

From: Christopher Seitz
To: McCall ; BCF3@aol.com ; mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org
Cc: dbm3wla@aol.com ; Ephraim Radner ; Elizabeth and Philip Turner ;
aburton@incarnation.org ; rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org
Sent: Saturday, April 18, 2009 11:00 AM
Subject: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

Dear Mark, with +SC, +W-LA, +CFL, et al

I am sorry to have missed you before you needed to get away. It was a real pleasure and privilege to meet and to have you present at the Houston event. I look forward to more common labor and fellowship.

Several things.

1. You indicated the desirability of editing the document in two ways, a) eliminating the statement about the signing of covenant (so +Love), and also the inclusion of the +RDW statement re: dioceses (to +CFL).
2. once done, could you send this to +MacPherson and +Howe and let them seek signers, a group we assume includes, minimally: +CFL, +W-LA, +Dallas, +SC, +Springfield, +W-KS, +RG, +Albany, +Hathaway, and perhaps +TN (Philip will call +TN on Monday). Ten is fine. You may know of others. (Would Bishop Tony wish to sign?)

OUR CONCERN IS THAT WE HAVE WAITED LONG ENOUGH. WE NEED THIS OUT ASAP. IT WILL ALSO SIGNAL THAT HOUSTON WAS PRODUCTIVE BEYOND THE OBVIOUS THINGS THOSE WHO ATTENDED KNOW WERE PRODUCTIVE.

3. on another front, we met with +Mark Lawrence and a priest in the diocese of CO at lunch. We are concerned that we have yet to model what we agreed to model as CP.

Here is where I believe things were left. I had to leave to interview Carey. +Mark can confirm.

- 1) The CO priest will request of +SC, as a CP Bishop, a 'visitation', 2) the purpose of which is to prevent his parishioners from concluding that the only route for them is joining ACNA (which will be happening in CO soon) because their Diocesan is not foregrounding his covenant commitments and indeed has ordained an openly homosexual priest, etc, but also has said he means to create space for others' views, etc; 3) +SC will phone +O'Neil and ask that this request be honored and seek to persuade him of its importance, 4) +SC will ask +Salmon to visit, and will indicate to +CO that +Chane is using Salmon in this way in DC.

At issue here is said parish understanding that they have some connective tissue to a covenant their Diocesan may wish to avoid, without challenging the Diocesan as to his authority, and so underscoring a way to remain in TEC and not leave for ACNA but also to affirm Communion life and differentiation.

Importantly, +SC reminded us that he does not want to get into a quid pro quo situation that, having implemented something like this, the PB makes sure he reciprocates when SSBs pass in General Convention and he is forced to let a proponent of the same do a visitation in SC. Hence, using +Salmon.

But also, hence, the importance of the Pastoral Visitors. They need to come into play in time as independent of deal-making and/or mild forms of extortion.

4. at issue here is a) the need to show +RDW and others that CP works at a practical level, and that we have tried, b) that we have not done this by asking something of the PB is is not her

right to give, but have worked bishop to bishop, c) that the PVs can in time occupy the space-- it is hoped--modelled by the CP initiatives in this regard. IMPORTANTLY, the visitation in CO, should it happen, needs to be labelled by all as a CP initiative and not just a single ad hoc thing (as in DC).

5. I am not persuaded there is any value in visiting the PB unless we have gone down this road first. She does not have the authority, and should not be given it, to endorse or be asked to approve of things like this, and we need to avoid giving it to her or continually to reinforce a perception she and her agents are cultivating that she is a metropolitan. Hence, if we were to pay a visit in time, for my part at least, it would be to a) indicate that we believe in the covenant and its ultimate success as a reality, and in b) the PV idea as an extension of CP work, and so how does she view the situation in the light of a) and b) and her public work of litigation and of forcing only two options: leave and join ACNA or buckle under her hierarchy novelty.

CP can show a third way, and ought to do so. Then the choice is hers, and something can be learned from her response to this, say with Jim Baker present, et al.

But I would be loathe to negotiate a single thing with her. The tide, in my view, is not running in her direction, and we must in all things avoid the idea that she is giving gifts or has any to give. Indeed, this is what is at issue in the McCall/ACI work. My instinct--for what it is worth--is to declare victory and work from that premise, and so to put some decent facts on the ground of our own. We have not done that yet and we need to in CO, and then in other places.

The ACI statement with ten or so signatories will signal where our principles in this matter are by what logic we are defending the polity of this Church and so of this Church in Communion.

I thought the conference was a success from the standpoint of Anglicanism--A Gift in Christ.

