



Report on Sydney Synod - October 2017

The first session of the 51st Synod met for five days - 9-17 October, commencing with a Communion Service in the Cathedral. The Secretariat's comprehensive report of Synod, *Synod Proceedings*, is available:

https://www.sds.asn.au/sites/default/files/2017.SynodProceedings.full.pdf?doc_id=NTUyNzU=

There is the Presidential Address; answers to all formal Questions asked in the House; all Resolutions made; Canons/Ordinances adopted and all relevant papers for items debated. Again, the Secretariat did a magnificent job managing the whole show. The Archbishop, as chair, is gracious, humorous and inclusive. Four topics are highlighted here.

Domestic Abuse Policy

(Paper: p368 of *Synod Proceedings*)

In Synod 2013, a resolution was passed calling for the education of clergy in handling domestic abuse, after a number of harrowing stories. Shockingly, some clergy were counselling partners to stay in the marriage, despite severe abuse. How to reconcile the theology of marriage (for life) with this appalling problem? This draft policy addressed the theological issues as well as providing a practical guide to clergy and parish workers on how to respond. It is a well-researched, sensitive and caring document full of excellent advice.

Resolution (16/17 page 80) requires that the policy be implemented now but also be refined and brought back to Synod for our blessing next year.

Feedback from any interested person is welcome – write to the Standing Committee by 30 April 2018.

Please read the material if you have expertise or experience that could contribute to further refinement.

I spoke at Synod about the problem of the word 'submission' which has been adopted in this Diocese, as part of the Complementarian Theology.

This theology, in summary, is key to keeping women out of priestly leadership roles in the Sydney Anglican Diocese and is also expressed in the "complementary roles of man and wife" – sacrificial leader husband/submissive wife.

I focussed on the incongruity between the excellent policy, which covers both emotional and physical abuse, and the retention of the word 'submission' in the context of marriage. I pointed out that current day definitions of "submission" equate to abuse. I argued that, if one adheres to *complementarianism*, then nevertheless the essence of such a marriage is still 'love', promised before God, one for each other, not control. I drew attention to

the offensiveness of this policy. (Copy of speech below.)

I did not want to derail this critical domestic abuse policy by side tracking debate onto all *complementarian* theology. The policy drafters were very supportive; the Archbishop was very gracious in thanking me for the speech. Contrary to comment in the press, I did not feel ignored. The applause was strong and quite a number of grateful people spoke to me later. I look forward to seeing any developments next Synod.

Synod issued a formal statement of "*Grief and Apology*" in regards to domestic abuse and how it has been handled in the past. (Resolution 17/17 (page 80).

Gender Identity: Initial Principles of Engagement
(Paper: p173 of *Synod Proceedings*)

A lengthy report on **Gender Identity** was brought to Synod, and concluded with a recommendation advising church workers on how to respond pastorally in this complex area, taking into account Scriptural teachings, medical and legal considerations. This advice is the "Initial (first cut, in a sense) Principles of Engagement". One may strongly disagree (as I do) with the theological interpretation which, in blunt summary, is that deviations from the male/female God given norm are the result of 'The Fall' and only male/female sexual relationships or celibacy are the appropriate Christian road.

But the Diocese has moved a long way in recent times; the reality of gender issues, which can be so painful, is no longer denied. The paper is well grounded in medical science, sweeping in its coverage, and highlights especially the distress caused by gender dysphoria which is fully acknowledged (ie “*distress associated with having a psychological or emotional gender identity that does not match a person’s biological sex*” p215).

During the debate on the Principles, the drafters advised they have been challenged by the category of Intersex, on which they need to do more work. Intersex refers to people who are born with any of several variations in sex characteristics including chromosomes, gonads, sex hormones, or genitals that, according to the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, “*do not fit the typical definitions for male or female bodies*”. One can see the difficulty the drafters have - how does their theological stance deal with the reality of Intersex people?

A truly enlightened moment occurred especially in the context of where this Diocese has come from. An amendment to the Principles was put forward in debate which declared, in summary, that ‘transitioning’ (changing your biological sex to accord with your internal sense of identity) is a sin. Two speakers, one being the *Reverend Andrew Katay*, stated this was a very dangerous proposition. What right do we have to declare a matter a sin when there is no such scriptural basis? *Dr Mark Thompson* (Principal of Moore College) spoke to the contrary but he failed to convince the majority of this normally highly conservative Synod. The amendment was voted down.

A revised set of Principles will come to next Synod and all

Anglican agencies, including our schools, which work with people with gender identity issues, are invited to provide comment to Standing Committee by 30 April 2018.

A motion that, in summary, offered an apology to all LGBTIQI people, for past treatment of, and attitudes to, by the church and some church workers, was withdrawn on the last day as the movers acknowledged they had received feedback that some of its wording could still offend. This motion was well-intended and it will be brought back to next Synod.

Same Sex Marriage
(report: p310 of *Synod Proceedings*)

As you will know, Synod was presented with a *fait accompli*. The Standing Committee, before Synod met, voted to provide \$1m from the Diocesan Endowment (money inherited by the Diocese from past generations) to support the media campaign by *The Coalition for Marriage* for the ‘no’ vote on same sex marriage.

