expressed the hope that this assembly would be the leaven for bringing the ECUSA and ELCA into the Concordat. Worshipers renewed their baptism vows and were sprinkled from a bubbling fountain near the altar. Free-form intercessions and thanksgivings were offered by the people. Thanks was given for Episcopal bishops who have the courage to ordain gay/lesbian priests and permit the bless-

ing of same-sex unions. Prayers were offered for gay and lesbian Lutheran clergy and congregations who are under discipline. Prayers were also offered for Anglican bishops gathering for Lambeth. A reception was held after the Eucharist.

Heyward Keynote: the unity of queerness

Carter Heyward opened part one of her keynote address by speaking about all of the progress that lesbians and gay men have made, in the midst of feeling that sometimes we are taking backwards steps. These thoughts were brought about, in part, by the round of full-page "ex-gay" ads in mainstream newspapers. She also noted the different places that each group (Lutherans Concerned and Integrity) may be in at any given moment; and that, while we are looking for a commonality of acceptance, we need to be mindful (indeed, celebratory) of our differences.

Moving into her address, Heyward stated that "our vocation as Christian men and women are important in these fear laden, gay-bashing times ... all people who are really gay affirming people, whether we ourselves are more or less hetero- or homoerotic, are really quite queer. That is, *all people* who are truly gay affirming people are, in these times, queer people. For what could be queerer in our deeply homophobic culture, than to struggle publicly for sexual justice and gender justice ... to be an advocate of gay and lesbian justice? What could be more queer in a heterosexist social order than to come out for justice love ... for all women and all men, irrespective of our sexualities?"

In discussing why she uses the word 'queer' so predominantly, Heyward said, "it's because [the word] has an edge to it – it does suggest that we're not looking to be normal – that we're not looking to normalize our lives in a heterosexist, homophobic, racist, sexist culture. We're looking to kind of stand out, to be people with an edge."

Making note of her participation in the Philadelphia 11, the eleven Episcopal women who were ordained prior to church canons being changed, she said, "it's the same reason that I love the fact that I was ordained 'irregularly.' ... Isn't it offensive for people to say, 'you're one of those irregular priests' – it has this kind of weird sound to it. But this [irregularity] has given us an edge as priests – it has kept us from being simply normalized priests in a patriarchal church."

Heyward went on to discuss the theological basis of our oneness with Christ. Focusing on the passage from John from which the convention theme was taken (That We May Be One), she said that we can learn from the relationship that Jesus shares with God, even if it is imbedded in the patriarchal language of the bond between the father and the son. "That is really very patriarchal language for something that doesn't need to be seen as patriarchal at all: the connecting link, the love that binds us."

The Jesus-God relationship is infused with the full spirit of God, and this is bigger than just one person or one relationship. "The issue is the linkage" not the language. Jesus shares a passionate connection with God, and it is through our connection with Jesus, with God, and with everyone we come into contact with that we are opened to "the complexity of the heart of reality."

We are all one body in the world. Within this one body, there is unity in diversity, and *vice versa*. In recognizing this universal linkage, queer Christians are called to come out "as passionate lovers of God."

On Saturday morning, Carter Heyward used the resurrection story in Mark 16:1-8 as a starting point for part two of her keynote address. She said our religion must empower us to live passionately and compassionately. While we all need solitude, our religion must not be an escape hatch to isolation and self-absorption.

Heyward described three windows into the passionate and compassionate life:

1) **Making time.** Technology has actually increased our labor—but rejecting technology is unrealistic, rather, "how do we use it in ways to honor ourselves and other people." We need time for ourselves and we should not forget to make time for others – for even our enemies. We should learn how to pray. "Spiritual discipline, prayer, meditation, silence, song, dance and movement... living in the spirit... something we all need – how to be disciples, how to walk with Jesus." And we also should learn how to nourish the body—our own bodies and those of others— not only with food, but with "right touching."

2) **Making love.** This is more than having sex, it is making community. "Lovemaking is a source of spiritual power. We are erotically empowered people." Our relationships must be totally nonviolent. We must have the deepest respect for all. We must seek to do no harm even in conflict.

3) **Making amends.** This includes acting for justice and making amends for the sins of our ancestors. How is our past silence and inaction part of the problem? Activism is a way to 'go and sin no more.' When something is wrong, do something about it. Involve others so that strength can be shared.

Near the end of her presentation, gathering together her themes of unity and queerness, Heyward stated, "queer straight people do understand, really well I think, that it's really not up to gays and lesbians, primarily, to carry the banner and the work against homophobia and heterosexism. It's a banner that's got to be carried by straight people; it's got to be carried by queer people, gay and straight together. It is primarily up to those people who have the heterosexual privilege – this would include even closeted gays and lesbians – those who have the heterosexual privilege, whether or not they are heterosexual – to lead the church in its efforts to undo homophobia and heterosexism."

integrity/Lutherans concerned

that we may be one

[Audio and videotapes of Carter Heyward's Keynote Addresses will be available in the coming months. If you're interested, please write to: Heyward Tapes, Integrity, Inc., PO Box 5255, New York, NY 10185-5255.]

Workshops a place to learn and meet

Over fifteen workshops were presented during the weekend. This allowed valuable opportunities for members from both organizations to interact and exchange information. Following are highlights from some of the workshops:

Building a Welcoming Chapter

This session was held on Friday afternoon and was led by Mr. Merton Spencer, LC's Midwest Regional Director. He said that caring for individuals is essential. People who visit are probably hurting in some way and chapters must minister to that pain. Merton said it was important to make visitors feel safe. Rather than asking too many questions of a visitor, it is often more effective to tell one's own story. "Cruising" of newcomers by established members should be strongly discouraged. Each officer should make a point of greeting every visitor. Follow-up phone calls or notes are important.

The workshop also included a discussion on effective methods of outreach. Chapters should...

- have a Web site. Many people, especially younger people, now search for information on the Web.
- print and distribute business cards with chapter contact and meeting information.
- send an information packet to local pastors/priests and ask them to refer gay and lesbian parishioners to the chapter.
- secure nationally known speakers for occasional high-profile events.
- network with other local gay and lesbian faith groups.
- establish liaisons with campus ministries and invite younger people to speak.

The continuing saga of The Concordat

What was advertized as an "explanation of the document and issues related to Episcopal & Lutheran Unity efforts" was, sadly, a soapbox for the adamantly opposed Jason DeRose, a graduate student at the University of Chicago Divinity School.

Couching his argument against The Call to Common Mission (what the re-worked Concordat has evolved into since its failure to pass in the ELCA) in

rather tenuous early-Church circumcision rhetoric, DeRose raised one important point that lesbian and gay Christians should be concerned about: if The Call to Common Mission (TCCM) is approved, the ELCA will be denying ordination to lesbian and gay Lutherans who adhere to the Augsburg Confession, while allowing non-Lutheran (Episcopal) ministers who aren't required to swear its allegiance to serve.

