

Printable Version of Topic

[Click here to view this topic in its original format](#)

On Our Way Home > General CEC discussion > **Continued Discussion Of The Current C E C "crisis"**

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 24 2007, 07:29 AM

Celine,

As expressed, my prayers are with you and those who are making the hard decisions about staying or going.

I open this thread to help you and others "air-out" what you are hearing from God about your continued journey.

I do not want to turn this thread into another Home to Rome thread. There are plenty of places to discuss the merits of various directions. I am just wanting to hear what some of you will do next.

No debating. No triumphalism. I will delete or move posts I deem inappropriate to this thread.

Posted by: Fr. Rusty Oct 24 2007, 08:01 AM

Perhaps people should take this up together, as the family, within their local Parrish Church before doing so on the web.

If the Priest has abandoned them, then you have a different matter.

The Local Church, theologically, is the Church expressed.

Its important, if at all possible, to try and take these issues up as a family, as the family of God expressed locally.

I suggest this is tried before doing so on the web.

Talk to your Priest, tell him your feelings, journey through this together, as a whole congregation if possible.

We did so when we left, we prayed to hear God together, we have no regrets concerning our decisions.

We made them together, it was/is "our" Journey.

To the Priests reading this:

Some will tell you to hold things close to your chest, I do not agree most of the time.

I was very open with the congregation here all the way through the last crises, told them the truth, kept them up to speed on things and we discussed everything together.

When it came time to make some final decisions, we made them as a Body.

Some Priests thought this was the wrong way to do things, I did catch some flack from some of them.

Now, much later, I still believe truth, openness and inclusion on all matters was the 100% right thing to do.

We stayed together through it and are, very happy.

Trust was not broken at the local level due to the things that happened on the National level.

Talk to your people, work through the hard stuff, give people time to process.

Love them.

Be honest and straight with your Bishop no matter what.

If you leave, do it well and rightly.

My love and prayers for you all,

Rusty+

Posted by: Celine Oct 24 2007, 11:13 PM

Thank you Fr Rusty for your input.

Your advise however assumes a functioning family. You assume a foundation upon which one can build. We have no such situation here.

"truth, openness and inclusion on all matters was the 100% right thing to do."

I know of no such clergy at St Michaels that operate as such. Foreign to the MO.

Surely you must think I am exaggerating. I wish I am.

Those priests and members not towing the party line have left. Remaining lay people are hush hush about it all out of fear of "being in rebellion" , bringing a "bad report" or "raising their hand" against Gods anointed. Due to carefully managed flow of "official" information, most are simply not aware of what is going on.

Questioning equals rebellion.

Such an environment can hardly qualify as healthy and conducive to working thru problems together, dialogue, honesty, healing

and restoration.

What are we to do?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 25 2007, 11:45 AM

I have closed the previous thread "New Charges..." so discussion can continue here. The charges are no longer new and other aspects of the "crisis" are currently being discussed.

Copy and re-post here anything from the old thread you wish to continue to discuss.

Thanks.

Posted by: seraph Oct 25 2007, 12:09 PM

As the events unfold it seems more clear to me that the CEC's change in top leadership which we may view with gladness, relief, anger, mistrust, boredom or with pain from experiences we have lived it probably does not directly affect the life of our parish! For St. Michael's Church it is a very great and personal crisis...and a lot of complex situations we really need to pray for maybe leaving our own personal peeves about the CEC aside for now....

Here are two angished voices from San Clemente seeing the situation from different angles..

QUOTE

I want to reiterate that at St. Michaels all that we have heard from our leadership is a 2 minute statement read from the pulpit by +Kessler last Sunday. All that was said is that +Adler retired as Patriarch and Primate. End of story.

No explanation. No "all hands on deck" meeting. No Q and A.

Thanks Patriarch Council. Thank you House of Bishops. A bang up job!

Your support, concern and "covering" really go along way here.

Bishop Hines, Bishop Bates, are you really surprised at the anger you find on this forum? Are you really that much in denial? Why don't you don't do something about this situation. Something meaningful. Maybe that will remedy the anger

with this plea!!!!

QUOTE

To restore trust and confidence in the leadership:

1) hold an immediate all member meeting, open and frank discussion about pertinent issues. No sacred cows. Q n A. Let people air their concerns and let them know their opinions matter. Invite those who have left to participate. Acknowledge mistakes and show they mean business. Those clergy implicated have them confess to the people.

2) Institute such meetings on a regular basis. St Michaels members will have to learn to move from dysfunction to a healthy view of church life. Both clergy and laity will have to learn to operate in a wholly new way. This takes time. It takes a paradigm shift. But it needs to start NOW.

3) assign a parish council

4) assign an outside observer to the parish. This person reports directly to Bates/ Hines as to the state of the parish and measures progress. This assures accountability and a trusted account as to the affairs of SM.

5) Start moving the whole communion away from the dysfunction of manipulated, minimal communication. Abolish secrecy and manipulation. Lead by example. Issue frequent, detailed and pertinent news briefs related to issues facing the ICCEC. The good, the bad and the ugly.

and this other voice.....

QUOTE

My heart is broken about Bishop Adler resigning. There is lots of grieving at St. Michael's. We have all been together for such a long time. My husband was a teenager when he started at the church over 30 years ago. We've watched everyone get married and have children, who are now grown with children of their own. Most everyone is related in one way or another. A few People complain that St. Michael's isn't being told all the dirty details, but who would be so cruel to do that in front of the children. Dan Sharp's children were there last Sunday. Betty Adler's grandchildren were crying because they saw their Grandma cry. Bishop's sweet mother broke down weeping. St. Michael's needs to be a refuge right now.

No one is 'covering up' anything...it was a huge thing to put Dan Sharp before the people, because so many would be so hurt. He has stood before two generations of St. Michael's children and preached to them daily. His own family practically lived at the church all these years. Could you easily wound the wife and children. who are family to you? You'd do everything possible to protect them. Bishop wasn't protecting Dan. He was protecting the innocent. Bishop Kessler loves St. Michael's and wants the best for the people, but do you honestly think he'd look out into the sea of faces that he's watched be born, grow up and have their own children and say "Your 'Dads' did these awful things!" I for one couldn't have born it to watch the families suffer in that way. I love Bishop Adler. I feel angry with him right now. I know about his two alcoholic indiscretions with women and about his prophecy to marry C. I'm angry that he'd do that to Betty! Betty is wonderful in every way. No wonder she turned to alcohol. I hope the real problem for Bishop Adler was the alcohol. I believe he's gotten that under control. Please pray for Betty and St. Michael's. People should be coming to us to help us

and comfort us right now. Not whip us some more. It was on our 'backs' that the CEC began. Lots of sacrifices and hardships from everyone, especially Bishop Adler and his family. I believe Bishop Adler's heart is good. I believe he truly loves us. I've known him for 18 years and have seen his love, generosity, strength, compassion for the people of St. Michael's. I know he wants to be good and please God. A Just Man falls and gets back up. He'll get back up.

very complicated and sad

seraph

Posted by: seraph Oct 25 2007, 12:11 PM

Prayer of Consolation

O God our refuge and our strength....