In Synod there were two failed attempts to have this matter debated. *Archdeacon Deryck Howell* moved that (in summary) Standing Committee be directed to bring an Ordinance to next Synod which would require Standing Committee to obtain Synod approval, in future, to any proposals for special drawdowns on the Diocesan Endowment, other than for asset acquisition purposes, using, eg, electronic voting between sessions. There was no debate as a motion from the floor that ‘the (above) motion not be put’ received majority assent, immediately stifling the matter.

The second motion from *Professor Bernard Stewart*, St Georges’ Paddington, sought Synod’s endorsement of the \$1m decision by Standing Committee, to be resolved via a secret ballot.

A clever move as a secret ballot achieves two things; no

pressure from expectations of others around you; and an actual tally of the vote. *Professor Stewart* effectively reprimanded Standing Committee for not having brought this motion to Synod themselves. “*They should have sought our endorsement*” he said. “*It is not right that Synod members might return to their parishes without having had the opportunity to express their minds on the matter of the \$1m.*” **A further motion from the floor that *Professor Stewart’s* motion ‘not be put’ was carried on voices.**

Stifled from the floor again.

Proposal for a Property Receipts Levy (ps.342, 364 of *Synod Proceedings*)

For the fourth year in a row, Synod was presented with another version of a draft policy which aims to raise more money from parishes where they have ‘*excess wealth*’ from income from ‘*property*’, now defined as ‘*net*’ income from buildings and land (leases, licenses and/or sales), income from investments and income from businesses run by a parish.

“This started back in 2012/13 when Standing Committee asked work be done to get a more transparent and equitable approach to requiring parishes - with significant sales or leases of property and land - to contribute to the Diocesan funds or organisations. The current system is that each parish negotiates an Ordinance (a binding legal contract) with Standing Committee for this purpose. These Ordinances are not based on any agreed guidelines or standards and so significant variations between parishes exist, and there is no confidence that these variations are fair or reasonable.

Biblical principles (St Paul) of sharing one’s wealth have justified the growth of this draft proposal to all income sources

described above. It is regrettable that St Paul did not have the foresight to define what might be 'net' income; he did say a community should not be "left hard pressed" as a result of sharing. Net receipts of less than \$120,000 have been exempted; as one speaker highlighted, here comes the 'creative accounting....'

There were strong views from affected parishes about the lack of reasonableness in restricting very tightly what might be allowable deductions before 'net' or 'excess' is defined.

Many questions were asked: eg: why not allow deductions for sinking funds, including for all parish buildings not just the one for which income is received; why exclude expenditure on ministries; the injustice of the excuse of ease of administration (for the Diocese) to limit allowable deductions; and the accounting complexity for local treasurers (volunteers) in arriving at 'net' figures.

This draft has been further complicated as it advises that those parishes with Ordinances may choose to stay with that approach, if the draft policy is problematic for them. Yet the policy was meant to be a replacement?

In answer to Question 10 (page 19) the Secretariat revealed that it is unable to supply a list of parishes which currently have Ordinances and how much is therefore raised by these, and for which funds/organisations. This goes to the problem that Synod has never been given a business case for the need for the extra funds to be raised – we don't even have a handle on the income from the current system we are *meant* to be replacing.

James Balfour, Representative from parish of St James' Church Sydney, sought leave of the House to put an alternative proposal to Synod, before this draft policy was debated. His

alternative was to scrub the proposal, with all its complexities and inequities, and raise additional funds via a '**parish cost recovery' method** – this is a well-worn, simple-to-administer path in this Diocese, equitable in its approach. Synod did not grant him leave to debate an alternative.

Clearly the drafters and Standing Committee are tired of the matter remaining unresolved and proposed that, after debate in Synod, Standing Committee would finalise an Ordinance on the matter, for implementation in 2018.

An amendment, which would have required the draft Ordinance to be brought to Synod next year, on the grounds that Synod must not abrogate to Standing Committee its responsibility on a matter, so fundamentally affecting parishes, was lost.

The time normally allowed for debate was severely curtailed. A number of frustrated parish representatives were unable to speak, including my colleague from CCSL who had researched relevant papers and was ready to highlight that, while this was notionally about wealthy parishes helping others, he had found evidence of four or five extremely wealthy parishes which will be completely untouched by the policy. Why? But debate on the whole proposal was halted as it was late in the evening.

The motion was passed.

See Resolution 34/17, (p 36.)

Synod further resolved (42/17, page 89) that the money raised will go to the Mission Property Committee for expenditure on some unspecified property developments.

One courageous gentleman did get to express doubt about the need to increase our capital base in the face of declining church attendance.

Lyn Bannerman,

Lay Representative for CCSL

***FOLLOWING THE
ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE
RESULT OF THE POSTAL
SURVEY ON SAME SEX
MARRIAGE,***

***Archbishop Glen Davies
commented on the Sydney
Anglican Website (15 November)***

"The Chief Statistician reported the participation rate of nigh on 80 percent of the voting public of Australia and of course the results were a clear mandate for the YES campaign with just over 60 percent voting YES and just under 40 percent voting No.

But that, of course, means that Australia is going to move towards same-sex marriage and as citizens in a democracy, we accept the decision of the Parliament on the basis of the vote of Australians.