Integrity's Michael Hopkins spoke in relaxed support of TCCM. He looks at the document not in doctrinal terms, but in relational terms. He said that, while it would not be a blow to the Christian movement if it didn't pass, we would lose "a wonderful opportunity for closeness." He did remark that he felt that there has been some slippage of lesbian and gay support for TCCM since the ecclesiastical trial of openly gay Pastor Steve Sabin in Iowa [*this has been extensively covered in the last three issues of The Voice of Integrity*].

During the brief discussion period, Will Stewart, a member of both Lutherans Concerned and Integrity (he is Co-Convenor of Integrity/Washington, DC) said that he hoped that passing TCCM would be "the leaven in the ELCA that will jump-start the inclusion of all."

Integrity Business Meeting

Integrity held its business meeting on Saturday afternoon. In his opening remarks, President Fred Ellis gave an overview of some of the organization's significant accomplishments since the last business meeting in New York two years ago. These included working with the Consultation and Beyond Inclusion on a very successful General Convention in Philadelphia. A coalition of organizations are meeting regularly on the issue of blessing same-sex relationships. We have been able to work with the national church's legislative office on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. Fred gave thanks for the support he has received during the past for last four years.

Ellis held up three newspaper ads which appeared in mainstream newspapers, touting the 'success' of the 'ex-gay' movement. Ellis said that a task force would be meeting in Washington, DC regarding these homophobic attacks to discuss how the gay community, collectively, can respond [see related article on page 50]. For the first time, he continued, the faith community in the gay community has been invited to offer their input.

Secretary Loudene "Gil" Grady gave an outline of her duties—which include sending certification/

decertification notices to chapters and preparing meeting minutes. Minutes of the last business meeting and last three board meetings were made available. [These reports have been posted on the Integrity Web site at <http://members.aol.com/natlinteg/>.]

Treasurer Mark Crouse thanked the chapters and members for helping to underwrite Integrity's presence in Philadelphia last year and reported that Integrity experienced a net loss of \$20,000 in 1997—mainly because of a shortfall of contributions for General Convention. He noted that there were thirty full-time Integrity volunteers who attended General Convention and he estimates 3,000 hours of volunteer time was expended. While Integrity pays for the lodging of volunteers (accounting for just over half of the convention budget of \$48,000), volunteers still need to pay their own expenses such as travel, food, and entertainment. Crouse said that a better system of fundraising is needed for General Convention 2000. One idea is for each chapter to help financially sponsor a volunteer. He anticipated a smooth transition to Treasurer-Elect Warren Carlson.

Director of Communications and President-Elect Michael Hopkins gave an overview of Integrity's upcoming presence at Lambeth. He said that Integrity had good press relations and coverage at the last General Convention. Hopkins noted that *The Voice of Integrity* received four Polly Bond awards at the Episcopal Communicators conference in May, and, although he is listed as publisher of *The Voice*, much of the credit should go to its editor, Mark Kozielec.

Hopkins also briefly discussed the future, outlining at least three priorities for the next two years: 1) increasing membership, 2) the blessing of same-sex unions, and 3) chapter/leadership development. He said that he will be soliciting nominations for the appointed positions Director of Communications and Director of Development.

Northeast Regional Vice President Phil Nicholson reported on the status of chapters in his region. Phil also reported on the membership survey conducted last year and the New York gay pride parade in which Bishop Cathy Roskam participated.

Midwest Regional Vice President Ted Blumenstein reported on the status of chapters in his region. He said he was particularly proud of three chapters that have good gender balance and encouraged other chapters to work toward this.

Southeast Regional Vice President Warren Carlson reported on the status of chapters in his region. He said that these chapters would be in good

hands with John Clinton Bradley as the new regional vice president. He shared excerpts from letters he had written, countering attacks from the radical religion right.

South Central Regional Vice President Dale McNeill reported on the status of chapters in his region. He noted that a regional convention was held in Louisiana last year, and that one will be held in Arkansas in 1998 and in New Mexico in 1999.

Western Regional Vice President Robert Heylman was unable to attend the meeting due to work conflicts.

Executive Secretary Mark Kozielec, whose contract is expiring at the end of the year, said that it has been in privilege to serve in this capacity. Fred thanked Mark for his service and said that five applications for the position had been received.

Fred Ellis reported that no decisions about the next annual convention have been made.

Awards Dinner

On Saturday evening there was a fabulous dinner and dance held in the hotel ballroom. During the awards portion of the program, Mark Crouse presented Fred Ellis with the Louie Crew Award for outstanding service to the cause of gay and lesbian justice in the church. As the youngest Integrity member present, Dale McNeill, was presented with a lifetime membership—funded through a \$1000 donation by David Tarbot.

integrity/Lutherans concerned

Fred Ellis, following his receipt of the Louie Crew Award at the banquet.

that we may be one

Heyward: More bishops may 'come out'

by David E. Sumner for *United Voice* (posted Aug. 4, 1998)

CHICAGO — Just before the Lambeth Conference convened in England, the Rev. Dr. Carter Heyward told homosexual activists that Anglican “homophobia” may prompt some quiet bishops to greater candor about their homosexuality.

Heyward made her remarks at a joint meeting of Integrity, the homosexual caucus within the Episcopal Church, and Lutherans Concerned, Integrity’s counterpart in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA).

Otis Charles, the retired bishop of Utah, is the only bishop Episcopal [sic] to date who is openly homosexual. ...

“Clearly it’s well known that there are a number of gay bishops in the House of Bishops. After Lambeth, I wouldn’t be surprised if some of our bishops come out in response to some of the homophobia occurring around the Anglican Communion,” Heyward said.

The two groups chose the theme “That They May Be One” [sic] for their meeting on July 16-19 at the Holiday Inn O’Hare in Chicago. Lutheran participants out-numbered Episcopalians by 131 to 34.

Heyward — professor of theology at Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Mass. — was the keynote speaker.

Heyward, who was ordained as one of the “Philadelphia 11” in 1974, has recently moved to the mountains of western North Carolina. She lives with a group of people committed to various social-justice issues. Heyward, who is 52, will continue to teach one semester each year at EDS, where she has taught since 1975.

“Our bodies and our sexualities are a sacrament — an outward and visible sign of God’s inward and spiritual grace,” Heyward told her Integrity-Lutherans Concerned audience. Heyward organized her remarks around three main ideas — making time, making love and making amends.

“How do we make time for one another, including those we consider our enemies?” Heyward said.

Heyward said that making time also means paying attention to what she called “body nourishment.” That means learning “how to be with one another in physical ways; how to nourish ourselves and one another physically.”

Several friends have told Heyward her that they experience God through sex, “especially in those moments where there is truly a mutual desire for doing what is right and building up the other’s well-being, which is what lovemaking is really all about.”