We need you right now Lord of Life and Mercy.
In your great mercy, comfort those who suffer
and grieve at this very hour.
Wrap your mantle of grace and mercy around all of us.
Give us your divine staying power.
Lord God, infuse wisdom and understanding into the hearts,
minds, and souls of those who seek to alleviate
the pain and anguish of the suffering.
We need you right now Lord of Life and Mercy.
O Lord, hold our feeble hands and grant us protection
from all hurt, harm, and danger from depression and despair.
Give us Lord what we need to lift up and build up
one another in faith, hope, and love.
Strengthen the feeble, raise up the fallen, shield the standing,
heal the hurting, We ask all these things in the precious name
of your Son, Jesus Christ, our Bread of Life.
Holy Mary, Mother of God
Angels and Saints
Be our intercessors.

Amen

yes Lord come to our help!

seraph

Posted by: Ken Follis Oct 25 2007, 12:13 PM

Joni brought ever so much closer to home. Thanks! Folks, just know that God does love you all and has a great future in mind for you. This, too, shall pass! Rom. 8:28 😊

Well said, Seraph! 😊

Posted by: Umbriel Oct 25 2007, 12:40 PM

I understand your position Joni but disagree.

A member meeting with parents deciding whether or not to allow their youth to attend should have been called. No one has to attend such a meeting if it is too hard for them.

How can you move forward if you dont expose all so all can be forgiven?

IF you do not give people a healthy place to vent or inform them of all the facts then you get what you have gotten. Pain and fracturing.

People as a whole seem to be forgiving. Yes confrontation brings out some uglies but it is better for people to get it out and deal with lest it festers.

Because of the approach taken thus far much more harm has been done. People are talking about the situation anyway in and out of SM. It would have been nice for folks to get the correct info from the beginning so things would not morph into this side believes this and that believes that.

Does that mean division would have never taken place. No people may have decided to leave anyway not trusting their leadership but atleast they could have made up their minds based on fact then after days weeks months years of not knowing what to believe.

You say you know of 2 incidents. Mabe there was 2 and not more or mabe there is more and not 2. How do you know when those who may know have kept silent.

The sytem discourages confrontation and revelation. I saw more times than I care to remeber and it still makes me sick. Mainly

sick at myself for not screaming louder than I did but if I broke silence I felt nothing would have changed. My family would have been on the outs and others' jobs, ministries, and reputations would have taken more hits than those who did the wrong.

Look at what you know and ask yourself how long did everyone in power know and how long did they refuse to let you be part of the accountability. Mabe with your prayer, support, and accountability you would have been able to prevent incident number 2.

Posted by: Guest Oct 25 2007, 12:49 PM

I counted four: 3 for Adler and 1 for Sharp.

Let's recall, Swaggert: 2; Bakker:1.

These are what we know about. Perhaps J. Lee Grady from *Charisma* is writing his latest story now.

Posted by: Nemo Oct 25 2007, 01:06 PM

Joni, I really feel for you.

QUOTE

St. Michael's needs to be a refuge right now.

We are all grieving right now. We all are looking for some refuge where we feel safe. For many, St. Michael's was hallowed ground. And if St. Michael's can be shaken, if St. Michael's is not safe, what does that say about the rest of our parishes? Our Communion?

QUOTE

Could you easily wound the wife and children. who are family to you? You'd do everything possible to protect them. Bishop wasn't protecting Dan. He was protecting the innocent. Bishop Kessler loves St. Michael's and wants the best for the people, but do you honestly think he'd look out into the sea of faces that he's watched be born, grow up and have their own children and say "Your 'Dads' did these awful things!" I for one couldn't have born it to watch the families suffer in that way.

Bishop Kessler may be trying to protect the hurt and innocent by his silence, but what about the hurt and grieving? What has he said to support them? People *are* talking. People *already* know what has been going on. How can he bear it to watch the families suffer in this way and do nothing?

QUOTE

People should be coming to us to help us and comfort us right now. Not whip us some more.

Believe me, you all have my love and support. What I find really disconcerting, though, is that you do not seem to have the love and support of the bishops -- at least not visibly. It's been a week and a half, now, and we have no official statement from the pro-tem Patriarch or Primate. Would it be so much to expect an official statement indicating that they care? Or are things still falling apart?

It's hard to be an episcopal church when the bishops are silent.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 25 2007, 01:12 PM

I grieve with you, Joni.

However, I must ask: Is it that difficult to call for an "adults only" gathering? I don't get it! This is not a "whipping" ...I just don't understand.

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 01:33 PM

Dear Joni,

First of all thank you for sharing your experience with us, this in itself was a big step.

you say:

QUOTE

A few People complain that St. Michael's isn't being told all the dirty details, but who would be so cruel to do that in front of the children.

I for one, think we should have an all member meeting. There is no need for children to be there.

Joni, here is our dysfunction: We are afraid to have an open, frank discussion to deal with our problems at hand. We claim to have these close relationships, but yeet we are afraid to talk. People leave and we simply minimize the problem, hush it up, and "move on". That my dear sister is not what a healthy relationship looks like!

You say:

QUOTE

No one is 'covering up' anything

Joni because of the lack of openness (that amounts to covering up), you don't know what really has and is occurring. You are told to trust, but no reason is given. Your founder, patriarch, bishop and rector has resigned. Do you know why? Do you know what his future role will be? Will he back at all? In what capacity? What are the conditions for his return? Legitimate questions all. And if you care for the man, you have ask these questions in love. BUT WE ARE NOT GIVEN ANY SUCH AN OPPORTUNITY

Joni this is not about Dan or Randy. This is not about fondling, alcohol etc. **Those are but symptoms of our dysfunction** Do you think it is normal what has happened? Do you think a two paragraph statement is sufficient to deal with our crisis? I think not.

QUOTE

Bishop Kessler loves St. Michael's and wants the best for the people, but do you honestly think he'd look out into the sea of faces that he's watched be born, grow up and have their own children and say "Your 'Dads' did these awful things!"

Yes he needs to do that, as hard as it is. IT IS THE TRUTH. We can handle it. We are adults, we are not made of porcelain.

QUOTE

Bishop wasn't protecting Dan. He was protecting the innocent.

This is an assumption you are making. Perhaps he was trying to protecting Dan and the innocent. We need to hear from him directly, hear an explanation. As it stands, it looks like a coverup, with dire implications. Why are you so ready to excuse and minimize?

