



Latimer Focus

ISSUE 43

SPRING 2018

In this issue

- 03 • **Editorial**
Rev. Dave Clancey
- 04 • **The Christian Community**
Rev. Lorraine Lloyd and Captain Peter Lloyd
- 05 • **The Response of St John's Woolston to Motion 7**
Rev. Stephen McNabb
- 06 • **Why I Am Standing Apart**
Rev. Malcolm Falloon
- 12 • **Why I Am Choosing to Stay**
Rev. Dr. Peter Carrell
- 14 • **Dale Oldham: A Tribute**
Rt Rev. Henry Paltridge
- 15 • **Books Worth Reading**
Rev. Dr. Bob Robinson
- 18 • **Latimer's Curate**

Latimer Focus

ISSUE 43 • SPRING 2018

Latimer Fellowship is a New Zealand Anglican society offering a biblical perspective on contemporary issues with resources.

Latimer Focus is published by:
Latimer Fellowship of New Zealand
PO Box 25-395
196 Colombo Street
Christchurch 8023
New Zealand
Email online@latimer.org.nz

LATIMER ONLINE

www.latimer.org.nz

FOCUS MAGAZINE EDITOR

Malcolm Falloon

CHAIR

Rev. Dave Clancey

EXECUTIVE

Rev. James de Costobadie
Rev. Malcolm Falloon
Rev. Mark Hood
Rev. Mike Keith
Rosemarie Hawkins
Lisa McNabb

PRESIDENT

Rt Rev. Richard Ellena

VICE PRESIDENTS

Rev. Wally Behan
Rev. Dr. Peter Carrell
Rt Rev. Henry Paltridge
Rev. Dr. Bob Robinson
Rt Rev. Derek Eaton
Dr Don Mathieson QC

Latimer Fellowship is a partner in AFFIRM; Anglicans For Faith Intercession Renewal and Mission

Latimer is part of EFAC; Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion

Opinions expressed are those of the writers of individual articles, and are not necessarily those of Latimer Fellowship.

Contributors in this issue:

REV. DAVE CLANCEY

Dave is Vicar of the parish of South Christchurch. He is Chair of the Latimer Executive.

REV. STEPHEN MCNABB

Steve is currently priest-in-charge of St John's Woolston; and soon a church planter.

REV. LORRAINE LLOYD & CAPTAIN PETER LLOYD

Lorraine is the Executive Officer and Peter is the Network Coordinator of AFFIRM NZ.

REV. MALCOLM FALLOON

Malcolm was a former warden of the Latimer Fellowship and is currently a PhD student at Otago University.

REV. DR. PETER CARRELL

Peter Carrell is a Vice President of the Latimer Fellowship, serves in the Diocese of Christchurch as Director of Education, Director of Theology House, Archdeacon of Pegasus and is Bishop-elect of Christchurch.

RT REV. HENRY PALTRIDGE

Henry is a retired missionary Bishop and worships at St Christopher's Anglican Church, Avonhead. He is a Vice President of the Latimer Fellowship.

REV. DR. BOB ROBINSON

Bob is Senior Lecturer at Laidlaw College, Christchurch Campus, and a Vice President of the Latimer Fellowship.

*Rev. Dave Clancey*

Editorial

In 1814 Ivan Krylov wrote a fable entitled "The Inquisitive Man". It is a short piece about a conversation between a man and his friend. The man had recently visited a museum of natural history, and he speaks to his friend of all the intricacy he had seen, and the detail and precision of the tiniest of insects. "And of course, you saw the elephant?" his friend asks. "Elephant? Are you quite sure that they have an elephant?" the man replies. "Quite sure", he is told. "Well, old man," the fable finishes, "don't tell anybody - but the fact is that I didn't notice the elephant!" And from this fable the idiom "The elephant in the room" arose, to speak of an obvious problem or risk that no one wants to talk about.

This edition of Latimer Focus addresses the elephant - that our denomination is divided. This is not a statement about the political landscape in the Anglican Church of Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia (ACANZP), nor is it a reflection on how people are feeling after General Synod / Te Hīnota Whānui 2018. It is a statement of fact that 11% of the parishes in the Diocese of Christchurch have voted to disaffiliate from the Province. That 10% of the clergy in the Diocese of Christchurch have resigned from the denomination. And that Anglicans up and down the country have felt no choice but to walk away from the denomination to which they were a part.

But for some there may be another elephant. What is the place and future of the Latimer Fellowship? How do we hold together when such division is occurring in our denomination? The Latimer Fellowship is not a church nor a denomination. We are a Fellowship, whose members agree to the Objects of the Fellowship as set out in our Constitution. At the heart of those Objects is the place of the Bible in the life of the Anglican Church. We work to "uphold, maintain and propagate Christian doctrines as set forth in the Holy Scriptures and embodied in A New Zealand Prayer Book, the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion." (Object 1). We seek to "maintain the position of the Holy Scriptures in the ACANZP [...] as the supreme and entirely trustworthy authority in all matters of faith and conduct." (Object 2).

We are a Fellowship whose membership is open to any communicant Christian who upholds and supports the Objects of the Fellowship. For some time now we have had members who are not part of the ACANZP. This includes members who were part of the denomination, but whose licenses were removed and who had to seek new ways of being Anglican. Those men and women from West Hamilton are now being joined by more and more people, as clergy and churches have to seek new ways of being Anglican in these Islands.

This edition of Latimer Focus gives voice to how people are responding to the changes introduced by General Synod / Te Hīnota Whānui. It offers different considerations by those who are choosing to stay within the denomination and by those who find that they cannot. Conscience and circumstance will allow for different responses, and over time those things may change as well. Indeed, many expect that in the coming years those of the progressive wing of the ACANZP will advocate for additional changes to canons and practices. Many expect that there will be a commensurate response from those for whom any additional change will be too much. We would be naïve to think that resignations, disaffiliations, and people leaving churches are restricted to this short window in time.

As the Fellowship walks forward into this future, therefore, we have great opportunities. In both the ACANZP, and the new expression of Anglicanism which is emerging, the Latimer Fellowship needs to work to see Christian doctrines, as set forth in the Holy Scriptures, upheld, maintained and propagated. Even when Reports and Working Groups of the church do not engage in Biblical and Theological reflection, the Fellowship needs to undertake those tasks and offer them to the wider denominations. We have a role to play to ensure that the Bible, and not structures or strategies or personalities or politics, is "the supreme and entirely trustworthy authority" in all expressions of Anglicanism in these Islands. And we need to work hard that we keep ourselves to our own objects - that in our reasoning and decision-making, in our discussions and relationships - it is the Scriptures which are our final authority.