Justice-love returns

Making love means a commitment to justice and working to end homophobia, racism and heterosexism, she said.

But Heyward emphasized the need for nonviolence in the same way that Martin Luther King Jr. embodied it. “It means a commitment not to harm, destroy or bring evil things on our enemies. It means struggling for justice and liberation in a spirit of compassion and willingness to make amends when we are wrong,” she said.

Making amends means correcting the wrongs perpetuated by the silence or lack of action of our predecessors. “Acting on behalf of justice is spiritually a way of making amends. Jesus said ‘go and sin no more.’ Isn’t activism on behalf of justice a way of going and sinning no more?”

Righting the wrongs against gays and lesbians is up to heterosexuals who have the power to do so, Heyward said. “This is not primarily our problem. It is the Church’s problem and society’s problem. Our heterosexual brothers and sisters have got to be there with us in helping lead the church to sexual and gender justice.”

Episcopal women and gays have made progress by acting together. “What has been a saving grace in the Episcopal Church for 25 years is that people have gotten together and there’s never been just one person doing one illicit thing,” Heyward said. “Not one, but 20 bishops will come out and sign a statement. Not one bishop will be ordaining a queer person, but ten will be ordaining queer people.

“Everybody knows that Jack Spang may be the most vocal and articulate bishop on the issue of queer justice. But he is by no means the only bishop who ordains gays and lesbians. That is a great thing. There are dozens and dozens and dozens of openly gay and lesbian priests in the Episcopal Church today. So come out and come out together,” Heyward said.

A new president

Episcopal participants at the conference were primarily men over 50, with only three women and one African-American attending. According to a recent article in *The Voice of Integrity*, half of all its

2,500 members are 51 or older, 8 percent are 71 or older, and none is under 21. About 98 percent are white and 72 percent are men.

President-elect Michael Hopkins told the annual meeting that his three primary goals are increasing membership, working toward General Convention approval of blessing same-sex couples, and local chapter development.

Hopkins will take office in October and serve for two years. He is vicar of St. George's Church in Glendale, Md., in the Diocese of Washington. He was ordained by Bishop Frank Griswold in the Diocese of Chicago.

The budget presented at the annual meeting indicated that \$40,000 had been expected in 1997 membership dues, but only \$33,847 came in. Since membership dues are \$25, a decline of 246 members or almost 10 percent could have occurred. Two regional vice presidents reported that some of the 50 local chapters had been removed from active status.

A resolution directing the Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music to develop rites for blessing same-sex couples failed by only one vote in the lay order at the last General Convention.

"I want to make sure we are as clear as we possibly can be in terms of what we want and what we go after," Hopkins said of General Convention scheduled for 2000. "In general, we're very well in tune with General Convention and how it works."

Hopkins said that at the last General Convention, 50 Integrity members put in more than 3,000 hours of volunteer time. "You don't realize until you're there what it means to have all these people all over the place for two weeks. They know we were there and that we were a people to be dealt with."

The budget indicated that Integ-

rity spent \$48,796 at the Philadelphia convention, with \$26,025 spent on housing expenses for volunteers. Integrity also received \$45,500 in gifts for General Convention expenses, with \$23,500 coming from non-members.

Fred Ellis III, outgoing Integrity president, reported earlier that he and Hopkins are members of a strategy group working toward rites for blessing same-sex couples. "We held a meeting in Washington prior to the installation of the presiding bishop and will meet again in September," he said.

Speakers barely mentioned more efforts toward gaining General Convention authorization to ordain noncelibate homosexuals, which Integrity generally sees as a "de facto" accomplishment in the Episcopal Church.

"We have made significant strides over the last three General Conventions," Ellis said. "It's gratifying to realize we have achieved what we have. There is no longer any national prohibition to the ordination of lesbian and gay priests. Dioceses have the option of providing medical benefits to same-sex partners of clergy."

Besides two keynote addresses by Heyward, participants could attend workshops on "Homophobia in the Church and Military," "Dating and the Single Life," "Rights and Responsibilities when Being OUT Brings Church Controversy" and "Relationships: Commitment to Long-Term Relationships."

'I have a hard time with this creed': an interview with Carter Heyward

By David E. Sumner for *United Voice* (posted Aug. 4, 1998)

Q. In your book "Staying Power," you write these words: "Increasingly I use the adjective 'christic' rather than the noun/name 'Christ' with reference to Jesus' power because it more accurately, I believe, reflects the power of God that moved him as a brother — one among many — rather than the one and only son of God." How do you reconcile this statement with the words of the Nicene Creed — "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God"?

A. I have a really hard time with the Nicene Creed as a statement of my personal faith. I don't have trouble with it as a statement of the corporate movement, the history of the Church, or as our collective sense as a Christian body.

There are a lot of things I can pray with gusto and great vigor, but I have a hard time with this creed. And I have such a hard time that I have to keep asking myself how can I stay a priest in the Episcopal Church if I can't with any sense of integrity get up and lead a congregation in confessing it as the faith.

This is my dilemma and continues to be a dilemma. There's certainly some truth in

heyward interview...

it. It's kind of like not taking the Bible literally in a fundamentalist way. I kind of feel that way about the Nicene Creed as well.

As long as I am a priest in the Episcopal Church I will wrestle with the issue of integrity in my work. I ask myself if I am being unfaithful to the people of God by staying a priest. I hope I am being faithful, but I am not sure about that every day.

Q. How would you characterize yourself as a theologian?

A. From an Anglican perspective, I find myself in the tradition of F.D. Maurice, the English bishop. He would be characterized as what I call a relational theologian. All of my work has been trying to sort out the extent that God and creation is in a relational movement together and the power of that relational movement.

We're always in some way becoming; we are always evolving. God is the evolutionary power behind that. I really focus on the relational dimension of spirituality, of God and of salvation more than on any one doctrine, such as the doctrine of the cross. God's relational movement is more central to my thinking than Jesus himself.

Q. How would you compare yourself to John Spong?

A. John Spong and I are from the same town, Charlotte, N.C. We are at one time from the same parish. His younger brother, Will Spong, was actually a youth leader of mine in church. So I go way back with Jack Spong.

I think he is a man of guts, courage and obviously charismatic. I believe history will put him on what my mother would call "the side of the angels." I think he really does genuinely want to stand with gays and lesbians, in particular, at this point in history. I think he gets a bad rap on both the left and right because people often tend to think of him as a showman.

To be honest, he's probably trying to pick up a ball that everyone else has dropped and carry it as responsibly as he can. He's doing a hell of a lot of good work in the world on behalf of gender and sexual justice.

Theologically, some of the process and liberation theologians have been saying the same things he is saying for many years. So it's not that theologically he is saying anything very new. It's that he has the power, clout and position in the Church to really say it seriously, and also has the courage to do so.