QUOTE

People should be coming to us to help us and comfort us right now.

Every word I have posted on this site, has been in a spirit of love. I have know your husband longer that you have. He is dear to me. Every single one of you. I want healing for all of us. BUT WE CAN'T BE HEALED UNLESS WE ARE WILLING TO LOOK AT OURSELVES IN TRUTH. We need help.

QUOTE

It was on our 'backs' that the CEC began.

Yes have a quarter century on my belt, this is one reason why I don't take this very lightly.

Posted by: Guest Oct 25 2007, 02:00 PM

[How can you move forward if you dont expose all so all can be forgiven?](#)

I think most everything has been exposed. Now we are grieving.

[People as a whole seem to be forgiving. Yes confrontation brings out some uglies but it is better for people to get it out and deal with lest it festers.](#)

The festering is over. We are dealing with the wound. We don't need to keep picking at it.

[IF you do not give people a healthy place to vent or inform them of all the facts then you get what you have gotten. Pain and fracturing.](#)

[Because of the approach taken thus far much more harm has been done. People are talking about the situation anyway in and out of SM. It would have been nice for folks to get the correct info from the beginning so things would not morph into this side believes this and that believes that.](#)

I believe that people should have a place to vent and receive correct information, from the elders. I believe sin should be confessed and exposed if not corrected. I know sin festers. I want St. Michael's to function according to scripture.

My statements were to explain how difficult the situation is here at St. Michael's. We're not like most churches whose congregations have been together for a few years. I can understand why the Bishops didn't run right out and expose everything. We are all family. You tell one person and with in a week the entire church would know. Including the children. Right or wrong, I know they were thinking of our families, not their own necks.

[Look at what you know and ask yourself how long did everyone in power know and how long did they refuse to let you be part of the accountability. Mabe with your prayer, support, and accountability you would have been able to prevent incident number 2.](#)

Well I did know about the first incident and that it was repented of and handled by the Bishops. I know that Dan Sharp's affair was not known about by all the elders. When some found out about it much later, there were great confrontations. Part of the delay in exposing Sharp was that the other woman had not told her husband yet and the elders were waiting for her to do that. But in the mean time, Dan was restricted in his priesthood duties. Right or wrong I believe that was done out of compassion for the families involved. Giving them a chance to prepare for the big explosion to come. Bishop's prophecy about marrying C was confronted by the elders also. It was not taken lightly at all.

Joni

Posted by: Umbriel Oct 25 2007, 02:03 PM

To Anyone

No coverup

Did you not read the statement last year.

http://ceccrisis.info/StatementPatriarchsCouncil0906_Revision1.pdf still holds a copy of it.

Where they say and I quote

"There is not a charge of sexual harrassment or sexual misconduct against Bishop Adler or any bishop in the International Communion of the Charismatic Episcopal Church"

This was a outright lie.

No legal charges but still charges not only against Adler but also against Hines.
Adler's charges wer brought against her by S***** M***** and Hines were brought by J*** C*****.

How can you say there is no coverup.

Posted by: Umbriel Oct 25 2007, 02:10 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 25 2007, 03:00 PM)

[How can you move forward if you dont expose all so all can be forgiven?](#)

I think most everything has been exposed. Now we are grieving.

[People as a whole seem to be forgiving. Yes confrontation brings out some uglies but it is better for people to get it out and deal with lest it festers.](#)

The festering is over. We are dealing with the wound. We don't need to keep picking at it.

[IF you do not give people a healthy place to vent or inform them of all the facts then you get what you have gotten. Pain and fracturing.](#)

[Because of the approach taken thus far much more harm has been done. People are talking about the situation anyway in and out of SM. It would have been nice for folks to get the correct info from the beginning so things would not morph into this side believes this and that believes that.](#)

I believe that people should have a place to vent and receive correct information, from the elders. I believe sin should be confessed and exposed if not corrected. I know sin festers. I want St. Michael's to function according to scripture.

My statements were to explain how difficult the situation is here at St. Michael's. We're not like most churches whose congregations have been together for a few years. I can understand why the Bishops didn't run right out and expose everything. We are all family. You tell one person and with in a week the entire church would know. Including the children. Right or wrong, I know they were thinking of our families, not their own necks.

[Look at what you know and ask yourself how long did everyone in power know and how long did they refuse to let you be part of the accountability. Mabe with your prayer, support, and accountability you would have been able to prevent incident number 2.](#)

Well I did know about the first incident and that it was repented of and handled by the Bishops. I know that Dan Sharp's affair was not known about by all the elders. When some found out about it much later, there were great confrontations. Part of the delay in exposing Sharp was that the other woman had not told her husband yet and the elders were waiting for her to do that. But in the mean time, Dan was restricted in his priesthood duties. Right or wrong I believe that was done out of compassion for the families involved. Giving them a chance to prepare for the big explosion to come. Bishop's prophecy about marrying C was confronted by the elders also. It was not taken lightly at all.

Joni

How can you say not taken lightly.

He was sleeping with one of his spiritual children. He should have been shown the door ASAP.

Was it not posted that he was caught in the act in a hotel room. Getting caught produces lightning quick repentance doesnt it.

Excuse me if I do not think restrictment in Priestly duties is fitting enough.

No don tell anyone it would brake this family apart how many sexually abused kids have heard that

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 25 2007, 02:12 PM

There's a book I read, about 3 or 4 years ago, that joined the list of the Five Most Influential Books in my life. It was written in the 50's by an Austrian philosopher named Karl Popper. The title is "The Open Society and Its Enemies, Volume One: Plato".

In the book, Popper shows how Plato (in his book "The Republic") laid out the political philosophy for a closed society in which an elite core was in total control, made the rules, and had ultimate authority. Popper shows how all totalitarian regimes since then have taken their cues from Plato - some admittedly so (both Stalin and Hitler used "The Republic" as a playbook). He then goes on and explains, with great detail, the differences between a CLOSED society and an OPEN society. A closed society is very centralized, non-communicative, and doesn't allow the creativity of "the little guy". An open society is decentralized, very communicative and actually has massive forward movement because of the FREEDOM that anyone and everyone has for innovation, and consequently improvement.

I could keep writing for pages, because this has become a very important philosophy in my life. But, like it or not, we have entered into an era when the Open Society is winning (I, for one, applaud it). The Soviet Union experienced downfall partially because of

fax machines! The Government couldn't control who faxed what to whom. Now with internet and other "open" communications, our whole world is being changed (consider Wikipedia as an example of openness; and Open Office, etc.).