Rev. Lorraine Lloyd
and Captain Peter
Lloyd

The Christian Community

"Joy is the infallible sign of the Kingdom of God" according to Teilhard de Chardin, yet one of the constant cries within General Synod/te Hinota Whanui was that "No one is happy here."

We had before us the report of the Small Working Group set up to find structural arrangements to keep us together across a deep divide of theology and Biblical understanding. To achieve this, compromise was inevitable and as a result "no one was happy".

AFFIRM had conducted a series of meetings throughout the Country to offer a contribution to the Small Working Group's deliberations. The most favoured idea was the FCA submission of an Extra Provincial Diocese. This was followed by an Eighth Tikanga Pakeha Diocese; with a new Religious Order following. The only one of these to emerge from the SMG's deliberations was a revised version of the Orders of Consecrated Life called a Christian Community. What did that give us?

The General Synod decision allows ministry units to declare where they stand Theologically and Biblically. The empowering clause, 12 in the Statute, allows a M.U. to declare its theological position as biblically affirming and requires all incoming clergy to formally commit to that, thus empowering the conservative standing ground.

We do not wish to gather around a negative. While the sexuality debate was a significant reason for its establishment, our continued existence must be the Mission of this Church as expressed in the five-fold Mission statement in the Constitution. Evangelism is our top priority with the other elements in the Five-fold Statement a natural outcome of living as members of the Kingdom of God.

In addition, as a Canonically recognised group the Statute enables us to:

- live out our Faith without compromise.
- teach what we believe the Scriptures teach without compromise, provided we do not step outside of the Doctrines in the Formularies.

- not be disciplined for refusing to bless same sex relationships.
- order our own life and mission.
- have a Bishop of this Church as our leader in Mission, who is also our Advocate and Supporter.
- have our own Annual Meeting (Convocation) where we can set policy and direction.
- exercise discipline according to the Statutes.
- retain the use of our resources for our ongoing mission.

The four fundamental requirements that guided the setting up of the Christian Community were:

Integrity: We do not have to compromise what we believe, teach or practice. We DO have to accept that others can do the same from the opposite end of the spectrum.

Identity: We will be a Canonically Recognised entity with a clear identity within the Church.

Leadership: While many are pessimistic about the survival of the Church today, we are confident that with strong Episcopal leadership we will be able to engage, unhindered by other agendas, in winning this Nation for Christ and the Church.

Resources: We retain the use of our resources for fellowship, discipleship and mission.

Parish affiliation happens when 2/3rds of those present at an AGM or SGM vote in favour of affiliation. We recommend a carefully thought out process that will give parishioners time to understand the opportunity that is being offered. AFFIRM can help with that.

*Rev. Stephen McNabb*

The Response of St John's Woolston to Motion 7

The time leading up to General Synod was a time of anxiety at St John's Woolston. People were anxious about what General Synod would do about Motion 29 and what that would mean for us.

We held several meetings to inform our parishioners of the issues and to give people the opportunity to express their views. Many had indicated that this was important to them after the 'Respectful Conversations' that the Diocese ran, which many of our congregation thought were biased and restricted dialogue. It was clear from conversations before General Synod that Motion 29 put the future of our church in doubt. Many people had indicated that they would leave if it passed. The challenge was going to be holding people together for as long as possible.

In light of this, we had told our people that if Motion 29 passed, then we would embark on a discernment process. The purpose of this was threefold. Firstly, to inform people of issues surrounding the proposal. Next, to encourage people to talk through the issues as they saw them. And finally, to help people engage with God's word and pray about same-sex activity and God's view of it. The most exciting part of this process was engaging with people over God's word, many of whom I don't get the chance to do so with on a regular basis.

The response of the parish to the FCA discernment process was overwhelmingly positive. We did not all agree on how we should respond to Motion 7.¹ Yet people felt heard and had engaged with God's word. The FCA discernment document contains a lot of information. Yet, it was manageable over the month-long process. At the end of the month, we held a Special General Meeting where we voted on a motion prepared by Vestry. This motion stated that we would disaffiliate from the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch due to the passing of Motion 7 which we believed to be inconsistent with God's word. This passed with 80% of the parishioners voting for it.

"The most exciting part of this process was engaging with people over God's word, many of whom I don't get the chance to do so with on a regular basis."

Most of the members of our church attended this meeting. This was a decision that has filled everyone with sadness and uncertainty. We are now working out the reality of this decision and what it means. Please pray for us all, those staying and those who will leave. Pray that the Gospel will continue to be proclaimed in Woolston as it has done for the previous 160 years.

St John's Woolston would have been in danger of not being viable by the end of the year whether we engaged in the discernment process or not. The difference is that everyone has had the chance to make an informed decision. It also means that we have had the chance to hold together a majority of the church. This is vital because now we can start something new rather than watching members leave in dribs and drabs until only a hollow shell remains.

¹ Motion 29 became Motion 7, after it was passed by General Synod.



Rev. Malcolm Falloon

Why I Am Standing Apart

A personal statement as to why I have withdrawn from the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia.