Q. What would you say to the bishops who signed the Kuala Lumpur statement?

eu reports...

One table offered free brochures and other items. Stickers saying, "Hi — I Am Available" and "You Are in Luck — I Am Single" were available for participants to attach to their name tags.

Free brochures included "A Response to the Kuala Lumpur Statement," by an anonymous author. Hopkins told *United Voice* that *Integrity* has made no official response to the Kuala Lumpur statement.

Lutheran participants seemed envious of the gains that gay Episcopalians have made. ELCA prohibits the ordination of noncelibate homosexuals.

"Lutheran bishops don't have the discretion of making all the decisions about ordination, whereas in the Episcopal Church there is some discretionary power vested in the bishops. As a result of that, there have been more ordinations and visible signs of acceptance [of gays and les-

biens] in the Episcopal Church," Robert Gibeling Jr. told *United Voice*. Gibeling is program executive for Lutherans Concerned of North America and based in Atlanta.

He says there have been some "irregular ordinations" of open homosexuals in ELCA. "When that occurs, ELCA has removed them from the clergy roster and from their parish positions."

Gibeling says that ELCA differs from ECUSA in that its polity could never allow a "local option" policy of ordaining homosexuals. When the national church doesn't approve, then no local synod can legally do it.

If the national church approves, then all synods must comply. "There are calls from some synods for that to happen," Gibeling said, "but I don't think it will happen at the next national assembly."

— Doug LeBlanc, writing from Canterbury, contributed to this story. *United Voice* (www.episcopalian.org/eu/uv) is the national newspaper of Episcopalians United. Distribute freely, with credit to *United Voice* for its reporting.

A. Ideally what I would like to say is, How are we going to get to know each other so that your stereotypes of me and other lesbians and gay men and my view of African men and bishops don't get in the way of being able to relate to one another in the spirit of Christ? How are we going to do that? Is there any way to set the stage for a genuinely mutual dialogue?

I have all kinds of preconceptions of Anglican, African male bishops. I would plead ignorance of most of what I'm talking about when I say I have all these images. I would assume most, if not all African bishops, would be ignorant of the kinds of forces and issues that are at work among gay and lesbian people.

I don't have any doubt that all of us want to be about the work of God and of helping love grow in the world. I would hope very much these brothers could hear that kind of thing from people like me.

I think if we could sit down with each other over a meal, pray together, so what we were not judging each other — spend a week or two sharing stories, sharing pictures, values, we could go a long way toward finding a way of holding the tension better than we are right now.

Q. What would you like to say to those orthodox Christians who hold views different from you about sexual morality?

A. I think people who would stand opposed to the Church's blessing of gay and lesbian relationships or ordaining gay and lesbian people are wrong about this. I simply assume there are many ways in which I stand in the wrong place on the wrong issue, but I don't believe this is one of them.

I think gays and lesbians can in every way embody wrong behavior and do what is evil in the sight of God as much as anybody else. We are no more so than anybody else. I certainly think my behavior is as able to be filled with goodness or evil as anybody else's, gay or straight.

I think there is a whole lot to be said for the confessional tradition of the Church, where we go in together to pray together for the forgiveness of our sins. We may assume that we know where somebody else's sin is in a particular way, but God really only knows.

Overheard

by Scott Larsen

A freelance reporter with Episcopalians United told me that he stayed away from attending the various sessions during the conference

“out of respect for the delegates.” The sessions dealt with various topics, from gay youth to homophobia in the military and the church. Another participant said, “Maybe he should have attended. Then he might understand what gays and lesbians of the church are going through.”

Two attendees at the conference were overheard talking about the gay and lesbian faith community in the larger gay community. “I find it easier to deal with the mainstream press than the gay press about religion coverage,” said one to the other.

During his remarks at the Saturday evening banquet, Fred Ellis remarked that someone had said to him how little was said about the relationship between Lutherans and Episcopalians. “Maybe we don't need to,” Ellis told the gathered people in the ballroom.

The official conference T-shirt included the names of the organizations, along with the outline of a cross and a pink triangle. One participant who wore this T-shirt to ‘Boystown,’ the gay neighborhood in north Chicago, at first felt a bit conspicuous wearing it as he walked down Halstead Street. But after a while, he started enjoying the reaction from passersby, trying to read and then comprehend the gay and Christian message conveyed on the shirt.

Michael Hopkins with Beyond Inclusion Director Rebecca Omeahen.

cherishing love

the cruelties of lambeth

by Nick Downen

When I began to hear about what was going on at the Lambeth Conference this summer, one of my first thoughts was to worry about what I would do at the Archbishop of Canterbury's next public appearance in the New York metropolitan area. I didn't have too long. During the third week of August I was informed, while casually telephoning Hans Franzen and his partner Phil Nicholson, Integrity's Northeast Regional Vice President, that the Archbishop was going to be at Christ Church, Greenwich, Connecticut, on Sunday, August 30, 1998, at the 10:00 A.M. Eucharist. Consternation! What must I do? My mind was in turmoil. I didn't expect to be put to the test so soon.

The 1998 Lambeth Conference has trashed the American church's positions on lesbian issues and women's ordination, has interfered with American church polity, and has tied evangelism, marginalizing, and scapegoating of lesbians and gay men. So called conservative bishops (they are really dangerous radicals) in the American church injected their concerns into Lambeth instead of abiding by our duly constituted governing body, the General Convention of the Episcopal Church. Concerned as we all are about the future of the American church polity, our greater fears must go with our lesbian sisters and gay brothers in third-world countries, many of which lack democratic governments and any real accountability of authority. Here begins a bleak and terrible period in the history of Anglicanism, trumpeting denial and ignorance of human sexuality and foreshadowing church-sanctioned human-rights abuses against lesbians and gay men, all in the name of the Bible.

My friend Bob Cookingham died of lung cancer last year. An openly gay man, longtime member of Integrity/New York, and parishioner of Trinity Church, Wall Street, Bob had corresponded with the

Archbishop of Canterbury during the year of Trinity's elaborate celebrations of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the parish (1697-1997). (These celebrations culminated in a dinner on Ellis Island on Ascension Day, 1997, when the Archbishop came to receive a large contribution from the Trinity Grants Program.) Bob wrote to the Archbishop to take him to task for not supporting lesbian issues. He received two replies which he deemed favorable, so much so that Bishop Donovan, Trinity's Vicar, read excerpts from them at his funeral.

I knew I had to go to Greenwich because of my friend Bob, Jesus had nothing at all to say about homosexuality, but a great deal to say about friendship – and hypocrisy.

An outdoor demonstration planned by some New York-area clergy was cancelled. Phil Nicholson spent a great deal of time on the telephone and the Internet planning the orderly, peaceful presence deemed appropriate by Integrity. He suggested dressing well and wearing pink triangles. He wrote and printed an excellent small pink card explaining the meaning of the pink triangle (experience has taught us that people often do not know this).