Although this won't prevent me from continuing to teach that marriage, in God's good design, is between a man and a woman - an exclusive and permanent union.

Yet, the Parliament needs to recognise that more than 1 in 3 Australians are opposed to this change. Therefore, protecting individual freedoms - freedom of speech, freedom of conscience and freedom of faith - need to be balanced with the move to address same-sex marriage..

We as Christians will continue to be strong in our belief of what God has given to us in His word. Our schools, our churches, our organisations will continue to reflect God's love in a world of diverse opinions - holding firm to what God has taught us in His word but generously, compassionately and graciously engaging with Australia where matters are in dispute. Where people consider God's word is not the authority, we must continue to witness to that authority in the way in which Jesus would do so - with love and grace but firmness and boldness and confidence in God's word for Australia today."

Implementation of Domestic Abuse Policy

Speech to Sydney Synod

by Lyn Bannerman, Lay representative, Christ Church St Laurence, Sydney

Thank you **Canon Grant** and **Archdeacon Hartley** for all this hard work. I **am** supporting this implementation motion. But there is a serious implementation matter that goes to the acceptance of our sincerity by the broader community, and within our Church.

One word gets in the way of our credibility. "Submit". And, **no**, I am not here to debate Complementarianism although I do not agree with that the theology. I am NOT arguing about that. It is the **one** word "submit" that lands us into trouble, making us fair game in the media. Stop blaming the media – examine ourselves.

I have studied complementarian theology. It seems to me that the pivotal point in the relationship between husband and wife in this theology is "love". Working out the complementary relationships, blessed by mutual love. The Archbishop's introduction to this Policy is beautifully worded. Love. No mention of "submit". He says that "misuse of power to control or exploit others" is to be condemned. **Bishop Robert Forsyth**, in his wisdom, when he brought to Synod the book: "Common Prayer: Resources for Gospel – shaped Gatherings", included two marriage services; one does not use the word submit. Synod accepted both forms. I take this to mean that Synod, within our framework of complementarianism, accepts that the promises of love, before God, are sufficient. In the light of this domestic abuse policy, I contend the version containing "Submit" is now an inappropriate option.

Indeed this policy includes a warning to clergy at page 477 on Marriage Preparation. It reads "**Care must be taken** if the

biblical themes of a wife's submission" Some real reservations are coming through? – excellent.

I personally know a few lovely intelligent young women, confirmed in the Anglican Church, who are sadly alienated from our Church because of one too many "submission" sermons at friends' weddings, including on one occasion, the words "I submit" being engraved in the bride's wedding band. We have lost them – to our Anglican Church; angry, deeply offended. We agreed, with sadness, yesterday that some people, abused in the Church, when children, are angry with God. But we know God is not angry with them, as He is all loving. So God also loves these beautiful young women whose warm hearts we have abused so harshly. They are not abandoned by our God.

"Submit", whatever it meant once, now means, according to the Cambridge English dictionary, to "allow another person or group to **have power or authority over you, or to accept something unwillingly.**" Put that beside the definitions of "emotional abuse" and you have complete incongruence. We cannot assert with any credibility that we oppose all forms of abuse, including emotional, and continue to use that word "submit". Ask anyone in the street what submitting means and the answers are ugly - emotional and physical. I am no linguist but I know enough that words change their meanings over time. The current meaning relates to behaviour that this policy rejects completely. But we continue to assert "submit" is a Biblical truth for marriage? Something has to give and if we want to be credible,

then on which one will we give? Abandon this policy or abandon that one word? Let's delete the words "submission"/"submit" from all Diocesan language, and our documents, relating to marriage.

Can I suggest that we re-read the Gospels, in those parts where our Lord interacted with the Pharisees? Ponder our Lord's sayings and attitudes in those readings. What might our Lord be saying to us, modern day Pharisees, on this?

I ask all Synod members who share this concern to write to Standing Committee before 30 April next year, expressing your concerns, in your own words, and telling stories you may have about the damage this one word has done in the lives of others and its incongruity with this policy.



The former Archbishop of Canterbury, **Rowan Williams**,

has urged faith-leaders across the world to identify with **the global campaign against gender-based violence (GBV)**

Bishop Rowan, Chair of Christian Aid, Britain's ecumenical aid-agency, said that faith leaders can still play a crucial role in many of the contexts where GBV is a challenge. He urged them to make a personal pledge to identify with '**the 16-Days of Activism Against Gender Based Violence**', which began on **25 November, International Women's Day**; and concludes on **10 December – Human Rights Day**.

<http://www.anglicannews.org/news>

'ORA ET LABORA'

Greetings in Christ

'The Church, Politics, War and Peace'



As is the case with all groups in a democracy, the church has a responsibility to participate and contribute to the ordering of society, but how should it do this?

Should it restrict itself to the provision of education, welfare and worship, or might it have something to say about governance and strategic policies in the world - including politics, economics and the exercise of power? To answer these questions, it may be helpful to explore a little history and political theory.