It is with deep sadness that I find I can no longer continue in licenced ministry within the Anglican church as it is currently structured. I firmly believe that by passing Motion 7 (2018) authorising same-sex blessings, the General Synod has compromised its understanding of Christian marriage and is tolerating within the church a teaching that is contrary to Scripture. By doing so, the synod has blessed as holy that which God has not so blessed but explicitly warned God's people against.¹

Consequently, I cannot in good conscience sign the declaration of adherence and submission to the authority of General Synod as required of me under the church's constitution. It is a sad irony that the very declarations designed to protect the integrity of the church, have now become the means of compelling me and other faithful Anglicans to withdraw from leadership and to stand apart. However, not being able to sign is more than a mere technicality or personal scruple; it is the consequence of a church that has compromised the faith "once for all entrusted to the saints".² Even were it the case that I was not required to sign anything, I still believe that as a matter of integrity I would be compelled to separate myself from the current structures in order to be in accordance with God's word.³ For by authorising same-sex blessings, the General Synod has compromised the church, compromised the gospel, and has compromised the future mission and well-being of God's people.⁴

A COMPROMISED CHURCH: A QUESTION OF AUTHORITY

The church has been compromised in two ways. Firstly, by changing the church's doctrine of marriage and chastity in a manner that is contrary to Scripture. The General Synod has authorised the blessing of a sexual relationship outside the marriage bond, namely same-sex unions which are prohibited in Scripture.⁵ This is a serious abuse of the authority vested in the General Synod by the constitution of our church: it is a theological impossibility for the Church to bless as holy that which God has declared through Scripture to be unholy. The claim is made, however, that the General Synod has not in fact made any change in doctrine, and that marriage remains the union of one man and one woman. But this turns on a distinction without a difference: by declaring same-sex blessings to be "non-formulary", the Synod has convinced itself that no formal change in doctrine has occurred. I consider this to be a legal manoeuvre motivated by political expediency. Yet, it is of little concern to me under which section of the constitution the resulting canon has been filed; for all practical purposes, a change has clearly been made.

A second, equally serious abuse of authority has been the granting of immunity from discipline for those conducting same-sex blessings. The granting of immunity, as well as being a tacit admission that a major revision as indeed occurred, also

¹ 1 Corinthians 6:9-11; Jude 4; Revelation 2:14-16, 20

² Jude 3

³ 2 John 10-11

⁴ 2 Corinthians 11:1-6, 12:19-21

⁵ Motion 7 (2018) created five new statutes, 747-751 (<http://www.anglican.org.nz/News/General-Synod-Te-Hinota-Whanui-GSTHW/Minutes-and-Statutes-of-the-63rd-General-Synod-Te-Hinota-Whanui-held-in-New-Plymouth-4-10-May-2018>). Statute 748 authorised bishops to permit same-sex blessings in their dioceses. The canon which the statute amends (Title G, Canon XIV) can be found here: <http://www.anglican.org.nz/Resources/Canons>

has the effect of creating a constitutional-free zone within the life of the church. The General Synod does not have the authority to make such a provision. The constitution, in speaking of its Fundamental Provisions enshrining the Church's doctrine, states:

The above Provisions shall be deemed FUNDAMENTAL, and it shall not be within the power of the General Synod, or of any Diocesan Synod, to alter, revoke, add to, or diminish any of the same.⁶

The changes made by General Synod, and the granting of immunity from discipline, have done the very thing that the constitution disallows. By exceeding its authority in this way, the General Synod has prevented a vital function of the constitution—to hold the church true to the teaching of Scripture. The Anglican church of this province is now ruled, in effect, by two constitutions: one expressed in the existing formularies, and another, parallel, "non-formulary", constitution under the direct protection of the General Synod. The implications of this are far reaching. The General Synod, having made itself the final authority in the church, is now free to apply (or not apply) the rules of the church as seems convenient to the majority of the day. Consequently, there is little to prevent further innovations from occurring, namely the recognition of marriage equality (so-called) and the ordination of candidates in same-sex unions. It is a compromised Church without authority.⁷

A COMPROMISED GOSPEL: A QUESTION OF INTEGRITY

Unfortunately, these decisions of General Synod have been but the fruit of a deeper, more serious malaise in the church—a

compromised Gospel. It has long become apparent that the debate over human sexuality goes right to the heart of the Gospel message and what it means for God to call people to repentance and forgiveness of sins in Christ's name. Throughout the debate, those promoting same-sex unions have wanted to radically reinterpret the church's teaching on marriage and chastity in order for the church's faith to align with what they term the "inclusive gospel". In doing so, they accuse conservatives of perpetuating outmoded doctrines that exclude and marginalise people in ways that are unloving, unjust, and a real cause of pastoral harm. It is also unfortunate that in advancing their cause, the advocates of an inclusive gospel have often reflected much of the anti-Christian rhetoric directed against the church by political activists in wider society.

This contest over the integrity of the Gospel was recognised by the GAFCON movement at its first conference in 2008. They named it as one of three "undeniable facts" that had "torn the fabric of the Communion":⁸

The first fact is the acceptance and promotion within the provinces of the Anglican Communion of a different 'gospel' (cf. Galatians 1:6-8) which is contrary to the apostolic gospel. This false gospel undermines the authority of God's Word written and the uniqueness of Jesus Christ as the author of salvation from sin, death and judgement. Many of its proponents claim that all religions offer equal access to God and that Jesus is only a way, not the way, the truth and the life. It promotes a variety of sexual preferences and immoral behaviour as a universal human right. It claims God's blessing for same-sex

⁶ The Constitution/Te Pouhere, Part A, Fundamental Provisions, Clause 6. <http://www.anglican.org.nz/content/download/45268/228706/file/For%20website%20-%20Constitution%20English%202016.doc>

⁷ The Windsor Report (2004), paragraph 24, also identified the question of "authority" as the underlying problem in the wider Anglican Communion. <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/68225/windsor2004full.pdf>

⁸ GAFCON (Global Anglican Future Conference) represents approximating 70% of Anglicans worldwide, drawn mainly from what is termed the Global South: Africa, Asia and South America. <https://www.gafcon.org>

"The Working Group has then asked whether these two integrities can be held together in the same Church. Can we acknowledge that those who have strongly-held views which are different to our own are also seeking to be obedient to the one Gospel of Jesus Christ? Can we honour the integrity of a position we cannot in conscience agree with?"

unions over against the biblical teaching on holy matrimony. In 2003 this false gospel led to the consecration of a bishop living in a homosexual relationship.⁹

This same Gospel crisis has been paralleled within the New Zealand church. Some have argued that this situation is no different to other controversies faced by the church in the past, where previous generations were still able to hold together. There is, of course, some truth in this, yet there is also a serious flaw: given that the Gospel is the only true basis for Christian unity, how can the Anglican Church hold together when there is such strident disagreement over that very same Gospel—how can a house divided against itself possibly stand?¹⁰

The solution offered by General Synod in 2014 was the adoption of a "two integrities" model for the church. General Synod's intention was not to replace the traditional understanding of the Gospel, so much as to allow an alternative understanding to co-exist alongside, each having its own 'integrity'. As the Synod acknowledged in passing Motion 30 (2014): "Although we are far from unanimous

in seeing the way forward, there is a broad recognition of the dynamic nature of doctrine, and the call of the prophetic word to be attentive to the movement of the Spirit."¹¹