I hope that +Burundi finds friends in this country.

Yrs warmly in Christ

Chris

PS--please can we pray about what it means for +Tanzania to take a big chunk of money and, effectively, use it to buy an airplane ticket to London to meet with Gafcon. This is despicable and cannot be left without response and of a serious sort.

From: McCall <roundmountain@taconic.net>

To: Christopher Seitz <CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>; BCF3@aol.com;
mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org

Cc: dbm3wla@aol.com; Ephraim Radner <ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>; Elizabeth and Philip Turner <eztpwt3@yahoo.com>; aburton@incarnation.org; rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org

Sent: Sat, 18 Apr 2009 12:26 pm

Subject: Re: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

Dear Chris,

I will revise the document today and send it out as you request. Should I include the names we think we have? Will that encourage others to sign or cause them to think we already have enough?

Philip told me Thursday night that Bishop Wimberly had agreed to sign and had advised Bishop Doyle of this. If this is still the case and with this exception, my tally agrees with yours: eight diocesans: +Tex; +CFL; +W La; +Dallas; +Springfield; +W Ks; +Albany; +SC. Plus, we have or may get Bishops Frey, Hathaway and Salmon. This is good and it would be even better if +Bauerschmidt would sign. I interpreted +Little's comments to indicate that he was in agreement with the principles, but may not see the need to sign on. But perhaps this should be confirmed.

+Lillibridge seems to be in this camp as well. Perhaps one should take no for an answer, but Bishop Lillibridge would be a big plus given his communion work with the WCG. We have in addition to the sheer number signing (10-12) one of the three Senior Bishops who have canonical responsibilities under Title IV (+Wimberly); two others who will become Senior Bishops this year on the retirements of Bps. Wimberly and Lee (+Howe and +Beckwith) and the immediate past President (+MacPherson) of the PB's Council of Advice, which also has canonical responsibilities in addition to an advisory role. This is very significant. If we could also add +Lillibridge, the only TEC member on the six-person WCG, this would really help in magnifying the impact, both in the courts and in the communion. Might +Lillibridge reconsider if it were presented to him in this light? All of you know better than I, but I thought I should raise it.

(By the way, I must figure out a way typographically to get these facts out early in the document. This might wind up as an exhibit in one of the court cases and I want these facts known before the document is ever read. Perhaps a cover page with the title and all the names and a second "about the authors" page with all the names and positions.)

Finally, there were significant developments in the Pittsburgh litigation while we were in Houston. There was a flurry of filings and a ruling yesterday permitting +Buchanan (with Beers as counsel) to intervene. This is merely a procedural ruling. Beers now has to prove what he has alleged (subordination, etc.). As some of you know, I have always regarded this procedural ruling as a foregone conclusion, but +Duncan's counsel opposed it vigorously. I was somewhat concerned that they were wasting credibility with the judge, but they know this better than I. There will still be substantial procedural wrangling in Pittsburgh over the terms of the settlement agreement reached three years ago between +Duncan and Harold Lewis+, so the substantive issues we are concerned with will come up later in Pittsburgh than in San Joaquin. I believe, however, that the failure of the procedural tactic by +Duncan's lawyers means that these substantive issues will eventually be decisive in Pittsburgh. (I have a great deal of respect for +Duncan's current lawyer, John Lewis. He is trying to get out of a deep hole dug by Duncan's former counsel in the disastrous Harold Lewis litigation. Bishop Duncan has been badly served in the past by my profession.)

But back to the draft: I will send it out later without names attached unless I hear otherwise.

It was an honor for me to meet all of you this week. I have the greatest respect and admiration for your work and witness.

Mark

PS

I was about to hit "send" when I saw Bp. MacPherson's email. So we should add +Tenn. and +RI to the diocesans and +Lambert as well. This is great news! I do hope we have Bp. Wimberly for many reasons, including those stated above.

From: McCall <roundmountain@taconic.net>
To: CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca; BCF3@aol.com; mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org; Bishop D. Bruce MacPherson <dbm3wla@aol.com>
Cc: ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca; eztpwt3@yahoo.com; aburton@incarnation.org; rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org; dbme@aol.com
Sent: Sat, 18 Apr 2009 3:00 pm
Subject: Re: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

Dear Bishop MacPherson,

Attached is a revised version of the Bishops' Statement. There are three changes to the text from the previously circulated draft:

1. I have added a paragraph to the bottom of p. 13 with the quote from Dawley to emphasize that this is not a novel interpretation.
2. At the suggestion of Bishop Lillibridge, I have added a paragraph at the beginning of the Covenant section on p. 16 that quotes the Archbishop of Canterbury's very helpful comments in his email to Bishop Howe.
3. I have deleted the sentence at the end of this section as requested by Bishops Love and Smith.