All of this has huge ramifications for the church, whether that church is episcopally structured or not. It's not so much about structure as about philosophy. I won't make the obvious connections with ecclesiology here, I'll leave that up to you. But I do suggest you read the book if you want a good solid philosophy of open society (whether that be business, home, church, civil government). Margaret Thatcher called Popper "my guru" and Vaclav Havel says his writings were the philosophical underpinnings for the downfall of the Soviet regime.

You can read a review (short) that I wrote by going to <http://www.kennethmyers.net/kennethmyers/Books%20%26%20Thoughts.html> and then clicking on Book of the Year.

+Ken
www.kennethmyers.net
bishopkenneth@sbcglobal.net

Posted by: Joni Oct 25 2007, 02:14 PM

Oh Celine,
Why won't you say who you are? Am I really your 'Dear Sister'?

[Joni, here is our dysfunction: We are afraid to have an open, frank discussion to deal with our problems at hand. We claim to have these close relationships, but yeet we are afraid to talk. People leave and we simply minimize the problem, hush it up, and "move on". That my dear sister is not what a healthy relationship looks like!](#)

Go to the elders and talk to them. They'll tell you the truth. Ask Father House. Call Bishop Adler and Kessler.

QUOTE
[Bishop wasn't protecting Dan. He was protecting the innocent. This is an assumption you are making. Perhaps he was trying to protect Dan and the innocent. We need to hear from him directly, hear an explanation. As it stands, it looks like a coverup, with dire implications. Why are you so ready to excuse and minimize?](#)

I make this assumption, because I know Bishop Adler. He isn't evil.
I'm not minimizing the situation. I think it's awful. I'm not making excuses for anyone. Bishop and Dan have been punished. I don't think everyone else needs to be punished too.

Joni

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 02:37 PM

Hi Joni,

Yes you are a "dear sister" as I hold you and your husband in high esteem. We are not enemies because we disagree.

QUOTE
Go to the elders and talk to them. They'll tell you the truth. Ask Father House. Call Bishop Adler and Kessler.

Although I have done so, I am not looking for a private meeting for my private benefit.
These are questions and answers that all member should be privy to. **I want us to heal, as the body of Christ together.**

It is their obligation to share information openly. The onus is on them to disclose. The obligation is not on me to ask them the right questions. I am not the shepherd. Besides, what is there to hide? What is so awful that they can't tell openly?

QUOTE
I don't think everyone else needs to be punished too.
WOW! Even if they are implicated? Why not? You are willing to let sin go unchecked? Aren't leaders to be held to a much higher account?

Are you truly satisfied how this crises has been handled?

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 25 2007, 02:40 PM

QUOTE

Sadly, there are hundreds and hundreds of people who know exactly what you are going through. For many, this was their reality a year or more ago. Why do you suppose so many bishops and so many parishes left last year? Was it all because they wanted to "go to Rome" or "were just dead wood" or "never understood the vision"? Were their concerns last year truly as baseless as many were led to believe? It seems not.

Many of you in pain now never heard of the hurts of those hundreds of people, dozens and dozens of parishes last year, or if you did, you were influenced to disbelieve what was right before you.

Sadly, many now will also not hear of your sorrow, of if they do, will likewise not believe you either or will choose to believe it is an issue that does not effect them at their parish.

Please understand that the very issues you are facing today were faced by many, many, many people a year ago or longer.

A year ago, Bishop Myers, in his open, published letter addressed to the Patriarch Council said that Bishop Adler needed to be removed, be in a place of being helped, not left in a place of leadership. That warning went unheeded.

The concerns expressed by many bishops and people since before the Manila convocation and loudly following was that the leadership of the CEC and particularly the leadership that was seated in San Clemente was dysfunctional.

Yesterday's warnings went unheeded. Those sounding the alarms were marginalized and driven out or left the CEC in droves, and yet their warnings have gone unheeded. Yesterdays' unheeded warnings have become today's pain.

The closed system of the SM and of the CEC just goes on.

Posted by: seraph Oct 25 2007, 02:42 PM

Joni[/QUOTE]

QUOTE

Go to the elders and talk to them. They'll tell you the truth

This sounds suddenly so terrifying.....! Maybe it is because of the experiences we have lived in our communion in the last 2 years...there has been no guarantee this would be the case!

Lord have mercy!

seraph

Posted by: seraph Oct 25 2007, 02:54 PM

QUOTE

charges not only against Adler but also against Hines. Hines were brought by J*** C*****.

What is this about?

seraph

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 03:10 PM

Thank +Ken for that post.

You must be speaking of that much desired paradigm shift!

Joni you said:

"I make this assumption, because I know Bishop Adler. He isn't evil."

I agree he isn't evil (evil as in a wolf in sheep's clothing).

But even by his own admission he has had blackouts due to alcohol and drug problems, and admitted to fondling

This show some very serious lapses in sound judgement. Lapses of judgement that have affected his ability to lead (indeed he is not leading anymore!). This raises more questions and concerns about how this has affected our current leadership, both on a local and national/international level. Wouldn't you agree?

Posted by: Guest Oct 25 2007, 03:39 PM

[WOW! Even if they are implicated? Why not? You are willing to let sin go unchecked? Aren't leaders to be held to a much higher account?](#)

That's not what I meant. I was meaning that alot of people are very hurt who have done nothing wrong. Those people, including myself, want to grieve and get through this. I'm not talking about letting sin go unpunished. I've never said that. Of course leaders are held to a higher account. I never said they weren't.

Joni

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 03:46 PM

Joni,

QUOTE

Those people, including myself, want to grieve and get through this.

To get through to this together, to truly deal with ALL that has happened, we need to properly deal with it. Hushing it up does not promote healing.

The lack of leadership shown only adds to the grief, pain and hardship!

We need our shepherds!

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 04:02 PM

Joni

Do you know why Fr. Kevin Barry, Fr. Jim Cuthbertson and Fr. Jeff Olkie have resigned/left St. Michaels?

These are good "inside the beltway" men with decades (!) of service.

Why have they quit the current leadership? Do you know?

Will you call them and ask?

Posted by: Joni Oct 25 2007, 04:05 PM

[But even by his own admission he has had blackouts due to alcohol and drug problems, and admitted to fondling This show some very serious lapses in sound judgement. Lapses of judgement that have affected his ability to lead \(indeed he is not leading anymore!\). This raises more questions and concerns about how this has affected our current leadership, both on a local and national/international level. Wouldn't you agree?](#)

I have confidence in Bishop Kessler, Father House, Father Powell, Father Harris and Father Powers. I've only seen goodness in them. I personally know one of the other Bishops in the CEC and I have confidence in him too. I don't know enough about anyone else to give them my confidence.

As far as Bishop Adler, I still have confidence that he is a good man who fell down. I don't know why he fell down. I don't understand it. I don't know what the future holds for him.