Power, Ideology and World Order

The term *Realpolitik* comes from nineteenth century Germany and refers to political actions based on the practical exercise of power, rather than ideology or morality. Such 'realism' argues that there is no reality outside what is material and that the rightness of a cause is to be determined by its 'success' rather than by any sense of morality or value judgement. It is therefore an 'amoral' political approach, principally concerned with the achievement of outcomes based on a sovereign nation's wishes. Negatively, this approach drove both *Otto von Bismarck* and *Adolf Hitler* in their desires for control of Europe over two world wars – although their 'outcomes' may not be considered a success.

In contrast, are several theories attached to *Political Idealism*. Idealism argues that reality is a human construct and therefore not material. It proposes that ideas have the

capacity to define, shape and direct a society and that the activities of the mind (including beliefs, values and morality) are the basis of reality. As a political manifestation, idealism argues that the state should pursue policies both internally and externally that lead to the enhancement of the human condition.

If, for example, there is a desire for peace within a nation then such a desire should be pursued internationally also. Political Idealism, however, has also had its failures, of which the incapacity to prevent two world wars is an example.

The political processes of the state tend to work themselves out between the extremes of the materialist and idealist perspectives of the world, and both perspectives are present in Australian political debate today – especially in the areas of defence and border protection, welfare and international aid, foreign affairs and trade.

Furthermore, modern western democracies have developed ways to manage the potential destructiveness that comes from the coupling of amorality with the raw exercise of power. This is normally achieved through 'checks and balances' that separate the activities of the executive (cabinet and public service), the legislature (the parliament) and the judiciary (the courts).

Well, that is how the theory goes, but the employment of propaganda, 'fake news' and

'spin', along with the existence of an apathetic or ignorant electorate may not necessarily lead to the level of accountability that the theory promotes. People need to be informed and discerning for the system to work.

Christians are called to be good citizens and participate in the life of the community (Romans 13) – which includes the business of government and political debate. Our goal is to be a means for the salvation of human society; bringing goodness, reconciliation and justice. We therefore have a responsibility to contribute to the processes that govern society and, by this, seek the common good. Individually, we might not all agree, yet we need to participate.

History demonstrates that the processes of social cohesion, the exercise of power, the maintenance of peace, and the implementation of change are not simple. Some examples are explored below.

The Treaty of Westphalia (1648)

Europe spent much of the first half of the seventeenth century in the midst of what came to be known as the 'Thirty Years War', also known as the *European Religious Wars*. It was one of the most destructive conflicts in European history in which around 30% of the population died - mostly in the German states. This is just one of the dark sides of what was brought about by the Reformation.

It was a time of 'regime change', during which the full

social impact of the combination of the Reformation and rising Nationalism was experienced through a series of wars fought over the issues of religious allegiance, political power

The outcomes of this conflict were widespread and indiscriminate killing of both military and civilian personnel, starvation and economic impoverishment, the destruction of infrastructure and the environment, and a total breakdown in law and order.

It may well have resonance with some parts of our world today.

An accord was signed in 1648, which came to be known as the **Treaty of Westphalia**. At the time, this document was not seen to be very important; nevertheless, it established principles for the conduct of warfare and the achievement of peace - some of which continue with us to this day.

Indeed, it is a foundational document for the twentieth century creations of both **the League of Nations** and **United Nations**.

An interesting aspect of the **Treaty of Westphalia** is the goal of 'mutual prosperity between states'. This goal encourages an attitude that is desirous of peace, justice, prosperity, and friendship between nations. A similar concept is proposed by the early nineteenth century American President, **John Quincy Adams**, who argued that the United States 'must work toward fostering a community of principle among the nations of the world'.

The **Treaty of Westphalia** also carried within it the concept of eternal peace and the setting aside of past conflicts. It therefore proposed a process of political reconciliation. This stands in contrast with many other treaties (such as that made at **Versailles** at the end of the First World War), which are more

concerned with restitution and revenge rather than reconciliation. **Versailles**, of course, laid the foundation for the Second World War, rather than any lasting peace.

Reconciliation needs to be our goal, rather than revenge or power. As the history of conflict has demonstrated, peace and stability are delicate things that can be too easily broken and destroyed. In the modern era, trust and dialogue, along with the rule of law, has been our protection against international conflict. Even **Aristotle** recognised this when he wrote: "*It is more difficult to organise peace than to win a war. But the fruits of victory in war will be lost if the peace is not well organised.*"

The United Nations (1945)

A great effort is often made after major conflicts to establish systems by which nations seek to minimise the rush to war again. As with the **Treaty of Westphalia** and **the League of Nations**, **the United Nations** was established after World War II as a way of encouraging international peace and stability. Its mission is to maintain world peace, develop good relations between countries, promote cooperation in solving the world's problems, and encourage respect for human rights.

The UN brings together countries that are rich and poor, large and small and of differing religious, social and political systems. Member nations pledge to settle their disputes peacefully, to refrain from using force (or threats of force) against other countries, and to refuse help to any country that opposes UN actions. The integrity of the UN is being challenged today, yet there are some other principles that help to guide us.

The Rule of Law

For the most part, it is through the UN that we apply the rule of

international law today. It is also widely recognised that without the rule of law there can be no justice within our modern political systems. It was for this reason that many international jurists expressed grave reservations over the legality of the United States led war against Iraq in 2003. If there is no law, then there can be no justice and therefore no peace.