I have added the names that have been given as likely signatories. For reasons stated in my earlier email, I have attempted to list them in order of seniority by date of consecration. If I got this wrong or this violates the customary CP protocol, please let me know and I will change the list accordingly.

Finally, Bishop Frey may not have received a copy of the earlier draft. He asked me to send him one, but I don't have his email. Perhaps someone with this information can ensure that he receives a copy of this version. Bishops Salmon and Hathaway may not have received one either.

Mark

From: dbm3wla@aol.com
Subject: Re: McCall document
Date: April 18, 2009 3:48:06 PM GMT-08:00
To: roundmountain@taconic.net, CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca, BCF3@aol.com, mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org
Cc: ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca, eztpwt3@yahoo.com, aburton@incarnation.org, rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org, dbme@aol.com, dbm3wla@aol.com

Dear Mark,

This will be going out tomorrow upon my return home from Sunday visitation (I am presently on the road). As to the ordering of names, we have traditionally listed them in alphabetical order as this eliminates the curiosity as to why maybe one particular person is listed before another. (You do not have to reorder this for me as I have altered the list in your attachment.) My cover e-mail will embrace the confirmation that you have provided with respect to the changes that were made as a result of our meeting.

For purposes of soliciting as many signatures as possible, I am going to include +Jacobus (he is on board iwth us but not able to make it to Houston), +Lillibridge, +Little, and +Smith. With the inclusion of these, we have a potential of 18 signers.

Lastly, everyone will get a copy of the disseminated e-mail and document along with a request to confirm the inclusion of their name. This will include a request for return by this Tuesday.

In the interim, Easter blessings and much gratitude for all you have done and do.

+Bruce

From: BCF3@aol.com
Date: April 18, 2009 5:06:26 PM GMT-08:00
To: roundmountain@taconic.net, CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca, mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org, Dbm3wla@aol.com
Cc: ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca, eztpwt3@yahoo.com, aburton@incarnation.org, rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org, DBME@aol.com
Subject: Re: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

In a message dated 4/18/2009 4:01:25 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, roundmountain@taconic.net writes:

I have added the names that have been given as likely signatories. For reasons stated in my earlier email, I have attempted to list them in order of seniority by date of consecration. If I got this wrong or this violates the customary CP protocol, please let me know and I will change the list accordingly.

Bruce suggests an alphabetical listing at the end of the paper. I like Mark's suggestion of a list at the beginning with identifying information. I am happy to try to help garner signatories.

From: "rjl" <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>
Date: April 18, 2009 7:19:27 PM GMT-08:00
To: "Bishop D. Bruce MacPherson" <dbm3wla@aol.com>, <roundmountain@taconic.net>, <CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, <BCF3@aol.com>, <mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org>
Cc: <ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, <eztpwt3@yahoo.com>, <aburton@incarnation.org>, <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>, <dbme@aol.com>
Subject: RE: McCall document

Friends...I am sorry to just be responding. Continuing duties here. Bishop, I do wonder if you could invite/recommend Bishop Doyle to join you in signing...He has gone 'on record' as wanting to be a CPBishop...now provides a good opportunity to join his fellow Bishops in a very public way. Chuck, Leigh and I are working on a 'statement' ...careful coordination and timing will be crucial...Russell+

Sent from my AT&T Windows Mobile phone.

From: "rjl" <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>
Date: April 18, 2009 7:26:14 PM GMT-08:00
To: "McCall" <roundmountain@taconic.net>, <CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, <BCF3@aol.com>, <mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org>, "Bishop D. Bruce MacPherson" <dbm3wla@aol.com>
Cc: <ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, <eztpwt3@yahoo.com>, <aburton@incarnation.org>, <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>, <dbme@aol.com>
Subject: RE: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

Would it be helpful....if the CP Rectors added a statement of support? Rjl+

From: "Christopher Seitz" <CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>
Date: April 19, 2009 3:57:27 AM GMT-08:00
To: "rjl" <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>, "McCall" <roundmountain@taconic.net>, <BCF3@aol.com>, <mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org>, "Bishop D. Bruce MacPherson" <dbm3wla@aol.com>
Cc: "Ephraim Radner" <ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, <eztpwt3@yahoo.com>, <aburton@incarnation.org>, <dbme@aol.com>
Subject: RE: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

Russ--by 'support' do you mean, support for the Bishops signing this document to be posted at ACI and used in the Pittsburgh case? Mark McCall can evaluate that better than I, but in terms of sending a message about where the CP Rectors are, this could I think be helpful. It will not go out as a CP Bishops statement, however, but rather as a statement endorsed by individual Bishops, all of whom are of course also CP Bishops.