It was on this basis that the Way Forward Working Group was established and asked to report back in 2016.¹² When the Way Forward Working Group report was released, the Archbishop's covering letter again highlighted the "two integrities" model:

The Way Forward Working Group has assumed that these two integrities cannot be reconciled. The Working Group has then asked whether these two integrities can be held together in the same Church. Can we acknowledge that those who have strongly-held views which are different to our own are also seeking to be obedient to the one Gospel of Jesus Christ? Can we honour the integrity of a position we cannot in conscience agree with?¹³

Consequently, Motion 7 (2018) simply puts in place the structures and arrangements based on principles already agreed upon in Motion 30 (2014). The result being that the Anglican Church now recognises within its life two mutually-incompatible and irreconcilable convictions with regard to how the Gospel message is to be understood and proclaimed. My conclusion is that the Anglican Church in New Zealand now holds to a compromised Gospel that lacks integrity.

A COMPROMISED MISSION: A QUESTION OF UNITY

A church that proclaims a compromised Gospel must inevitably pursue a divided mission. That indeed is the case with the

⁹ <https://www.gafcon.org/resources/the-complete-jerusalem-statement>

¹⁰ Ephesians 4:4-5; Mark 3:25

¹¹ Motion 30 (2014). <http://www.anglican.org.nz/content/download/38945/196736/file/Motion%2030.docx>

¹² However, the debate over the Motion 30 report in 2016 led to the passing of another motion (Motion 29), calling for a second working group to meet and produce a further report for 2018. It was the presentation of the Motion 29 report in 2018 that resulted in the passing of Motion 7 that has caused such consternation among many faithful Anglicans.

¹³ Archbishop's covering letter, 22 February 2016, <http://www.anglican.org.nz/content/download/41331/208882/file/Archbishops%20Cover%20Letter%20WFWG%20RELEASE.pdf>

provisions made by General Synod for the formation of "Christian communities".¹⁴ Presumably the reasoning behind such provisions is to allow conservative clergy and congregations to maintain a sufficient degree of separation from the rest of the church in order to pursue their own distinctive life and mission instead of leaving the church altogether.¹⁵ While this appears to be an attractive option to consider, I do not believe it presents a viable option for Gospel mission, for three reasons.

Firstly, it provides a pragmatic solution to what is a theological problem. The result being that the Gospel is turned from a unifying principle into a sectarian preference. In order to defend and promote one's particular Christian community, members must unavoidably engage in overt political action. In the past, evangelical Anglicans have often been accused (largely unfairly, in my view) of being party-spirited, but now it becomes a necessity for the sake of the Gospel. Every parish meeting, every ministry appointment, every episcopal election—are all now politicised in a way that will sap the life of the community concerned.

Secondly, it normalises false-teaching within the life of the church. Whereas before, teaching that contradicted the Scriptures was resisted as not reflecting the apostolic faith as this church has received it, now, a certain degree of tolerance must be accepted. After all, it is now only a matter of divergent

opinion, the limits of which are determined more by the House of Bishops (or, more likely, individual diocesan bishops) than by the Fundamental Provisions of the church's constitution.

Thirdly, it creates a church-within-a-church. In order to provide the necessary degree of separation, the formation of these communities will lead to the ghettoizing of conservatives Anglicans with all the attendant turf wars and demarcation disputes that entails. It is also not clear from Motion 7 (2018) how such future conflicts can be avoided, as much depends on the goodwill of diocesan bishops, who have not had a good track-record in this regard.¹⁶ The formation of Christian communities, as a pragmatic solution to what is in essence a theological crisis, will effectively partition the church along theological lines. Consequently, although the church may have an outward appearance of unity, when it comes to mission, it will be hopelessly divided.

A NECESSARY CALL TO HOLINESS

If the mission of the church is compromised, then the church's response to God's call to holiness must be seriously questioned.¹⁷ For holiness brings to completion God's mission of sending his Son into the world: that through the proclamation of the Gospel, the Church might be gathered and presented to Christ as a pure and spotless bride—holy and blameless and irreproachable before him.¹⁸

¹⁴ Statute 749 enacted by Motion 7 (2018) made provision for Christian communities: <http://www.anglican.org.nz/News/General-Synod-Te-Hinota-Whanui-GSTHW/Minutes-and-Statutes-of-the-63rd-General-Synod-Te-Hinota-Whanui-held-in-New-Plymouth-4-10-May-2018>

¹⁵ The official rationale given by the Motion 29 Working Group is as follows: "The formal recognition of Christian Communities would allow individuals, families and other groupings the option of coalescing into communities bound by common bonds of affection and theological conviction; being able to remain involved in the life of a parish, the diocese and this Church." <http://www.anglican.org.nz/content/download/46886/237010/file/Final%20Report%20of%20the%20Motion%2029%20Working%20Group%2022%20January%202018.pdf>

¹⁶ A case in point was the forced withdrawal of the West Hamilton parish in 2014 after protesting the decisions of the General Synod. <http://whcc.org.nz/our-story/>

¹⁷ 1 Thessalonians 4:1-8

¹⁸ Ephesians 5:25-27; Colossians 1:21-23, 28; Revelation 19:6-8. See also the Windsor Report (2004), paragraph 3 & 4: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/68225/windsor2004full.pdf>

That is why the Apostle Peter exhorts the church: "As he who called you is holy, be holy yourselves in all your conduct; for it is written, "You shall be holy, for I am holy."¹⁹ In the end, it is the call to holiness that sets the present controversy apart from others in the past, such as those concerning the remarriage of divorcees, or the ordination of women.²⁰ For this reason, opposition to same-sex blessings cannot simply be written off as unacknowledged homophobia or bigotry.