I rode to Greenwich on St. Clement's bus. Alone among all the Episcopal churches in Manhattan, the good parishioners of St. Clement's (The Rev. Barbara C. Crafton, Record) rented a bus, a spanking-clean, air-conditioned bus with rainbow-motif-upholstered seats. It was wonderful riding with these kind and deeply engaged people. We arrived in Greenwich in good time.

On arrival I spied almost at once the rainbow flag flying from an upstairs window of the church annex. An openly gay member of the clergy staff lives there.

It was standing room only at Christ Church. In recent years, it has been said that Episcopalians as leaders are statistically less numerous in American business, government, and the military than we used to be. This alleged decline would be hard to discern in this congregation. Looking into the faces of these smiling, well-dressed people – almost 100 percent lily white – I felt the presence of remarkable social and economic power (Greenwich ranks third among all U.S.A. communities in annual per capita income).

and friendship

Three bishops officiated: The Rt. Rev. Clarence N. Coleride, Bishop of Connecticut; the Most Rev. Frank Tracy Griswold III, Presiding Bishop and Primate of the Episcopal Church; and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Present in the congregation to my great delight, was Bishop Righter. He left just after the sermon.

My experience of the Episcopal Church has shown me the prophetic power of the Bible readings in our liturgical calendar. This Sunday, our Epistle (Hebrews 13:1-8) speaks of hospitality. Believing hospitality to be one of the church's – and Integrity's – most important ministries, I paid careful attention to the Archbishop's sermon.

He began well. He commended the Diocese of Connecticut as the first diocese of the American church and Samuel Seabury as the first American bishop and Presiding Bishop. Surprisingly, he commended Seabury's powers of asserting unpopular High Church views and winning his opponents over to them. But he began to lose me when he spoke of hospitality and brought in the prostitutes and women taken in adultery whom Jesus spoke to, but told to "go and sin no more." (This was not from the Gospel reading for the day, by the way.)

I reject the parallel between lesbians and gay men and prostitutes and women taken in adultery. His justification for this parallel, which I sensed he knew was weak, was that he is an upholder of "orthodoxy" and "tradition." He made no attempt to define these terms (Orthodoxy as in Czarist Russia? I wondered. Tradition as in Judaism?) so they mean pretty much what he wants them to mean. In my view, tradition is fundamental, but it needs to be weighed and sifted and chosen with a great deal of deliberation and care. We have good traditions and bad traditions. One person's tradition is another person's oppression. "Tradition means the last bad performance," Toscanini once declared.

Hospitality is not about telling people they're sinful, even if they are – we all are. Jesus didn't speak to the women to chide them for their sexual sins, but because they were social outcasts. Hospitality is not about singling out sexual sins for special mention. This is judgmentalism. Hospitality welcomes and loves people unconditionally.

"The Episcopal Church Welcomes You." This slogan is familiar from church signs all over the country. The Lambeth Conference has tarnished it for me, rendered it suspect, untrustworthy. There are no degrees of welcome. Either you are welcome – or you are not.

I am convinced that the religion of the Archbishop of Canterbury and his supporters, the Evangelical Party in the Church of England and churches founded by Evangelicals in the British empire, is incompatible with the religion we have been taught in the American church for many years (I have been an Episcopalian since 1966). Their religion is based on a simpleminded, uncritical, partial and judgemental reading of the Bible. They believe that the Bible is mostly about keeping sexual transgressors (as defined by them) out. The American church teaches us, has dinned into us, that we are not a "Sola Scriptura" church, that the Bible is often abused, as it was when cited to justify slavery in this country, and that our church has the authority to govern itself. The Bible emphasizes social justice, not sexual matters. These beliefs are unusual among American churches. They have attracted lesbians and gay men and other new members to the Episcopal Church.

At announcement time the Presiding Bishop, in a kind example of true hospitality, spoke of the Integrity members wearing pink triangles who had come "up from New York City" for the occasion. While not strictly accurate – not all the Integrity members there were from New York, nor all the New Yorkers Integrity members – this greeting sounded genuine and was deeply appreciated.

After the Eucharist we gathered in a large auditorium for a reception. Champagne flowed freely

Here begins a bleak and terrible period in the history of Anglicanism, trumpeting denial and ignorance of human sexuality and foreshadowing church-sanctioned human-rights abuses against lesbians and gay men, all in the name of the Bible.

religious response

“People of faith have mobilized nationwide to stand for equal treatment of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people. We refuse to be erased from the religious landscape of this country.” – Laura Montgomery-Rutt, National Organizer, Equal Partners in Faith

Over 30 National religious leaders from many faith traditions gathered in Washington, DC on July 23-24, to express their support for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered (GLBT) people in the wake of recent advertisements paid for by the Christian right. The leaders vowed to speak out together from a faith per-

cherishing love and friendship...

and the well-stocked bookstore was open. The Archbishop greeted people and signed copies of his books and Prayer Books. Then he came to the platform and the Senior Warden presented him with \$14,000 from the Sunday plate collection, mentioning also the \$170,000 (described as “the first installment” of an unspecified amount) which he had received at a banquet the night before. An additional \$16,000 was pledged at this reception, bringing the total to \$200,000. This money is apparently intended for special projects for Anglican churches in third-world countries.

During a brief question-and-answer period Phil Nicholson respectfully presented the Archbishop with some stories Integrity members have recently written. He said he would read the stories carefully. He repeated what he has already said in his sermon, that “argument” is not the way to approach lesbian and gay matters. I am puzzled as to whether he meant by “argument” “quarreling” or “reasoned discourse.” Perhaps he meant both.

Did we make a difference? I doubt it. Our number was small. Only about 35-40 wore pink triangles. But we were there.

Afterward I went for a long ride with Phil Nicholson and Hans Franzen through the beautiful green countryside of Connecticut and New York. Late summer wildflowers were in full bloom. We said little. My sense of self felt gradually healed and my sanity restored. The bonds of love and friendship we’ve been able to forge for ourselves in Integrity are worth more than all the church pronouncements in the world.

Coming home on the Staten Island Ferry, I saw two men embracing and kissing and looking down at the city lights reflected in the dark water. They were speaking softly in Spanish. I was never so glad to get back to New York in my life.

Nick Downen is a member of Integrity/Staten Island and the Book Editor for The Voice of Integrity.

spective to challenge the religious right’s manipulation of religion to promote a political agenda, and to affirm the spirituality and equality of GLBT persons and supporters across our nation.

Integrity’s president, Fred Ellis, called upon the bishops of the Episcopal Church to denounce the recent ads. These ads are not representative of the inclusive love expressed by the risen Christ in the Gospels. Additionally, not representative to

lians in tismal

‘to strive and peace people, spect the

every human being,’” Ellis said.