I want a church to go to that will baptize, marry and bury my family. I want to have Christmas and Easter at church. I want a regular church with liturgy. I want my family and future grandchildren to go to my church. No affairs, alcoholism or fighting. That's all I've ever wanted in a church.

Joni

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 25 2007, 04:09 PM

"Well I did know about the first incident and that it was repented of and handled by the Bishops."

If by the first incident, you are referring to what happened with me, you are mistaken about it having been repented of and handled by the Bishops.

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 04:19 PM

QUOTE

I want a church to go to that will baptize, marry and bury my family. I want to have Christmas and Easter at church. I want a regular church with liturgy. I want my family and future grandchildren to go to my church. No affairs, alcoholism or fighting. That's all I've ever wanted in a church

Yes and Amen!

Unfortunately, affairs, alcoholism or fighting are part of the human experience. Sadly it happens, we all fall short.

When (not if) these type of events occur **how we respond is what sets us apart**. Why would we allow this to break us apart? Sticking our collective head in the sand is not going to cure anything. It will only make it worse as we will not have dealt with what truly ails us.

Posted by: Joni Oct 25 2007, 04:25 PM

[Unfortunately, affairs, alcoholism or fighting are part of the human experience. Sadly it happens, we all fall short.](#)

[When \(not if\) these type of events occur how we respond is what sets us apart. Why would we allow this to break us apart? Sticking our collective head in the sand is not going to cure anything. It will only make it worse as we will not have dealt with what truly ails us.](#)

I agree that the response makes the difference.

I thought you said you and your wife are leaving S. M. Have you changed your mind?

What truly ails us?????

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 04:43 PM

Joni the answer to your question "What truly ails us?" can be found in my posts on this forum "

However if you would like to summarize it, I will be glad to do so.

Posted by: Umbriel Oct 25 2007, 05:04 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 25 2007, 03:54 PM)

QUOTE

charges not only against Adler but also against Hines. Hines were brought by J*** C*****.

What is this about?

seraph

There was a charge and a investigation if you want to know the results you will have to ask your current primate.

Just know of it and that the person claimed stuff happened. Been told he is believable by some and disgruntled by others. All I am stating is that there was an accusation

So when and if you get a answer from Bates you will have to decide whether or not you believe the findings. That is the problem people who may be guilty or people who may be innocent are forced to live under a cloud of suspicion. Your leaders have to make themselves believable by being HONEST and OPEN.

If you are going to turn your communion around you have to have access to the things.

Celine, Seraph: keep fighting and take heart if you are staying.

Joni: realize Celine and Seraph are fighting for that very ideology you mentioned.

If you are willing to love you have to be willing to get hurt.

If you are to get past the hurt you have to be willing to forgive.

In order to forgive you have to know what to forgive.

If you are going to keep from going through the same problems things have to change.

Those who forget history

Posted by: Celine Oct 25 2007, 05:19 PM

QUOTE

I thought you said you and your wife are leaving S. M. Have you changed your mind?

We have not changed our mind. We are resolute and of one mind. For now we are not attending, we are in some sort of exile, a place called limbo.

by staying we enable

by leaving we lose our voice

Thank you Umbriel for the words of encouragement.

Joni, Umbriel is right we are fighting for that very place, for your church. For my church. For that community of Christ's people where there is love and trust and shelter. I will not give up.

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 25 2007, 05:54 PM

Sorry to tell you this, folks, but the CEC is larger than one church in California (however, at this rate, maybe not by much 😞 .)

Maybe when the church was an independent church, it could be a place to go for holidays, baptize, marry and bury your family. But when Adler got a bee in his bonnet and decided to start a DENOMINATION, the CEC became about more than just SM's.

Maybe some folks out in CA who know and love the leadership and are all interrelated don't want to know exactly what is going on...and they sure don't want to have to deal with it because it is painful. I understand that.

But there are parishoners all over the US (and the World) who pay tithes to this church and take spiritual direction from this church and attempt to bring others into this church and they MOST CERTAINLY have the right to know about what is happening with their leadership.

They MOST CERTAINLY have the right to know why their Patriarch is no longer the Patriarch.

They MOST CERTAINLY have the right to inspect financial records.

They MOST CERTAINLY have the right to open disclosure about why emergency HOB meetings are called.

They MOST CERTAINLY have the right to know exactly why the CEC is splitting, why bishops, parishes, entire diocese left/are leaving.

They MOST CERTAINLY have the right to understand the theology of their church.

The CEC was NEVER open about these things. They couldn't even agree on church dogma. And now they want to cover and spin some more. It's sad.

So, I can only imagine the pain of those at SM. Many of us went through similar pain a year ago when our priests and bishops were minimized, silenced and denounced because they spoke up for what was right and they spoke out to their congregations about the TRUTH!

We went through the pain of leaving our congregation where we went for holidays and to baptize, marry and bury our families.

We went through the pain of disillusionment.

We went through the pain of wandering in the desert.

We went through the pain of losing friendships.

We went through the pain of losing our church.

We know and feel the pain that you are experiencing now.

But the answer is not more cover up. The answer is not more lies, half truths, and spin. Parishoners are not mushrooms. They are not innocent children (not all, anyway). The members and the tithers are adults and MUST be allowed to know the truth...the only thing that can set any of us free.

Blessings!

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 25 2007, 06:48 PM

IMHO....There are several issues going on within the CEC... all coloring our reactions to the events of the last days...

* some are related to **personal failings** and the human condition and though painful, not exclusive to SM or the CEC. 😞

* some are related to **leadership style**- The CEC favors a very paternalistic/patriarchal leadership style which tends to view the laity not as equal partners but rather as children or sheep. That is not okay for all...

* some are related to **culture of confidentiality/secretcy** which seems to have flourished at SM and imported throughout the CEC with less than favorable outcomes. 🙄

* some are related to **structures** within the CEC, not well developed, user friendly for those at the top that can be made to exclude those at "the bottom", be they clergy, laity or dissident bishops and parishes... 😞

* some are related to a **loss of confidence** of many in the leadership . 😞

There is no one single solution for all of these, it is not just fixed by prayer gatherings, ignoring the problem, inner healing, the replacement of one leader for another, nor by a single meeting with parishioners. It will take an objective assessment of what ails us and a commitment to profound changes.

I feel that process can not begin without greater openness, not necessarily of the lurid details of failings common to men, but to frank , inclusive conversations about the condition of our church, the challenges ahead and a common vision for the future!

May God help and bless us

seraph

Posted by: **BonnieZ** Oct 25 2007, 06:50 PM

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge Bishop Ken and Shirley Myers and thank them for their participation here.

A year ago, we were begging for comments from the leadership.

Although the Myers have moved on from the CEC to the next step that God has for them, I appreciate their presence here. What they have to say is especially critical to this conversation.

Bp. and Mrs. Myers, your contributions are a blessing and I am grateful for the input you give. I hope you both know how much you are loved and prayed for.