The other main concern is seeing to a visitation in the name of CP, something now long overdue. We are hoping that Theron Walker requests a CP visitation from +Mark Lawrence, asap, and +Mark will request that +Salmon go in his place, as a CP Visitor. I understand from Philip that +Wimberly has also volunteered his services, as has +Hathaway.

I would request of your advisory group that a series of these visits be planned, asap, and with some sense of organisation, perhaps using these three men. It was usefully pointed out that the places needing support are precisely those where the Bishop is very unclear about his support of Covenant, and so the parishes under him that want this are left to themselves, either to buckle under or leave with the help of AAC/ACNA. In point of fact, this is not really the case in B-ham with Limehouse, as +Mark reminded me. That said, any parish that wants to underscore their commitment to covenant and CP needs a way to show their people that CP is the way to do this.

The negotiating of this takes place between a CP bishop and the respective Diocesan, but the advisory group of CP can start setting the matter in motion. Only in this way will the PV scheme have a proper foundation, and otherwise it may be stalled for a season. We can however show Lambeth that this way forward works, (if it does), and help parishes resist leaving as the only way forward.

From: "McCall" <roundmountain@taconic.net>
Date: April 19, 2009 8:18:05 AM GMT-08:00
To: "Christopher Seitz" <CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, "rjl" <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>, <BCF3@aol.com>, <mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org>, "Bishop D. Bruce MacPherson" <dbm3wla@aol.com>
Cc: "Ephraim Radner" <ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, <eztpwt3@yahoo.com>, <aburton@incarnation.org>, <dbme@aol.com>
Subject: Re: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

Dear Russ+,

I assume you are asking about the desirability of having the statement you are drafting for the CP Rectors endorse the Bishops' Statement on polity rather than trying to garner rector signatures on the Bishops' Statement itself. The latter would probably introduce delays that would not permit the timing of publication now contemplated.

But having an endorsement in your separate statement seems like a very helpful idea to me. As I said in our meeting Wednesday afternoon, there are two purposes to the Bishops' Statement, the first and most important of which is to articulate the canonical and legal basis on which the theological differentiation of the CP fellowship is based. From my perspective, it is very helpful for all CP constituents, bishops and rectors, to endorse these principles.

On the second purpose of the Bishops' Statement--to serve as a resource for the litigation and the expert testimony--the general principle is the more support the better, although on this front, it is the bishops' signatures that matter the most. The only thing that would hurt is a format that implies more signatures should have been attached, e.g., if your statement were open to all rectors but only a handful actually signed on. But if this is something that will go out over the signatures of yourself, Chuck+ and Leigh+ on behalf of all that shouldn't pose a problem.

The only consideration I see for the rectors is that we are endorsing autonomy for liberal bishops as well as CP bishops. But isn't that where we are now anyway? We might as well lay things out plainly and all be on the same page.

We will need of course to get our timing right and make sure the Bishops' Statement is out before the endorsement!

Thank you for your hospitality during our meeting this week and for the opportunity to see your beautiful church.

Mark

From: "rjl" <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>
Date: April 19, 2009 2:33:45 PM GMT-08:00
To: "McCall" <roundmountain@taconic.net>, "Christopher Seitz" <CSeitz@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, "rjl" <rjl@stmartinsepiscopal.org>, <BCF3@aol.com>, <mlawrence@dioceseofsc.org>, "Bishop D. Bruce MacPherson" <dbm3wla@aol.com>
Cc: "Ephraim Radner" <ERadner@wycliffe.utoronto.ca>, <eztpwt3@yahoo.com>, <aburton@incarnation.org>, <dbme@aol.com>
Subject: RE: McCall document--Colorado visitations--visit to PB

Mark...your assumption is correct. CPRectors are preparing (a) a Resolution for GC that we know will not pass...but hopefully be read, (b) a statement on behalf of ALL CPRectors that we hope to get Bishops to sign that endorses the Covenant (release after ACC meeting and then (c) a paper that would endorse the Bishops paper....will keep u in the loop...a few days behind...still hosting the Carey's!! Thanks for your kind words and your hard work...will hope Doyle signs on! RJL+

Sent from my AT&T Windows Mobile phone.