“There is a growing movement of understanding and affirmation for [GLBT] people of faith across this country. It is a direct response to the basic teachings of our faith communities which call for justice and a proclamation of God’s unconditional love,” said Bob Gibeling, Executive Director of Lutherans Concerned.

“We are here to expose the lie that religious belief and acceptance of [GLBT] human beings created in the image of God stand in contradiction to each other,” said Lee Walzer, Vice President of the World Congress of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Jewish Organizations.

Upcoming plans by members of the Roundtable include a press conference in September 1998 and a prayer breakfast at the Capitol in January 1999. Additional actions and events will be announced in the coming year.

These ads are not representative of the inclusive love expressed by the risen Christ in the Gospels.

of the Church to the recent “These are not representative of the inclusive love expressed by the risen Christ in the Gospels. Additionally, not representative to lians in tismal ‘to strive and peace people, spect the every human being,’” Ellis said. “There is a growing movement of understanding and affirmation for [GLBT] people of faith across this country. It is a direct response to the basic teachings of our faith communities which call for justice and a proclamation of God’s unconditional love,” said Bob Gibeling, Executive Director of Lutherans Concerned. “We are here to expose the lie that religious belief and acceptance of [GLBT] human beings created in the image of God stand in contradiction to each other,” said Lee Walzer, Vice President of the World Congress of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Jewish Organizations. Upcoming plans by members of the Roundtable include a press conference in September 1998 and a prayer breakfast at the Capitol in January 1999. Additional actions and events will be announced in the coming year.

new board elected

The following nominees to the national board of Integrity, Inc. were elected during balloting that took place between May 1–31, 1998. All offices carry two-year terms that commence on October 1, 1998. More than 500 ballots were received and counted by Integrity/Tidewater, the official teller chapter for this election. An installation ceremony will take place in Washington, DC on October 9, 1998, during Integrity/Washington's regularly scheduled worship. The Rt. Rev. Ronald Haines, Bishop of Washington, will preside. All are invited.

The Rev. Michael W. Hopkins, President

Michael is Vicar of St. George's, Glenn Dale, MD. A member of Integrity since 1985, he has been Director of Communications for Integrity, Inc. since 1996. Michael and his partner of six years, John Clinton Bradley, reside in Maryland.

Warren A. Carlson, Treasurer

Warren was a Co-founder of Integrity/Central Florida. He has been Vice President of the Southeast Region since 1994. He is a financial consultant and editor of a national financial magazine. Warren lives in Florida with his partner of 28 years, Timothy Hoppe.

Loudene ('Gil') Grady, Secretary

Gil has been re-elected to a second term as Secretary. Actually, it's a fourth term, if you count her two terms served between 1988–1992. She was also the interim Western Region Vice President in 1994. She is an EFM graduate and a cursillista. Gil and her partner, Dottie Fuller, have given much to Integrity over the years and received the Louie Crew Award in 1996.

The Rev. Ted Blumenstein, Midwest Regional Vice President

Ted will begin his second term as Midwest VP. He is a retired priest in the Diocese of Southern Ohio. He serves as Chaplain for Hospice of Columbus, is president of Fifty Plus, and serves on the Speakers Bureau of the Stonewall Community Center. Ted is an organizational development consultant, helping vestries and diocesan units with planning and crisis intervention.

Philip G. E. Nicholson, Northeast Regional Vice President

This will be Phil's third term as Northeast VP. He was a Co-founder of Dignity-Integrity/Mid-Hudson (NY). Phil is retired from IBM and is very involved in his parish and diocese. He and his partner of 10 years, Hans Franzen, run a "pop and pop" business, DATAPHILE, through which they administered our recent "every-member survey."

Dale McNeill, South Central Regional Vice President

Dale has been re-elected to a second term as South Central VP. He is a member of Integrity since 1979 and has been

active in local chapters. He has been successful in implementing regional retreats and meetings. Dale is the manager of the telephone reference section of the Dallas Public Library and is working toward an M.P.A. from the University of North Texas.

John Clinton Bradley, Southeast Regional Vice President

John is newly elected to the national board. John has been very active in Integrity/Washington (DC), most recently as Director of Communications. He is the creator and administrator of Integrity Lightspeed, as well as editor of our unofficial website [<http://members.aol.com/natlinteg/>]. As noted above, John lives with his partner of six years, Michael Hopkins, in Maryland.

Robert Heylman, Western Regional Vice President

Robert has been active in Integrity since 1986. This will be his third term as Western VP. He serves in various capacities at St. Paul's Cathedral in San Diego and has preached at World AIDS Day services in that diocese.

beyond inclusion '99

Beyond Inclusion is an organization which has come powerfully to life in the last two years. God's grace was surely shown in the conference held in Pasadena, CA in April 1997 where 250 people gathered to discuss the theology behind the blessing of same-sex unions and the ordination of gay and lesbian clergy. It was shown during Beyond Inclusion's presence at the 1997 General Convention. And, it reveals itself with our plans for the future.

Beyond Inclusion is for all members of the Episcopal Church. We want to reach out into the straight populations of parishes with the message that full inclusion of gays and lesbians in the life of the Church is not something to be scared of, rather, it is a blessing to parish life. And, that this message is indeed compatible with the Gospel. It is an evangelical message— one that has taken on more urgency than ever, especially following the events in Lambeth.

There has been an overwhelming call for another conference. The Rt. Rev. Cathy Roskam, Suffragan Bishop of New York, has invited us to her diocese, and St. Bartholomew's on Park Avenue has agreed to allow Beyond Inclusion to use St. Bart's for the conference, to be held April 15-18, 1999. Speakers are yet to be confirmed, but it promises to be a moving and notable event. Please watch for more information— and hold these dates on your calendar. — *Rebecca Omahen, Director, Beyond Inclusion*

parallel lives

A Pilgrim's Way, by Walter C. Righter. New York :Alfred A. Knopf, 1998; 168 pages. \$22.00

A Review by Edwin Atlee Garrett III

The Church's one foundation is Jesus Christ her Lord" is a hymn proclaiming the basis of unity for all Christians, written by Samuel J. Stone, Curate at Windsor, and sung with great fervor in the parish where I was baptized, grew up, and was eventually ordained deacon. Bishop Righter, speaking of his wife, says: "Nancy...was blindsided, never having been exposed to the possibility of evil within the church...writ large in the House of Bishops was a horrible shock." Unfortunately, I learned in seminary that others--particularly those with authority--often acted from "foundations" quite apart from Jesus Christ.

Asked by Nick Downen to review this book, I came to the task with at least some knowledge of the so-called "Heresy Trial"; after all, it had been in every newspaper and news magazine. More than that I did not know. I was disturbed by the details provided in *A Pilgrim's Way*.