Just War Theory

The Just War Theory is an ancient Christian principle (originally developed by **Augustine of Hippo** and **Thomas Aquinas**) that gives guidance on when Christian nations may go to war. It is not a doctrine of faith, and is not accepted by all. Among other things, it requires that any war must:

- be declared by a legitimate authority,
- have a just cause,
- use reasonable force,
- have a reasonable outcome, and
- only be used after all other avenues for a peaceful resolution have been explored.

Since the mid-twentieth century, it has been usual practice to have the United Nations legitimise the involvement of democratic nations in warlike and peace-making operations beyond their own borders.

Sovereignty

It may be argued that the optimism of the **Enlightenment** was destroyed by the devastating outcomes of the First and Second World Wars. Yet, these were the actions of sovereign states operating under the 'rule of law' and all arguing for the rightness of their cause. It is clear that the maintenance of peace and justice with compassion is not an easy thing. Nevertheless, we are now witnessing some challenges to the concept of national sovereignty arising from both economic globalisation and the rise of global terrorism.

Moreover, large corporations now have greater economic power than many smaller nations, and have the capacity to operate beyond the controls of many national governments. Likewise, they also have the power to influence the policies of larger nations even to their detriment, yet they are not accountable to the electorate. The rise of international terrorism has also challenged sovereignty because of the capacity of these groups to create conflict across national boundaries and beyond the constraints of national security forces.

Post-modernism

The term *post-modernism* describes the current philosophical impasse of the western world. It is a reaction to the dominance of *modernism* (or the *spirit of the Enlightenment*) and has its philosophical roots in the nihilism of *Sartre* and *Nietzsche*, the psychology of *Freud*, and the politics of *Marx*.

For the most part, *post-modernism* has been a social critique that challenges generally accepted propositions of truth and knowledge and suggests a philosophical relativism in response. It is also sceptical of those institutions that make claims of possessing absolute truth and ‘special knowledge’ – especially those that claim to have a superior ethos and values. This critique clearly includes religion and the humanities, but has also extended to the sciences!

Post-modernism embraces social fragmentation and sits comfortably with a multiplicity of ‘perspectives’ that provide an understanding of the nature of the world and its operation. It allows for the existence of many ‘goods’ rather than ‘one greater good’ and is highly focused on the needs of the ‘self’. It is therefore likely that people in a post-modern world are not going to be bound to modern institutions, or their

beliefs and values. Indeed, there is a greater concern for short-term goals, rewards and opportunities. This is more expressive of the ‘new world order’ in which we live, at least until a new dominant paradigm arises.

A New Covenant

Where does this lead us? The good thing about history is that it often provides an insight into our contemporary yearnings. As the ancient prophet, *Jeremiah* wrote:

“The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt--a covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. No longer shall they teach one another, or say to each other, "Know the Lord," for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sin no more.” (Jeremiah 31:31-34)

The Christian perspective is that a ‘new world order’ already exists. The ‘new covenant’ is one of peace and justice focussed on God. Regime change for the Christian is about bringing in the ‘kingdom of God’, which is God’s rule on earth - ‘*as it is in heaven*’.

The symbol of this kingdom is the cross, which carries with it the ethos of self-sacrifice and unconditional love. It is not about having power and control over people, neither is it about exacting revenge or retaliation toward those who have wronged us, nor is it about persecuting or abusing the poor, weak or marginalised.

It is therefore through grace that God changes the world. This love goes on loving even when we are not loved in return. In worship, we recognise God’s love for humanity in that he was willing to die for it, and we are challenged to do likewise. It is for this reason that the ordering of society is of interest to the Christian, but it should not arise out of the exercise of *realpolitik* or a desire to dominate.

The Reverend Andrew Sempell
Rector, St James’, King St. Sydney

LOVE

Love bade me welcome: yet my soul
drew back,
Guilty of dust and sin.
But quick-eyed Love, observing me
grow slack
From my first entrance in,
Drew nearer to me, sweetly
questioning,
If I lacked anything.
‘A guest’, I answered, ‘worthy to be
here:’
Love said, ‘You shall be he.’
‘I the unkind, ungrateful? Ah my
dear,
I cannot look on thee.’
Love took my hand, and smiling did
reply,
‘Who made the eyes but I?’
‘Truth, Lord, but I have marred
them: let my shame
Go where it doth deserve.’
‘And know you not’, says Love,
‘who bore the blame?’
‘My dear, then I will serve.’
‘You must sit down’, says Love, ‘and
taste my meat.’
So I did sit and eat.

George Herbert

ANGLICANS TOGETHER NEWSLETTER

published by “Anglicans Together”
Opinions expressed are those of the
contributors

Email: mjholle@bigpond.com

THE HISTORIC CHURCH OF ST PAUL'S BURWOOD HAS HAD TO BUILD 'A SHED' IN THE RECTORY GROUNDS

The St Paul's Parish Pantry started some 6 to 7 years ago because there were people knocking on the Parish door asking for help!

At that time there were just a few tins of food (left over from the old 'tin bin' days) on a little 3 shelved book case. However parishioners began to bring more food and another bookcase was added and then another until every square inch of the Parish Office was used with the donated food.



The need has kept growing. The Rector and the parish office staff have had to limit the days and hours that people can come, otherwise nothing else would be done in the office.