In responding to God's radical call to holiness, the church must separate from the world and be devoted to the Lord Jesus as the bride of Christ. The church must also be consecrated by the Holy Spirit to be the agent of God's mission in the world. All three aspects are needed: separation, devotion, and consecration. To be separated from the world means for us not to be conformed to the standards of this world but to be transformed.²¹ Devotion requires us to live lives worthy of the Gospel of Christ and for Christ to be exalted in all we do.²² And it is the Holy Spirit who consecrates us and sets us apart for God's work of mission: to be a holy nation proclaiming the mighty acts of him who called us out of darkness into his marvellous light.²³

In an age that prizes tolerance above all else, the idea of separation—as standing apart from the world—is counter-cultural to say the least, and yet it is a vital aspect of a holy church. At times we are even called to be separate and to stand apart from fellow believers for the sake of the Gospel.²⁴ Though to separate in this way must be distinguished from the divisions, for example, that afflicted the Corinthian church over leadership.²⁵ While we must never confuse party-spirit or schism with a necessary call to holiness, to rule out such a step in principle, exposes the church to the danger of tolerating those things of which the Risen Lord has called us to repent.²⁶ As the Windsor Report (2004) acknowledges: "unity and communion are meaningless unless they issue in...holiness of life... In other words, unity, communion and holiness all belong together. Ultimately, questions about one are questions about all."²⁷ Tolerance for the sake of the Gospel is commendable, but tolerance for its own sake is in the end a refusal to heed what the Spirit is saying to the churches.²⁸

A NEW WAY FORWARD

Anglicans in New Zealand are not the first to face these issues and decide that they must take a stand for the sake of the Gospel.²⁹ But does this mean we must walk away from the

¹⁹ 1 Peter 1:15-16

²⁰ For an outline of how the Anglican Communion handled the issue of women's ordination see the Windsor Report (2004), paragraphs 12-21: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/68225/windsor2004full.pdf>. For a discussion of the remarriage of divorcees within the New Zealand Anglican Church, see Chris Spark's essay, "Double Standards? Divorce and Remarriage in light of discussion on same sex relationships in the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia." <http://www.latimer.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/Chris-Spark-Double-Standards.pdf>

²¹ Romans 12:1-2

²² Galatians 2:19-20; Philippians 1:20-21, 27-28; 2 Corinthians 5:14-15

²³ Acts 13:2-3; 1 Peter 2:9

²⁴ 2 John 10-11

²⁵ 1 Corinthians 1:10-13, 3:16, 21-23. For an example of false teaching causing divisions, see Jude 19

²⁶ Revelation 2:15-17, 22-23

²⁷ Windsor Report (2004), paragraph 3: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/68225/windsor2004full.pdf>.

²⁸ Revelation 2 & 3

²⁹ One of the first instances occurred in June 2002 in the Diocese of New Westminster, Canada. Anglican theologian J. I. Packer gives an account of his decision to leave: <https://www.gafcon.org/resources/why-i-walked-sometimes-loving-a-denomination-requires-you-to-fight>

Anglican church entirely? No, not entirely. But it does require that we separate ourselves from the current structures and take our stand alongside other faithful Anglicans world-wide. As the GAFCON assembly recently affirmed "We are not leaving the Anglican Communion; we are the majority of the Anglican Communion seeking to remain faithful to our Anglican heritage."³⁰ In order to stand apart, a realignment needs to take place through the formation of new Anglican structures.

In its 2016 submission to the Motion 29 Working Group, the Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans (FCANZ) advocated for the creation of an extra-provincial diocese as the best way forward.³¹ An extra-provincial diocese would not be under the jurisdiction of the General Synod, yet would be authentically Anglican and preserve as much formal unity among New Zealand Anglicans as possible. While the Working Group in their final report gave some consideration to "Other Ecclesial Arrangements", in the end they decided against recommending an extra-provincial diocese. They argued that it was beyond their remit from General Synod to do so, though they did make this concession:

We note however, that should faithful Anglicans in this Church wish to consider other ecclesial arrangements, it would be appropriate for this Church to consider how best to embrace this challenge with the same grace and spirit as is reflected in Motion 29; seeking to find 'breathing room' for one another; to live out our commitment to each other in the light and life of the gospel.³²

This was a recognition by the Working Group that no consensus was going to be possible and that a number of Anglicans, such as myself, would be forced to withdraw should their recommendations be adopted. As a consequence, the Working Group

urged "respectful conversations with any clergy person or Ministry Unit that wishes to leave this Church as a result of the recommendations made in this report."³³

Despite the reluctance of the Working Group to endorse the FCANZ proposal, I remain convinced that the creation of an extra-provincial diocese is still the best way forward—with or without the co-operation of the General Synod. It is likely—as indicated by the on-going revisions being proposed within the North American churches—that conflict and controversy will continue to be a feature of the New Zealand Anglican church unless a new Anglican expression is formed. The General Synod, in a sense, has attempted to resolve the impasse by devolving responsibility back onto diocesan bishops and their synods. But, given the communion-wide controversy generated by same-sex blessings, I do not believe it is feasible to resolve these issues without reference to the wider Anglican Communion.³⁴ This is something the General Synod has not been prepared to countenance on the grounds that it would infringe their right of autonomy.³⁵

By passing Motion 7 (2018), the General Synod has effectively aligned themselves with those who have torn our global fellowship apart: it is the General Synod who have divided this church not those of us who refuse to condone such schismatic actions. For this reason, the formation of an extra-province diocese within New Zealand is a necessary step in order to preserve fellowship with faithful Anglican partners around the world. I believe it is also the best way to ensure that New Zealand will continue to have a vibrant and authentically Anglican witness to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ for generations to come.

Malcolm Falloon
24 July 2018

³⁰ <https://www.gafcon.org/news/letter-to-the-churches-gafcon-assembly-2018>

³¹ FCANZ submission to Working Group, media release, 4 October 2016, <http://www.fcanz.org/media-messaging>.