The story of the second heresy trial in the history of Episcopal Church is superbly told throughout Bishop Righter's excellent book. The question facing anyone reviewing the book is where to begin. Putting other responsibilities aside to sit down and read one evening, with our two Labrador retrievers sprawled on the rug beside me in the family room of our house in the woods on the coast of Maine, having some music come to mind and, without looking at the CD inserted in the player, Benjamin Britten's *War Requiem* was softly heard. My reading was at the point of Bishop Righter's departure from Kanuga Conference Center. This, indeed, was the place to start.

"Even though I had talked to her every evening, I looked forward to getting home to Nancy and our house in the woods, and our golden retriever...This was a good time to be alive." Here were feelings about home we both knew; he was in New Hampshire, I was in Maine. Although I have never met Bishop Righter nor corresponded with him, I sensed a relationship. Indeed, I had contributed to his legal defense fund.

The Britten Requiem, however, was providing the subtle stimulus of music which encouraged the emerging of memories-- memories which found par-

allel in the life of Bishop Righter. Already reading some startling similarities, it seemed a good idea to take the *Clerical Directory* off the bookshelf. He was born a mere four days after my own birth. He was born in a place with ancestral history; so was I. He was a scion of 17th century Germantown (Philadelphia) German/Swiss Pietist stock; so, likewise, am I. He was confirmed by Francis Marion Taitt; so was I. He has childhood memories of Philadelphia gaslights; so do I. His father ran an electric train around the Christmas tree; so did mine. He grew up in, and reflected in his early political views, a conservative Republican heritage; so did I. Starting in college just before Pearl Harbor brought the United States into World War II, he dropped out of college and enlisted in the army when war came; so did I. In so many ways our early life experiences had been similar. His changing views were, therefore, very easy for me to understand; the events which had brought them about were also part of my own lifetime. Could this be why, if I had been in his place, I believe I would in good conscience have been guilty of performing the same "heresy?"

The question immediately arose as to why his accusers could have arrived at such different viewpoints toward the issues of our time. One, I learned, had been a ten-year-old when artilleryman Righter and infantry machine-gunner Garrett were fighting in Europe; some were even younger-- and two had not even been born. Assuredly, their world was a radically different one from ours; never did they witness the hideous consequences of prejudice, sanctified by both Bible and tradition, which denied the basic humanity of those who were different. A biblical literalism, which even contemporaries of our Lord Jesus Christ had long outgrown, enabled basically good people to be manipulated by shrewd schemers with a thirst for power. Fears born out of ignorance found relief through denying humanity to others: Jews, gays and lesbians, political, religious and intellectual leaders of "inferior" people and lifestyles. I feel certain that Sgt. Walter Righter was just as appalled as I by the devastation of lives and heritage surrounding us arising from man's inhumanity to man. I assume he also heard the question "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us" and like Isaiah and countless numbers since answered, "Here am I; send me." If he also was moved to give himself in the hope of banishing such horror, I do not know. If we shared that motivation, how wrong we were! The sin, which appalled us, still hides in

The Rev. Edwin Atlee Garrett III is a retired priest in the Diocese of Maine. His parish is St. Saviour's, Bar Harbor.

human hearts— and is quietly cultivated within the Church itself.

The steps used by a small minority to create the opportunity for thwarting the democratic process of General Convention is traced in *A Pilgrim's Way*. While reading this book I wondered whether “The Accusers” had ever read the Preface in The Book of Common Prayer. Likewise, did the question of Bible-study method come to mind when Bishop Fairfield, one of their number, made an attack on Edmond Browning at the 1997 General Convention. Their confusion about the distinction between doctrine and discipline would imply a lack of acquaintance with church history. “Heresy” has always referred to an understanding or belief (i.e. “Doctrine”) not in accordance with that traditionally held. When then Presiding Bishop Philander Chase (d. 1852) wrote a spirited denunciation of those holding such a radical, unbiblical notion as that God did not intend any human beings to be enslaved by others, was he speaking about doctrine or discipline? Whatever it was, nothing was done about it. The two “heresy” trials in the two-centuries’ history of the Episcopal Church have both been of retired bishops. Perhaps they seem more vulnerable.

The machinations of “The Accusers” seemingly were scarcely commendable. Although at the outset they claimed to have a “superb case” based on “Doctrine” its flaws became evident in the initial hearing at Hartford; they then made an attempt to shift the charge from a matter of “heresy” in “Doctrine” to one of “heresy” in “Discipline.” Challenges were made to the propriety of some judges being bishops who had also knowingly ordained non-celibate gay/lesbian candidates. This manoeuvre was employed without success.

Bishop Righter writes in a preeminently understandable style. What he has written offers details of the very human and painful side of an unnecessary attempt to subvert the decisions of both the General Convention and the House of Bishops. Some of Bp. Righter’s colleagues told him not to take it “personally.” This, however, would be a bit difficult inasmuch as he was personally responsible for all the legal costs arising for his defense; his accusers, on the other hand, had all of their expenses covered out of the financial resources of the National Episcopal Church.

The final chapter of this excellent book is devoted to Bishop Righter’s experiences at the 1997 Philadelphia General Convention. Once again, as a

fellow former-Philadelphian, I had many similar memories of the past when as a General Convention volunteer I was working out on the (former) tracks beyond the rebuilt shed of the Reading Terminal where I had boarded many a train. My position at the Information Booth also afforded a marvelous site from which to evaluate the passing parade—including “The Accusers;” especially, when they were in an “off-guard” mode. No comment will I make beyond that they were interesting— very interesting.

And, then, recognizing him from news photographs, I went up to the delightful man who supposedly was an “abomination” in the minds of the accusers. Pointing out that we had never met, I introduced myself to Barry Stopfel, and then said, “I hope you will not be offended if I, paraphrasing Abraham Lincoln’s words spoken at the White House to Harriet Beecher Stowe, say to you, ‘So you’re the ‘little’ man who started this big war!’” He, who certainly is not “little” in any sense, laughed heartily and introduced me to Will Leckie— two pioneers living and working toward a healthy and vital future for Christ’s One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church!

Bishop Righter is to be commended for a well-written book. He tells it “like it was”— for that and the great good it does for the health of the whole Church, he is to be thanked.

From, *A Pilgrim's Way*

[Scene: the bishop’s meeting at Kanuga. The Accusers are attempting to bargain: withdrawal of the presentment in exchange for a moratorium on gay and lesbian ordinations. Ed.]