In the latter part of 2017 it was time to expand. With the help of a State Government Community Building Partnership

Grant, the Parish has erected 'the Shed' in the Rectory grounds, together with an awning for shelter for those who come.

This will become the new 'PARISH PANTRY'. It will enable the Pantry to be open more often.

The plan in the new year is for the Pantry to branch out into fresh fruit and vegetables, which is not currently possible.

The new 'Shed' site is not close to the parish office, so it will be staffed by the parish volunteers. It is hoped the Pantry can be opened more frequently and for longer hours.

Who are the people the Pantry serves?

The Rector, Fr James Collins listed the wide range of people who come needing and asking for food. - They are those sleeping rough; the homeless, ie those sleeping in garages and those couch surfing; the mentally challenged; single parents (both men and women) with children - some very young children; those in boarding houses; those out of work, or on limited contract or casual work or those retrenched looking for work. There are the refugees and migrants - often without assistance or knowledge of how to access resources; the

elderly, who have difficulty managing on an age pension; those just released from prison or mental health wards who are given little to re-establish themselves in the community.

Fr James said "The need has kept growing and we won't turn people away if we can find a way to help them." "For a long time we kept the Pantry going without any help other than from our parishioners. Then the Mayor Cr. John Faker made the Pantry the recipient of the Mayor's Christmas Appeal. Then the next year, Anglicare started to contribute, as did local business men. Chalmer's Rd Special School and the Burwood Baptist Community Church and the Brighton Retirement Village, Croydon have also got on board."

"Our clientele is changing. We still have our regular street people but we have an ever increasing number of people who can manage to pay rent for a room in a boarding house but by the time bills are paid there is little left for food."

"The way forward is to build 'the Shed' and stock it and then for volunteers to open it as often as possible."

ANGLICANS TOGETHER INC. MEMBERSHIP 2017-2018

Membership Form to: THE TREASURER, 7 Cheddar Street, Blakehurst, NSW 2221

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

HOME PHONE: _____ MOBILE: _____

EMAIL: _____ PARISH: (Diocese, if not Sydney) _____ Member of Synod: Yes/No

SUBSCRIPTION FOR JUNE 2017-JULY 2018 : \$30.

METHOD OF PAYMENT:

Cheque to Anglicans Together Inc OR. Direct deposit to account. CBA Enmore BSB 062165 Act 1012 3708 - including name
NB Enclose receipt of deposit or confirmation number _____ Tick if our receipt required _____

“It’s Time to Say Sorry”

The Reverend Dr Keith Mascord

Author of *‘Faith without Fear: risky choices facing contemporary Christians’*

Originally published in SMH, 8 NOVEMBER 2017

As the votes are counted in the Postal Survey on Same Sex Marriage, it’s time to reflect a little on the experience of the last few months.

As a deeply committed older Christian, I’ve been dismayed by the contributions of Australian churches to the acrimonious and damaging debate which has been imposed upon us, and particularly by those who have joined the Coalition for Marriage.

I’ve been dismayed, first, because Australian churches have been callous and un-Christ-like in their support for an extended public campaign, which they surely knew was certain to cause widespread distress and suffering to some of Australia’s most vulnerable citizens.

I’ve been dismayed, second, by the essentially dishonest, fear-driven and fear-creating nature of the campaign churches have signed up to, and put big money towards.

The Coalition for Marriage campaign is pervasively dishonest. It is dishonest in not being up-front about the foundational reason conservative Christians are implacably opposed to marriage equality, and that is their belief that any and all sexual relationships outside of heterosexual marriage are immoral and defective.

The campaign is dishonest in trying to scare people into thinking that society will unravel if marriage is extended to include LGBTI+ Australians. Scare-mongering, by its very nature, is dishonest, because it plays to people’s fears, and doesn’t require evidence. It is often best without evidence, except for cherry-picked and easily discredited examples from overseas, which, even when

proved accurate, mostly amount to fundamentalist Christians resisting scientific and societal consensus, doggedly insisting on their right to discriminate and exclude.

The Coalition for Marriage’s NO campaign has been dishonest in arguing that children will become the innocent victims of a YES outcome. The strategy is dishonest because all available evidence suggests that children brought up by same-sex couples do equally well as those brought up by opposite sex couples, with ideological talk about the need for gender complementarity failing the test of peer-reviewed scientific research. The children do well and they are sure to do even better when their parents are given the societal honour and recognition of marriage.

I am dismayed, third, because those churches who have joined the Coalition for Marriage appear oblivious to how morally compromised they have become. They are morally compromised for claiming that they alone speak for God. Church history is littered with examples of similar bogus claims, about the age and shape of the earth, about slavery, interracial marriage and women’s rights.

Christian churches are morally compromised when they interpret the Bible in such a way as to cause preventable suffering to those *Jesus* described as his *‘little ones’* – the weak, the defenceless; the marginalised. They are already compromised for almost 2,000 years of abusive interpretation, described by one of America’s leading Christian ethicists as *‘teachings of contempt’* directed at those who are sexuality and gender diverse.