FCANZ is a part of the GAFCON network



Rev. Dr. Peter Carrell
(Photo: Mandy Caldwell
Photography)

Why I Am Choosing to Stay

Emma Thompson, well known British actress, in a Guardian newspaper interview says this about her lack of Christian faith:

"I was quite keen on Jesus and toyed with Christianity in my teens. I went to Bible classes with the vicar who lived next door, and I remember saying: 'My uncle is a homosexual, would he be allowed into heaven?' The vicar paused, and at that moment I knew I was done with religion."¹

Emma Thompson's autobiographical vignette highlights a significant difficulty for 21st century Western churches: our responses to questions about homosexuality are often a barrier to people hearing and responding to the gospel. This general observation is underpinned by a recent comprehensive survey of New Zealand attitudes to faith and religion. In an NZ Herald report on the survey, we read,

"Most New Zealanders positively connect Jesus with love. Perceptions towards Jesus are often quite positive; non-Christians suggest he is relatable, approachable and gracious. But there are major hurdles. Church 'teaching on homosexuality' is the biggest blocker to engaging with Christianity, cited by 47 per cent."²

My first reason for staying in the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia (ACANZP) is that I believe our church, even with its ambiguous response to same-sex blessings (i.e. that we may both teach against and may offer blessings) is a better church for sharing the gospel of Jesus with the LGBTQI community than a church formed through disaffiliation from ACANZP on the grounds that it opposes same-sex blessings. The world around us whom we seek to win for Christ is not looking to the church to reinforce the mores and social ethics of the

past re homosexuality. Rather, it is looking to the church to see what the love of God in Christ for humanity means in respect of gay brothers, lesbian daughters, gender fluid friends. A church founded on doctrinal purity over homosexuality strikes me as a church which is not facing the challenge of sharing the gospel today when the biggest blocker to the gospel is "teaching on homosexuality." I have no easy or simple answer to the question of how we overcome that blocker but I am convinced a better answer will come from within ACANZP than from within a new, post-disaffiliation church.

My second reason for staying is the presence of my friends and colleagues in ACANZP who are gay or lesbian, and, for that matter, those who explicitly, visibly support them. Whatever I think of their beliefs and practices as Anglicans, and whatever they think of mine, I am not prepared to leave ACANZP because of our differences. They are Anglican, I am Anglican, together we live in a church which through centuries has accommodated huge differences. I think we should keep doing so. But more importantly, I recognize that their differences in belief and practices arise from an experience of being sexual human beings which I do not understand because it has not been my experience. Thus I am prepared to give the benefit of the doubt (so to speak) to them: by remaining in ACANZP I am acknowledging that despite centuries of heritage and tradition underpinning a biblical theology of holy living which denies the validity of same-sex blessings, that theology may be wrong. I have to accept that possibility because it is extraordinary that these friends and colleagues, often in the face of hostility and marginalization by their church, maintain a steadfast belief that God loves and accepts them, wishes to bless their lifelong partnership and calls them into the

¹ Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2018/aug/25/emma-thompson-dieting-screwed-up-my-metabolism-i-regret-ever-going-on-one->, accessed 26 August 2018

² NZ Herald, https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12074520, accessed 26 August 2018.

A link to the survey, commissioned by the Wilberforce Foundation, may be found within the article FCANZ is a part of the GAFCON network

ministry of the church. Contrary to Emma Thompson, they have not walked away from ACANZP. I choose to stay in ACANZP and journey with them in the life of faith as we work it out in an Anglican fashion.

Quite appropriately, my many friends and colleagues in ACANZP who oppose same-sex blessings to the point of choosing to disaffiliate (or, at the time of writing, are edging steadily towards such a choice) are entitled to say, "Well, are we also important to you, Peter?" My answer is, "Yes! And I wish you would stay because the GS 2018 decision encourages you to stay and supports your beliefs and practices. I believe we can journey together, all of us as Anglicans in these islands."

Now that plea, voiced now at several parish meetings since May 2018, is largely falling on ears that are unpersuaded by my appeal to stay together. In my understanding, as I listen to friends and colleagues who are disaffiliating, there is no compromise possible on the matter of whether ACANZP remains a pure church doctrinally, that is, a church which makes no provision, makes no change which permits same-sex blessings. I can recognize and admire those who will not compromise, and I certainly recognize that costly sacrifices are being made by non-compromising individuals and congregations.

But what I find myself unable to do is to accept that compromise can only work in one direction in our church. For what disaffiliation implicitly presupposes is that all those who want the change expressed in GS 2018's Motion 7 should desist from that wish, and instead compromise and reject the change. That is, those disaffiliating propose to make no compromise while asking the majority of ACANZP to compromise. By contrast, Motion 7 asks of this church that we all compromise. That those wishing no change accept there will be change while not being

forced themselves to change their belief or practice; and that those wishing for change accept that the contrary view remains in our church, indeed is permitted and protected in its desire to speak against the change.

In effect, my third reason for remaining in ACANZP is that I am willing to be part of a church in which all compromise and I am unwilling to be part of a church where only some compromise. In doing this, I am also seeking to live out a vital theology of church, that we are all members of one body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12), committed to not rejecting other members, even though this is very demanding on all members when there are striking differences in the body (Romans 14-15).

Finally, and saying my third reason in a different way, I am remaining in ACANZP because I want to be part of an Anglican church in these islands which includes Polynesians and Maori, and urban and rural parishes. That inclusion is not because it is a "nice" thing to be inclusive. Nor is it because I am invested in maintaining an historic institution. Rather, attempting to take seriously the meaning of the body of Christ for these islands, I want to be in a church which remains members with our Treaty partner and members with our constitutional partner, the Diocese of Polynesia. If I disaffiliated I would be saying to those members that I do not want to be a member of the body they are members of. I note also that the tendency towards disaffiliation is mostly an urban phenomenon. I am not prepared to disaffiliate when that means saying good-bye to my brothers and sisters in Christ in Waimate and Hokitika, in Amberley and Akaroa. We are members of one body and I am committed to our life together in the body of Christ.

Peter Carrell is Bishop-elect of Christchurch
31 August 2018



Rt Rev. Henry Paltridge

Dale Oldham: A Tribute

**Dale Oldham died Wednesday 29 November 2017 in Christchurch.
A tribute to a former Latimer Chairman.**

Dale's daughter, Kathryn wrote soon after her father's death.

With hearts full of grief we are writing to let you know that Dad went to be with his Lord and Saviour this afternoon. Last night's Daily Light, which Mark and I read with him, seemed to have prophesied this.

"Trust in God, also in me; in my Father's house are many rooms; if it were not so I would have told you. I am going there to prepare a place for you."

This was followed the next morning by: "One thing I ask of the Lord... that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life."