The political nature of what was happening was clear. One of the bishops asked Jim Stanton, the Bishop of Dallas, why he had signed the charges against me. He said, “What have I got to lose?” Not exactly a statement of principle. At one of the evening support sessions in Jack McKelvey’s room, we were trying to make sense out of what was happening. Looking at me, Jane Dixon said, “We may have to go to trial, and you may have to say so!” The minute she said that, it made perfect sense. It was the clearest way out of the confusion we were in. We had been seeking a political solution, which is exactly what my accusers wanted us to do, hoping that they could wear us down by threat and by simply saying over and over again what their terms were for withdrawal of the presentment. We needed to couch our replies in principles, not in politics. So I agreed to make my first speech in the House of Bishops in twenty-three years.

who counts? who cares?

by Ann Carlson

This year, Integrity/Tidewater volunteered to be the election ballot counters for the national Integrity elections. As the official “keeper of the mailbox” for the chapter, I set aside a cardboard box to hold the unopened ballots until after the cut-off date. I saw the stack grow from the first handful of envelopes to overflowing with the more than 500 ballots which were finally returned. During the several weeks I watched them accumulate on my desk, I would glance at them and find myself thinking of all the individuals they represented. It may be that, compared to several thousand dues paying members, 500 is a small return. But in my imagination, 500 people who care enough about our Church to be active in Integrity are enough to perform miracles! That box of envelopes seemed to me like the presence of a great unified family, and made me glad.

I was glad, that is, until we began to open them. Most simply voted, which was what we expected. There was one dear person who took the time to write a short note of thanks to Integrity/Tidewater for volunteering. (To that person: A special thanks goes back to you! It’s amazing how knowing that someone cares make hours of counting, and double-checking, and triple-checking, seem worthwhile.) But we got enough angry enclosures, messages and requests to make my vision of a unified family go quickly marching off into the mist. There were 15 specific complaints, some extremely vehement. But those people apparently didn’t care enough to address their complaints where they might make a difference; to the national board or to their regional VP. What did you expect Integrity/Tidewater to do about it? We were also frustrated by the eight requests for us to change address records, check dues status, affect national policy, or to prompt action from the national board. I actually did summarize and send on the complaints and requests, but we were left feeling a little used and abused by the whole experience.

In a similar way, when I joined the Episcopal Church almost a decade ago I was thrilled by the discovery of a place where gay and lesbian Chris-

tians really count. I knew several serving openly in parish and diocesan leadership, and was so impressed that Integrity, Inc. was officially recognized by the national church. The sexuality dialogues convinced me that this Church was unique. I believed that these open discussions were between diverse Christians who were committed to being Church together despite differences. I knew I would see the baptismal covenant lived out in Episcopal congregations, that different views would be welcomed, and that dissent would be respected instead of feared.

My rosy view of the Episcopal Church didn’t last beyond first impressions either. Lately it’s turned black indeed. The recent Lambeth resolution convinced me that there is much of “the Church” that will not rest until they manage to remove us from “their Church” one way or another. My diocese seems to have taken a sharp turn to the right, and in my parish we hear rumors of people thinking we have enough, or even too many, of “those kind of people.”

Lately, all I see is the ones who will stop at nothing to see us gone, or the ones who want to keep us around but only if we remain grateful, compliant and “in our place.” (At our last chapter meeting we read the pastoral letter from the so-called liberal bishops at Lambeth, showing concern for any hurt the Lambeth resolution might have occasioned among gays and lesbians. Some in our chapter were not sure whether this lukewarm mush was from our friends or our enemies!) The truly inclusive, liberating, prophetic voices seem very faint and few.

But even when my pessimistic view is foremost, I know enough to know that both positive and negative views are true. Integrity is a marvelous organization and its members are some of the most wonderful, dedicated people in the world. The Episcopal Church is a beacon, sometimes wavering and sometimes faint, admittedly, but still a beacon. And, as much as I get angry, tell myself that I will leave the Church, want give up on Christianity and spend my time and money elsewhere — I won’t. I will come to terms with this too. After all, I am no more everything I want to be (always right, always smart, always generous, always kind) than are my friends or is my Church. Yet others have, and I hope will continue to come to terms with me.

dixit
Anno

Dr. Ann (“Anno”) Carlson is Convenor of Integrity/Tidewater.

president's column

By the time that you read this, we will be well into October and The Rev. Michael Hopkins will have taken office as your new president. I want to take this opportunity to thank all of you for giving me the privilege of serving you these last four years. Most of all, I want to thank those who have given their time and talents at Lambeth, General Convention, on special projects, and others who have served on the national board during this time. Without them, we would not have enjoyed the success that we have experienced.

As an organization, we face several challenges. Some of these have been before us for a while. Others, although probably there before, have surfaced as a result of Lambeth.

First, we must finally address how we will function as an organization on the national level. This is an issue that your national board has discussed several times over the last five years. You, the members of this organization, must join us in this discussion. Do we continue to operate as a completely volunteer organization, with only one part-time contract employee? Do we, as our sister organizations have done, hire a full time staff person for administrative and management duties? This would free board members, especially the president, to focus on development and working with chapters and individual members. If we choose the latter, it will require a tremendous commitment from the membership, and a complete change in our thoughts on funding. However, recent events and indications of what many of our members expect, say that we must seriously consider this change in our organizational structure.

Second, our membership is aging. We must reach out to young gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered people (GLBT) to show them that there is a place for them in the Episcopal Church. Not an easy task in light of the recent vote on the sexuality issue at Lambeth. Also, something that we, as older GLBT people, have traditionally feared doing. Our Lutheran friends have a very effective outreach ministry through the Lutheran College Ministries. I would commend that to us as one possible way to proceed. Your board would certainly welcome your thoughts and input on this.

Third, over the course of the next two years, we must identify and involve new leaders on the

national level. Especially, we need to involve more women. A significant percentage of our membership are women, and 50% of our volunteers at General Convention in 1997 were women. However, only one of them came forward or was nominated to run for national office. We have many talented people, both women and men, at the local level. We need to encourage them to move up to the next level.

Finally, we must immediately begin preparations for the struggle that we will face at General Convention 2000 in Denver. In light of the decisions at Lambeth, our sisters and brothers on the conservative side of our Church are re-invigorated. There is no doubt that they will make a concerted effort to block any further advances on GLBT issues, and in many cases, will attempt to turn back many of the advances for which we have fought so hard. We must work, both nationally and on the local level, to ensure that they are not successful.

As you may know, the national by-laws entitle me to continue to serve on the board for two more years as the past president. I am committing myself, and ask all of you to join me, to seeing that we address these issues. With God's guidance and help, we can, and must, continue our witness to the inclusive love of God for all people.

Again, my thanks to all of you for these last four years, and I ask you to join me in the following prayer as we move forward.

"Grant, O God, that your holy and life-giving Spirit may so move every human heart that barriers which divide us may crumble, suspicions disappear, and hatreds cease; that our divisions being healed, we may live in justice and peace; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

As an organization, we face several challenges. Some of these have been before us for a while. Others, although probably there before, have surfaced as a result of Lambeth.

Fred H. Ellis III