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 25 2007, 06:52 PM

QUOTE (BonnieZ @ Oct 25 2007, 06:50 PM)

A year ago, we were begging for comments from the leadership.

How true..those that left and those that stayed!

Posted by: Fr. Joe Butler Oct 25 2007, 07:33 PM

I am praying for those at St. Michael's and other places that are hurting during this last go round. It is not easy. It really hurts. I was a CEC Deacon and then Priest and was apart of the CEC for almost 14 years. My family and half of my parish left the CEC in May 07 after planning the parish in St. Augustine, FL (Penstcost Sunday 1996- after it closed under Archbishop Woodall in 1995).

I want to say I am sorry, to those who are going through the pain, for not speaking louder about my concerns and not pushing the point harder. I know that it may not have made a differents. The PC would not even listen to the Bishops. Just look at what has happened to my current Bishop - Bishop Kenneth Myers.

Just know that there is healing and restoration. It will take some time. I'm just comeing out of the "fog". You will to.

I just want to say I'm sorry for not being a louder and stronger voice.

May prayers are with you. May God bring healing and grace to all of you.

Posted by: Fr. Joe Butler Oct 25 2007, 07:38 PM

Please forgive my typo's in my last entry. I'm very tired.

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 25 2007, 07:47 PM

Your sin is frogiven. Go and sin no mroe.

Posted by: Fr. Joe Butler Oct 25 2007, 07:51 PM

Thank you so much Shirley.

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 25 2007, 08:04 PM

seraph

As always, very succinct. Clear thinking. Well articulated.

Somehow your last post needs to live on.

If a tree falls in the woods and no one is there to hear it, it does it make a sound?

Blessings

Posted by: seraph Oct 25 2007, 08:05 PM

It does...if only to God!

blessings

seraph

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 25 2007, 09:08 PM

QUOTE (Shirley Myers @ Oct 25 2007, 08:47 PM)

Your sin is frogiven. Go and sin no mroe.



Posted by: seraph Oct 25 2007, 09:26 PM

QUOTE

Shirley Myers... Your sin is frogiven. Go and sin no mroe.

Dear Fr Joe:

Dude it seems like you have been given a license to question, dog and otherwise pester your new bishop....provided you always write neatly and with no spelling errors! 😊

You have been absolved publically of the sin of silence and typos! I will add my Amen to that!!!! I wonder if bishop Myers saw that post and has had time to sort through its implications for himself! 😊

Good to see that the CCR seems moving in a more progressive direction too....absolution not exclusive to male only clergy....wonderful trend!!!!

blessings

seraph 🙏

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 25 2007, 10:02 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 25 2007, 10:26 PM)

QUOTE

Shirley Myers... Your sin is frogiven. Go and sin no mroe.

....

Good to see that the CCR seems moving in a more progressive direction too....absolution not exclusive to male only clergy....wonderful trend!!!!

blessings

seraph 🙏



Posted by: masfa Oct 26 2007, 12:33 AM

QUOTE (Fr. Joe Butler @ Oct 25 2007, 07:33 PM)

I am praying for those at St. Michael's and other places that are hurting during this last go round. It is not easy. It really hurts. I was a CEC Deacon and then Priest and was apart of the CEC for almost 14 years. May family and half of my parish left the CEC in May 07 after planning the parish in St. Augustine, FL (Penstcost Sunday 1996- after it closed under Archbishop Woodall in 1995).

I want to say I am sorry, to those who are going through the pain, for not speaking louder about my concerns and not pushing the point harder. I know that it may not have made a differents. The PC would not even listen to the Bishops. Just look at what has happened to my current Bishop - Bishop Kenneth Myers.

Just know that there is healing and restoration. It will take some time. I'm just comeing out of the "fog". You will to.

I just want to say I'm sorry for not being a louder and stronger voice.

May prayers are with you. May God bring healing and grace to all of you.

My heart is broken about Bishop Adler resigning. There is lots of grieving at St. Michael's. We have all been together for such a long time. My husband was a teenager when he started at the church over 30 years ago. We've watched everyone get married and have children, who are now grown with children of their own. Most everyone is related in one way or another. A few People complain that St. Michael's isn't being told all the dirty details, but who would be so cruel to do that in front of the children. Dan Sharp's children were there last Sunday. Betty Adler's grandchildren were crying because they saw their Grandma cry. Bishop's sweet mother broke down weeping. St. Michael's needs to be a refuge right now. No one is 'covering up' anything...it was a huge thing to put Dan Sharp before the people, because so many would be so hurt. He has stood before two generations of St. Michael's children and preached to them daily. His own family practically lived at the church all these years. Could you easily wound the wife and children. who are family to you? You'd do everything possible to protect them. Bishop wasn't protecting Dan. He was protecting the innocent. Bishop Kessler loves St. Michael's and wants the best for the people, but do you honestly think he'd look out into the sea of faces that he's watched be born, grow up and have their own children and say "Your 'Dads' did these awful things!" I for one couldn't have born it to watch the families suffer in that way. I love Bishop Adler. I feel angry with him right now. I know about his two alcoholic indiscretions with women and about his prophecy to marry C. I'm angry that he'd do that to Betty! Betty is wonderful in every way. No wonder she turned to alcohol. I hope the real problem for Bishop Adler was the alcohol. I believe he's gotten that under control. Please pray for Betty and St. Michael's. People should be coming to us to help us and comfort us right now. Not whip us some more. It was on our 'backs' that the CEC began. Lots of sacrifices and hardships from everyone, especially Bishop Adler and his family.

I believe Bishop Adler's heart is good. I believe he truly loves us. I've known him for 18 years and have seen his love, generosity, strength, compassion for the people of St. Michael's. I know he wants to be good and please God. A Just Man falls and gets back up. He'll get back up.

Joni
leclear8@verizon.net
Mom to Victoria, Nacole, Jamin, Shane, Mark and Kevin

Posted by: Joni Oct 26 2007, 01:23 AM

Do you know why Fr. Kevin Barry, Fr. Jim Cuthbertson and Fr. Jeff Olkie have resigned/left St. Michaels?

These are good "inside the beltway" men with decades (!) of service.

Why have they quit the current leadership? Do you know?

I don't want to comment on them. They are another story...

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 05:35 AM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 26 2007, 01:23 AM)

Do you know why Fr. Kevin Barry, Fr. Jim Cuthbertson and Fr. Jeff Olkie have resigned/left St. Michaels?

These are good "inside the beltway" men with decades (!) of service.

Why have they quit the current leadership? Do you know?

I don't want to comment on them. They are another story...