Dale Oldham, born in 1940, came to faith in Christ in a bible class led by Bernie Cox, at St Aidan's, Bryndwyr, along with Brian Koller and Derek Eaton, calling themselves the EKO, with a statement: For ever to serve the Lord. Marie Oldham, Dale's wife, wrote the following about Dale in "Out of St Martin's" (pages 267 -273): *'Dale qualified as a Pharmacist in Christchurch and then he was ordained an Anglican clergyman following theological studies at Ridley Hall.'*

Marie Oldham wrote about Christian things of that era:

'Easter camps at Tyndale House... were wonderful times of fellowship and teaching... We had outreaches into the community, involvement with the CMS League of Youth and the Evangelical Churchman's Fellowship. We learnt to give and to serve in our local church, but also looked beyond our own country to the needs of churches overseas.'

It was at St Aidan's Bryndwyr, under the ministry of the Rev. Les Morris that Dale grew spiritually especially through a Sunday afternoon bible class, that also included people like Pauline Elliot (nee Witbrock), and Gerry Brittenden.

Marie wrote of their courtship: *'Dale and I knew each other briefly in New Zealand, but met again in England. We were married at All Souls Church, Langham Place.'*

Dale's curacies were between 1967 and 1973: *'Dale was Curate for 3 years at St. Mary's of Bethany, Woking. As two curacies were the norm then, we returned to New Zealand for the second one with three years at St. Paul's, Papanui.'*

Dale and Marie went with NZCMS to Dodoma in 1974, to manage the Diocesan Chemist Shop and to be Chaplain for an English speaking congregation. Their time in Tanzania had important lessons for them.

'For seven years our family lived in a country that is very different to New Zealand... Once believing, our African Christian friends showed us that having Jesus in their lives gave them purpose for living even without the necessities of life.'

In 1981 Dale returned home with his family to be the Home Secretary of NZCMS based in Christchurch until 1985, from where he became the Assistant Minister at St. Timothy's, Burnside. He then became Vicar of St. Stephen's, Shirley until retirement in 2005. For much of this period he was also on the Latimer Executive, serving as Chairman for a time, contributing positively to its ministry.

Well done good and faithful servant!



Rev. Dr. Bob Robinson

Books Worth Reading

FREEDOM TO LIBEL?

Peter G. Bolt and Malcolm Falloon, eds.
(Epping, NSW: Bolt Publishing, 2017, 414 pages, ISBN: 9780994634924, NZ\$45 + \$5 p&p from malfalloon@me.com)

Subtitled *Samuel Marsden v Philo Free: Australia's First Libel Case*, this collection of scholarly essays is a study of Australian colonial history that has some tangible links with New Zealand. The subject matter concerns the two libel cases brought by Marsden in 1817 after the publication of a lengthy letter in the *Sydney Gazette* under the pseudonym 'Philo Free.' In the letter, Marsden and his missionary colleagues were, in effect, accused of hiding behind a cloak of piety in order to make money (and misuse public funds) in their mission activities. Marsden knew that the attack was not only designed to damage his reputation and standing but was also intended to influence opinion in London and impede the growing missionary movement in the South Pacific as a whole. Marsden's aristocratic opponents (including Governor Macquarie and his Secretary, J.T. Campbell – the writer of the libellous letter) did not hide their own decidedly anti-evangelical and anti-pietist motivations. Much of the book is taken up with examining the cases (both of which were won by Marsden) from a variety of angles: legal, historical (Australasian, colonial and imperial, South Pacific), missionary and, of course, as a contribution to Marsden historiography and biography. Kiwi readers will appreciate the fine summary chapter by Malcolm with which the collection ends. In it, he not only corrects the colonial caricature of Marsden but draws on his own doctoral research into CMS missionaries in pre-colonial New Zealand to illustrate the way in which, for Marsden, "the central issue at stake was the cause of Christian missions." The book is a nicely produced paperback with illustrations and maps – though,

unfortunately, without an index – and Latimer readers will surely want to ensure that public and other libraries have copies of this well-written and readable set of essays.

SALVATION BY ALLEGIANCE ALONE

Matthew W. Bates (Baker Academic, 2017, US\$24.99, 256pp, ISBN: 978-0801097973)

The subtitle explains where the book is going: *Rethinking Faith, Works and the Gospel of Jesus the King* – an attempt to add some substance to the word "faith" by redefining it as "allegiance." Bates does this by offering a biblical theology of salvation and discipleship; we are saved solely by allegiance to Jesus the already enthroned King. Of course, "faith" remains a thoroughly biblical word but when it translates into the mere intellectual assent or 'easy-believism' of even well-taught Western Christians, surely something of the biblical meaning is absent. Bates points out that the story of the rich young ruler assumes that salvation depends on certain human actions and then discusses how these relate to the sola "by faith alone." If we put together Jesus' prescription for entering the Kingdom by means of cross-bearing and self-denying discipleship, with what Paul means by Christ's status as Lord, a stronger word than "faith" is needed. Saving faith, Bates concludes, is embodied, enacted *allegiance*, and his well-argued case seems to amount to a challenging corrective.

CRUCIFIXION OF THE WARRIOR GOD

Gregory A. Boyd (Fortress Press, 2017, US\$59, 1492pp, ISBN: 978-1506420752)

This is a lengthy and well-constructed study of a topic that confronts every Christian reader of the Old Testament: how to understand the violence found there when

compared with the non-violent teachings and example of Jesus; and in the light of the Cross – hence the subtitle: *Interpreting the Old Testament's Violent Portraits of God in Light of the Cross*. Boyd has no doubts about scripture, including its violent passages, as inspired. But these passages are trumped, as it were, by the certainty and centrality of the cross and resurrection as the final revelation of God. Boyd's credentials as a notable pastor preacher are apparent in the readability of the two volumes that make up the whole.

INTERPRETING OLD TESTAMENT WISDOM LITERATURE

David G. Firth & Lindsay Wilson, editors
(*InterVarsity Press, 2017, US\$30, 248pp, ISBN: 978-0830851782*)

This reviewer is puzzled by the lack of preaching and teaching from the 'wisdom' portions of the Bible in New Zealand churches. The pragmatic nature and visual content of much of Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Ruth, and the wisdom content of some Psalms, and parts of the wider Old Testament story from Joshua to Esther, would all seem to be well-suited as platforms for the gospel into Kiwi culture. The volume not only explains and applies the content of each of the wisdom books or sections but also offers practical and reflective chapters on challenging themes such as retribution, anxiety, learning from observation and experience, and divine absence. A helpful starting point for preachers and teachers of scripture.