Is there some light in this dark account? There is. Even amongst those who voted NO in the postal survey, there has been widespread disappointment with how the NO campaign has been waged, and with the out-of-touch leadership of their churches. An *Australian Christians for Marriage Equality* campaign has been waged, not quite so loudly or well-funded, but with wonderful support. A new grass-roots movement called *Equal Voices* has drawn Christians from around the nation to encourage straight allies to support their even braver LGBTI+ fellow Christians, one of whom, a young daughter of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, penned these words of defiance:

“We are not the monsters you make us out to be, however much you may shout it from street corners. We aren’t deviant or degenerate. We aren’t child abusers. We don’t need to be healed or brutally driven into an image of cisgender heterosexuality. What we need is for you to listen to our voices and see us for who we are. We are every sexuality, romantic orientation and gender under the sun. We have intersex variations. And, above all of this, we are human.”

The best thing to have emerged from this awful process is that Christians have come to realize, how urgent is our need to say sorry, and to embark on what will be a long and painful process of reconciliation. To that end, all Christians are invited to add their names to a National Apology to LGBTI+ fellow Australians. <https://equalvoices.org.au/apologise/> **This includes a commitment to reconciliation.**



A spontaneous decision found us at Westminster Abbey just in time for Evensong on Thursday 13 October.

We four - your correspondent, husband, daughter and granddaughter - arrived in time for a treat beyond our expectation. We were participating in the **First Evensong of the Translation of Edward the Confessor**. It was seven hundred and forty years to the day that the remains of St Edward, King and Confessor were moved into a new shrine behind the high altar of the Abbey Church.

To the great joy of our mixed Anglican/Roman family, the Service Booklet explained that Evensong would be sung jointly by 'the Choirs of Westminster Cathedral and Westminster Abbey'.

(From 1650 daily prayer in the Abbey continued in the form of the two offices of Matins and Evensong while, since 1903 in Westminster Cathedral - Roman, Vespers had been sung daily.)

'Tonight's Service... is a celebration of our common

The Octave of the Translation of St Edward the Confessor*

heritage which stretches back to and beyond St Edward, whose example and devotion is commemorated with joy by both our churches. Here, at the Shrine of St Edward, we pray for the gift of unity which is Christ's own divine will'.

The choirs filled the Abbey with joyful praise; the first lesson (Eccl. 2:7-18); was read by **the Reverend David Stanton**, Canon in Residence at the Abbey and the



second by **Canon Christopher Tuckwell**, Administrator, Westminster Cathedral. During the Anthem, the Dean of Westminster and the Administrator of Westminster Cathedral censed the Shrine of St Edward the Confessor.

In a sermon preached by the Dean of Westminster the **Very Reverend Dr John Hall**, at an earlier service, he had said "The shrine is a powerful place of prayer and reconciliation, drawing divided people together".**

We took our leave through the 'West' door through a corridor of all the participating clergy from Abbey and Cathedral who were happy to talk. **Imagine our surprise when we were greeted by a female voice with an Australian accent - Minor Canon, the Reverend Jenny Petersen who trained at Moore College!**

We left with the Dean's words ringing in our minds **'we pray for the gift of unity which is Christ's own divine will'**.

*During Edward's life of St Edward the Confessor, King of England 1042-1066, the re-founder of Westminster Abbey is celebrated. Canonised in 1161, to this day pilgrims come to pray at his shrine.

Susan Hooke

Parishioner, St Peter's, Cremorne

**<http://www.westminster-abbey.org/worship/sermons/2009/october/sermon-on-the-feast-of-the-translation-of-st-edward-the-confessor>

FROM MOORE COLLEGE TO WESTMINSTER ABBEY - JOURNEY OF A FEMALE PRIEST -

Minor Canon the Reverend Jennifer Petersen

The Reverend Jenny Petersen joined Westminster Abbey as Minor Canon and Chaplain in March 2017.

Following her meeting **with Canon Jenny Petersen**, Susan wrote to Jenny asking if she would give details of her journey. The following is her reply:



"It was lovely to meet you after Evensong last week. Yes, I know of **Anglicans Together** and have followed your website online with great interest for several years. Yes, I am happy for you to mention our meeting in your report. I trained at **Moore College/Deaconess House** - 1979-1981, alongside **Erica Mathieson** and **Irene Mok**. I was a Presbyterian

candidate and among other things remember my classes in liturgiology taught by *Bill Lawton*, and early debates about women's ordination and headship. On graduation I was set apart as a deaconess for home mission work among university students as a staffworker with AFES.

In 1986 I left Australia for the bigger pond of the USA and the UK and found a new home in the C of E, while keeping up my ties with Sydney by doing some occasional freelance editing with the AIO.

In 1991, I was sent for further training at *Wycliffe Hall, Oxford* in

an attempt to make me into an English Anglican. I was ordained at *York Minster* in 1994 by *Archbishop John Habgood*, who enjoyed telling me that he'd been ordained by *Hugh Gough*, so I was part of an Australian apostolic succession. As if to fulfil all righteousness, the following year *Bishop James Jones* wrote in my Bible that he'd ordained me as a **presbyter**.