Why? Did they not share the life of faith with you and the families at St.Michael's? Is their departure from leadership not also painful? Do their stories not impact the community as a whole?

curious

seraph 🙄

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 26 2007, 06:45 AM

QUOTE

IMHO....There are several issues going on within the CEC... all coloring our reactions to the events of the last days...

* some are related to personal failings and the human condition and though painful, not exclusive to SM or the CEC. sad.gif

* some are related to leadership style- The CEC favors a very paternalistic/patriarchal leadership style which tends to view the laity not as equal partners but rather as children or sheep. That is not okay for all...

* some are related to culture of confidentiality/secretcy which seems to have flourished at SM and imported throughout the CEC with less than favorable outcomes. ninja.gif

* some are related to structures within the CEC, not well developed, user friendly for those at the top that can be made to exclude those at "the bottom", be they clergy, laity or dissident bishops and parishes... blink.gif

* some are related to a loss of confidence of many in the leadership . cool.gif

There is no one single solution for all of these, it is not just fixed by prayer gatherings, ignoring the problem, inner healing, the replacement of one leader for another, nor by a single meeting with parishioners. It will

take an objective assessment of what ails us and a commitment to profound changes.

I feel that process can not begin without greater openness, not necessarily of the lurid details of failings common to men, but to frank , inclusive conversations about the condition of our church, the challenges ahead and a common vision for the future!

May God help and bless us

seraph

The difficulty many have believing or trusting in the leadership, as Joni still apparently does, is the above reality stated by seraph. This is not merely a matter of "a good man who fell" or the occasional human failure here or there in the history of the CEC. The problem would appear to be structural and deeply systemic by design to almost guarantee human failure will occur and people will get hurt. There just isn't an open, accountable, healthy system, from top to bottom in place to provide balance.

Some still think of Kessler, House, and the other SM leaders as good men and worthy of their trust to lead and to care for the people of SM. Yet, clearly, aren't these the very men who watched Adler melt down over the past three years and their response was to deny, cover up, prop up, finance him, and enable him?

Also, when a man gropes another woman, makes unwarranted sexual advances, it is not just a "slip up" or sinful act, it is criminal sexual contact.

At the Manila convocation, Bishop Frank Costantino, a man of some knowledge in matters of substance abuse, declared quite openly and publicly, for many to hear, that Adler "was prophesying under the influence".

Yes, it is clear the Adler family is now in great pain, but they knew for over 3 years that he was abusing alcohol and drugs and was envisioning Betty's death and his remarriage to another man's wife, was found groping women altogether too often, and generally in no place to be pastoring a parish, a diocese or a denomination and yet, what intervention was done? The tears? Tears of sorrow? Tears of the sense of loss? Tears of regret? There are many emotions.

His wife knew, his son knew, his daughter knew, his fellow bishops knew, his local bishop's council at SM knew.

Joni and others may still have confidence in the goodness of the leadership of SM and of the bishops of the CEC in general. In the face of the results of that self same leadership, one has to wonder why?

Posted by: Samwise Oct 26 2007, 07:10 AM

And to add to these excellent posts:

1. What the CEC did was TALK about consensus government, but did not follow it. Howard is a great example of that, wherein there is now abundant testimony and written evidence that he did not follow consensus government and simply did what he wanted. The same is becoming a bit clearer now of Adler, and of others bishops and canons and priests at the local level who talk "consensus government" but don't really follow it.
2. What I said a year ago or more--and still adhere to--is that the CEC created its own fiefdoms with bishops. Therefore you do indeed have widely diverse practices at times and instead of a true hierarchy of government like the RCC, you have (even as recently as this week) the argument that +Bates or +Hines can't intervene in the SC diocese. Of course either can, if we truly believe we created the government we were led to believe we had. And if we really KNEW that the CEC was all about bishops having their own fiefdoms, not accountable to anyone, and that consensus government was NOT really being followed, would we have ever joined? I would not have--I was--we were--lied to repeatedly.

As a result many of us were disillusioned when Bates, Davidson and Howard mistreated their own clergy, failed to offer due process, failed to respond to letters of protest or appeal, and these matters were brought to the attention of Adler and San Clemente and NOTHING, absolutely NOTHING, was done. Not even a phone call or letter in response. These bishops wouldn't even let priests retire gracefully from the CEC, or transfer to another diocese, move to another denomination or parish on many occasions.

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 26 2007, 08:08 AM

QUOTE (Samwise @ Oct 26 2007, 07:10 AM)

And to add to these excellent posts:

1. What the CEC did was TALK about consensus government, but did not follow it. Howard is a great example of that, wherein there is now abundant testimony and written evidence that he did not follow consensus government and simply did what he wanted. The same is becoming a bit clearer now of Adler, and of others bishops and canons and priests at the local level who talk "consensus government" but don't really follow it.
2. What I said a year ago or more--and still adhere to--is that the CEC created its own fiefdoms with bishops. Therefore you do indeed have widely diverse practices at times and instead of a true hierarchy of government like the RCC, you have (even as recently as this week) the argument that +Bates or +Hines can't intervene in the SC diocese. Of course either can, if we truly believe we created the government we were led to believe we had. And if we really KNEW that the CEC was all about bishops having their own fiefdoms, not accountable to anyone, and that consensus government was NOT really being followed, would we have ever joined? I would not have--I was--we were--lied to repeatedly.

As a result many of us were disillusioned when Bates, Davidson and Howard mistreated their own clergy, failed to offer due process, failed to respond to letters of protest or appeal, and these matters were brought to the attention of Adler and San Clemente and NOTHING, absolutely NOTHING, was done. Not even a phone call or letter in response. These bishops wouldn't even let priests retire gracefully from the CEC, or transfer to another diocese, move to another denomination or parish on many occasions.

Samwise,

Excellent Point!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I am so glad to be on the other side of this 2nd Round in a year....



Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 08:15 AM

QUOTE (Samwise @ Oct 26 2007, 07:10 AM)

And to add to these excellent posts:

1. What the CEC did was TALK about consensus government, but did not follow it. Howard is a great example of that, wherein there is now abundant testimony and written evidence that he did not follow consensus government and simply did what he wanted. The same is becoming a bit clearer now of Adler, and of others bishops and canons and priests at the local level who talk "consensus government" but don't really follow it.
2. What I said a year ago or more--and still adhere to--is that the CEC created its own fiefdoms with bishops. Therefore you do indeed have widely diverse practices at times and instead of a true hierarchy of government like the RCC, you have (even as recently as this week) the argument that +Bates or +Hines can't intervene in the SC diocese. Of course either can, if we truly believe we created the government we were led to believe we had. And if we really KNEW that the CEC was all about bishops having their own fiefdoms, not accountable to anyone, and that consensus government was NOT really being followed, would we have ever joined? I would not have--I was--we were--lied to repeatedly.