THE PARABLES AFTER JESUS

David B. Gowler (Baker Academic, 2017, US\$29.99, 320pp, ISBN: 978-0801049996)

This book assumes that readers have commentaries that explain the meaning of the parables of Jesus but that they also might need help in interpreting and applying them in the very different world that we now inhabit. The volume provides such help by looking at how preachers and teachers over the centuries have understood the parables – hence the subtitle: *Their Imaginative Receptions across Two Millennia*. There are some fifty of these 'imaginative receptions' across a range of stimulating perspectives including visual art, music, literature, science fiction, drama and poetry, sermons, politics, theology – and even more widely. Any would-be preacher on the parables could not fail to be helped.

BEYOND CHURCH WALLS

Rick Rouse (Fortress Press, 2016, US\$19, 120pp, ISBN: 978-1451490343)

This is a wonderfully clear and helpful expansion of the traditional view of pastoral care as it shifts the focus of such care from within the church family to the wider community. It offers a missional view of care and concern for the needs also of those not (yet) within the church. Subtitled *Cultivating a Culture of Care*, Rouse sets out what this new approach has begun to look like when practiced. The only hesitation from this reviewer: does Rouse look carefully enough at the burn-out that can and does result when smaller or mid-sized churches make this shift and are simply overwhelmed by the needs of those who are anxious or even desperate for help?

To conclude: a list, with brief descriptions, of some other interesting books (some rather expensive) now passed on to the Christchurch Laidlaw Library (borrowing conditions apply).

Scripture as Real Presence: Sacramental Exegesis in the Early Church by Hans Boersma (Baker Academic, 2017). More interesting than the title might suggest: the heart of biblical exegesis in the early church was the attempt to find the sacramental reality ("real presence") of Christ in the Old Testament Scriptures.

The Imago Dei as Human Identity by Ryan S. Peterson (Eisenbrauns, 2016). Biblical scholars and theologians have struggled to define what 'imago Dei' (the image of God) means. This large survey concludes: the basic claim of Genesis 1:26–28 is that humanity is created to image God actively in the world; the verses disclose humanity's relationship with God and the rest of creation, what humanity does in the world, and what humanity is to become. Jesus Christ himself finally fulfils this description of the identity of men and women.

Divine Will and Human Choice by Richard A. Muller (Baker Academic, 2017). Theologians and philosophers struggle to relate sovereign divine providence to genuine human freedom. This is a comprehensive survey that is especially strong on the Reformers and their successors and equally well-informed about current debates on human freedom and determinism.

Gift and Promise: An Evangelical Theology of the Lord's Supper by Peter Schmiechen (Wipf and Stock, 2017). A volume that asks, "What would happen if the liturgy for the Lord's Supper started with the images in the New Testament rather than the divisions of our past?" And answers: "It would be like going through an open door into a new world."

Latimer's Curate

While I was at theological college I could never really understand the point of church history – it seemed to me to be a thing of the past.

Not that it wasn't enjoyable studying the birth of biblical Christianity in the USA, the revivals of East Africa or the rise of liberalism in the Victorian Church (even if it seemed to be the Victorian Church half a world away). They all had their points of interest.

In fact I found this last topic to be especially fascinating – how liberalism had really begun as an evangelistic movement to enable 'modern' people to believe what to the modern mind seemed unbelievable. The argument was that modern people could not relate to a spirituality constrained by a Holy Book written millennia in the past. What was required in a mature society was a stripping out of those things either crudely offensive in their intellectual naivety (e.g. miracles) or simply untenable in the light of recent scientific 'discoveries' (e.g. a Creator God).

This was all interesting, but what I really longed for was engagement with the current issues of the day in churches in the twenty first century, not theological battles from yesteryear that the church had long since outgrown.

And then I began to serve in my current denomination.

The first sign that things had gone awry came when the senior priest with whom I was paired up as a mentor told me that he didn't believe that everything recorded in the gospels had literally happened. This left me wondering what the word 'literally' added in this context - was he suggesting that only some of the things recorded had actually happened?

I began to suffer flashbacks as a result. At theological college I had noted what a shock D. F. Strauss had been to his contemporaries; when *'The Life of Jesus critically examined'* was published one reviewer called it '...the

most pestilential book ever vomited out of the jaws of hell!'

Now I was the one shocked. The spirit of Strauss seemed to be alive within my own denomination in the twenty first century. What had Strauss said all those years ago? '...therefore where a narrative runs contrary to the laws of nature it must be regarded as unhistorical.'

Nor was this an isolated incident. I then heard that some time before I began my curacy, the clergy in my Diocese had been asked whether they believed in a physical resurrection, and a third had put up their hands to admit they did not.

But rationalism was only part of the problem. Arguably the greater issue was the spirit of romanticism which was not just alive but positively thriving. If rationalism celebrated the triumph of the human mind, romanticism eulogised the feelings and sentiments of the individual over the eternal truths of the Word of God.

Again I suffered more flashbacks. What had Friedrich Schleiermacher said? 'The essence of religion is neither thinking nor acting but intuition and feeling'; and '...true religion is not permitted to contain a code of laws.' Romanticism had divorced authentic God-blessed experience from his Word – which is why Schleiermacher could speak with disdain of 'some people who cling to a dead document by which they swear they draw proof.'

I could not help but think of the last synod I had attended, which seemed to be built on the sand of privatised sentimentalism with various appeals based on 'heart' and 'feelings' and 'knowing inside' and the weight of Biblical content conspicuous by its absence. Nor could I put out of my mind a Bishop's election I had witnessed where a prominent speaker spoke movingly of how 'I came here today expecting to vote for one name but the Spirit has been whispering to me [insert name].'

" If the definition of insanity is doing the same things hoping for a different result, am I serving in a denomination where we have all gone insane?"

The twin attacks of rationalism and romanticism on the authority of the Bible as the Word of God had been a nightmare from history. Only now I had woken up, to find that the nightmare was reality in my own denomination two centuries later.

We know how the story ended in the Victorian church – it was a church which became dominated by ritualism and humanism, with the tragedy that the good news of the Lord Jesus Christ found through the living words of the Living God was side-lined for generations to come. If the definition of insanity is doing the same things hoping for a different result, am I serving in a denomination where we have all gone insane?