After a curacy in East Yorkshire I served in London as an associate vicar and university chaplain for about 20 years. In 2010 I was invited by the Dean of Westminster Abbey to serve as an occasional Duty

Chaplain, then as a Priest Vicar, and in March 2017 to my total amazement I was given the full-time residential post of Minor Canon and Chaplain. **So I am delighted to be here in the truly inclusive Collegiate Church of St Peter in Westminster, bringing all my Australian heritage and accent with me.**

Best wishes, *Jenny*"

World Christian Leaders concerned for the Continuation of the 'Status Quo' in Jerusalem

ACNS - 9th November 2017

The Archbishop of Canterbury Justin Welby has echoed Pope Francis' call for the "Status Quo" agreement over religious sites in Jerusalem to be protected.

After meeting the *Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophilos III*, at Lambeth Palace last week, *Archbishop Justin* said:

"I join other Church Leaders in calling for all parties to uphold the Status Quo and resist



weakening it. I believe that a continued Christian presence in the Holy Land is of paramount importance."

The Patriarch of Jerusalem has spent recent weeks visiting religious leaders around the world to call for support for the

'Status Quo', which protects religious communities' ownership of land in Jerusalem.

A Bill before the Knesset - the Israeli Parliament - signed by 40 Knesset members, would restrict the right of churches to deal independently with their land.

In re-stating his support for Christian communities throughout Israel, the Palestinian Territories, and across the Middle East, *Archbishop Justin* asserted that - *'Jerusalem must remain a place where people of all faiths can live and thrive together'*. He had visited Jerusalem and the Middle East in May.

Archbishop Justin's words echo those of *Pope Francis*, who, after meeting *Patriarch Theophilus III* in October, said: *"The Holy City, whose Status Quo must be defended and preserved, ought to be a place where all can live together peaceably; otherwise, the endless spiral of suffering will continue for all."*

Archbishop Justin praised the close relationships which exist between the Heads of Churches in Jerusalem, especially between *the Patriarch* and *Archbishop Suheil Dawani*, the Anglican Archbishop in Jerusalem and Primate of the Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East.

Archbishop Justin's meeting with *Patriarch Theophilus III* ended with prayer in the Crypt Chapel at Lambeth Palace, concluding with the words of *Psalm 122*, which implores prayer for the peace of Jerusalem.

Photo Credit: Gavin Drake

Archbishop Justin Welby and his wife Caroline light candles in the grotto of the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, in May this year, watched over by Greek Orthodox Patriarch Theophilus III and the Anglican Dean of Jerusalem, Hosam Naoum.

*I was glad when they said to me
'Let us go to the house of the Lord'*

*Jerusalem which is built as a city
Where the pilgrims gather in unity*

*O pray for the peace of Jerusalem;
may those who love you prosper*

*For the sake of the house of the Lord
our God:*

I will seek for your good.

TAIZE - A Place of Refreshment and Inspiration.

If you appreciate music in worship, meditation and a simple lifestyle, then you will find Taize, France, a place of refreshment and inspiration.

Founded during World War 11 in a spirit of reconciliation, this Ecumenical Community of Brothers offer renewal to the world and the church. A recent visit to Taize was for me, a revelation: to experience the joy of the beautiful candlelit services during the day and evening, bible studies with others from around the world, workshops, bunking with others from *Innesbruck, Austria, Italy and Germany* was a wonderful experience.

Although there were 4,000 of us there at Taize in mid-July, the small groups meant that we all had community. The under 25's have their own program.

I met a Spanish couple who had met there thirty years ago, had returned and now brought their children and three friends.

Many of us have sung the simple, repetitive prayers



associated with the Taize community over the years without

knowing the breadth of the Taize story.

Whilst I was there we prayed for the forthcoming *Morocco Workshop*. I spoke with a young woman who would participate and she confirmed that it would be difficult and possibly dangerous, but that it was



something she wished to do. The Taize group has visited many countries which have been hostile to the Gospel. **Brother Roger, the founder**, went to the USSR shortly after World War 11 and Taize did a considerable amount of work there.

A workshop I attended was entitled "*Building Muslim-Christian friendship*" and included a young pastor from Indonesia sharing stories.

I also shared a story, about the NSW initiative at the beginning of the Law Term for judges, barristers and solicitors to visit the Gallipoli Mosque - at their invitation.

Whilst, here in Sydney, it has been traditional for Christian and Jewish services

to be held, it is new to visit the mosque, so the legal profession has made real efforts to respond positively and to attend the mosque. (There is no actual service, but rather a talk; guided tour of the mosque and a delicious meal).

At Taize, in addition to the large services of worship, there are services taken by the different individual denominations, and I attended an Anglican service held 'in the undercroft', taken by an English priest. Since the former **Archbishop of Canterbury** took pilgrims to Taize in 1994, there has been a steady stream of Anglicans from the UK. However at the service I attended **we came from all over the world including parts of Africa and Asia, New Zealand and Canada.**

Other workshops included ones by the youth of Africa, Asia and the Pacific. They put together presentations of skits and stories about building love in communities, brick by brick, flower by flower. That is really what Taize is about.

Two hours on a train from Paris, then a short bus ride takes you there. The expected donation is small. My only advice would be to take a cushion to sit on.

This would be a great adventure and pilgrimage, alone or with friends. Google **Taize Community** and follow the prompts.

Mandy Tibbey
St Luke's Church, Enmore

Photos: 1. Families; 2. the Youth Program