As a result many of us were disillusioned when Bates, Davidson and Howard mistreated their own clergy, failed to offer due process, failed to respond to letters of protest or appeal, and these matters were brought to the attention of Adler and San Clemente and NOTHING, absolutely NOTHING, was done. Not even a phone call or letter in response. These bishops wouldn't even let priests retire gracefully from the CEC, or transfer to another diocese, move to another denomination or parish on many occasions.

Sam:

Even in the best of circumstances "consensus government" does not provide the balance and protection we, being human, need...! It may have to a certain extent worked for a while at the parish level in St Michael's but that is hardly the test of soundness and of time!

It sounded great...I remember the quote in the very earliest CEC documents, "*the bishop will not do anything without the consent of all*". As it was further explained it turned out to be quite different...and the results of its implementation not just at SM but throughout the CEC have been quite disturbing.

Concerns about consensus government as I have seen it applied in the CEC...

1. rector's councils are **chosen, members appointed** by the rector/bishop/patriarch and serve at his pleasure- dangers: we all tend to pick people we like and agree with us- it makes life easier ...not too healthy for governing a church!
2. rector's council are **advisory only**- "ruling elders" do not have to abide by the consensus or input from the "non ruling" elders. There is no voting, debating, negotiating... and after all is been said...the onus is on the rector/bishop/patriarch to say ...this is the word of the Lord.
3. rector's councils **exclude from participation** people who could have valuable input- men only, some places only clergy. That creates huge blind spots....there are female perspectives, lay people's perspectives that are lost.
4. **relationship requirements** for participation in councils- outings, retreats for them only, Adler discussed the importance of this relational aspect of consensus. How concerning....a patriarchal oligarchy...aka good old boys club, ...the few beholden to you by deference to your office, friendship, similarities in thought....a few white guys, conservative, republicans, smoking cigars and drinking scotch always in power...? scary thought!
5. **NO debate, no vote**....there is a spiritualization inherent in the system....tongues and prophecy and "seeking the word of the Lord" taking precedence over rational, painful examination of options and the working over disagreements, difficult compromises that are realistic in the life of all institutions. Great potential for spiritual manipulation...If God says buy that shopping center...to disagree is what...?
6. **Confidentiality v.s Secrecy**- requirements of "no discussions outside the council" taken to extremes lead to a culture where all is secret, questions and dialogue limited to a very narrow space, input limited to that of a select few....! There is a vacuum of information and a culture of silence that can be fostered...we have witnessed some of the fruits of that!
7. **Closed system throughout**- my son pointed this out to me...! In reality the only input at the very top is that of the PC members....! Each rector's council is pretty much a closed unit...allowing only the input the ruling elder and his peers allow! A couple of guys really make all the decisions for the CEC based only on the criteria they choose.... does not seem healthy!
8. **Spiritualization**- "The Government of God"- how serious that sounds, almost makes you afraid to question its premises. Yet it is no such thing objectively, not really practiced that way in the Bible, nor consistently in history....it is the adaptation denomination wide of a government style which per Adler himself...was taught to him by +kessler and implemented at San Clemente. When did that become GOD's GOVERNMENT? This is a serious concern....How can God's government be questioned ,much less improved upon???? Rome makes such claims, we have neither the history nor the theological underpinnings to come close to that!

I am sure you could all add your concerns to mine, and also that in some parishes and dioceses the system has worked well. Yet, for fallible men in a complicated world...there seem to be way too many potential pitfalls for mismanagement, secrecy, abuse, spiritual manipulation, exclusion, lack of accountability, and control.

NO offense is meant for those who believe in the system...but honest criticism and concerns should be heeded.... !!! In my experience consensus government is NO SUCH THING...it is government by "a few men" even a "few good men". After this decade long experiment, I for one, am not okay with that!

blessings

seraph 🙏

Posted by: Nemo Oct 26 2007, 08:36 AM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 26 2007, 08:15 AM)

Concerns about consensus government as I have seen it applied in the CEC...

You forgot probably the biggest problem of all: In a "consensus government", the loudest, most forceful personality rules the day. Look at what happened last year with the Bishops. Without Bishop Constantino to back them up, the dissenting voices could not seem to slip a word in edgewise (at least, that was my take on the situation). At the end of the day, they got fed up and left. Now, just the loudest voices and strongest personalities remain.

The funny thing is, the remaining bishops claimed they had no idea that the other bishops had serious issues. Were the quiet men afraid to speak up, or did everyone else forget to listen?

Posted by: wakeup Oct 26 2007, 08:38 AM

QUOTE

Do you know why Fr. Kevin Barry, Fr. Jim Cuthbertson and Fr. Jeff Olkie have resigned/left St. Michaels?

.....

I don't want to comment on them. They are another story...

This is a MAJOR point that can't be glossed over. These three priests are 'a different story' because they got fed up with the bull had the b***s to stand up and demand answers. Now they, along with the others who have left, are being DEMONIZED for leaving. By whom? The LEADERSHIP. These are the same three men who have been there for decades! Who helped found the church! Great, strong men of God.

Joni and others -- this sounds very much like a cult. Everything is fine until you disagree. God forbid you would ever leave the (true) church. We will smear and shun you.....DUH!!! WAKEUP!!!

For many people, these men (Adler, Kessler, Sharp, House) are used as the standard of truth. As long as the 'leaders' tell them what they want to hear, they give their undying allegiance. No one gets the benefit of the doubt except them. Period. End of story.

Sad. Very sad.

Posted by: Joni Oct 26 2007, 08:45 AM

At the Manila convocation, Bishop Frank Costantino, a man of some knowledge in matters of substance abuse, declared quite openly and publicly, for many to hear, that Adler "was prophesying under the influence".

Yes, it is clear the Adler family is now in great pain, but they knew for over 3 years that he was abusing alcohol and drugs and was envisioning Betty's death and his remarriage to another man's wife, was found groping women altogether too often, and generally in no place to be pastoring a parish, a diocese or a denomination and yet, what intervention was done? The tears? Tears of sorrow? Tears of the sense of loss? Tears of regret? There are many emotions.

His wife knew, his son knew, his daughter knew, his fellow bishops knew, his local bishop's council at SM knew.

Why didn't the Bishop's take care of this problem years ago if they knew what was happening? Why would they leave the Patriarch to be disciplined by his wife, son, daughter and parish of St. Michael's? How could Betty or Mia have stopped him???

I thought it was the Bishops responsibility to take care of the Patriarch and the CEC. Was Bishop Adler all by himself in leading the CEC, no wonder the pressure got to him and he became an alcoholic! Where were the men who were supposed to take care of him? Were the Bishops afraid of him? The Bishops should have fought with him until everything was settled according to the scripture. That's what they are there for. To make sure everything is running according to scripture, *for the people in the CEC*. It sounds to me that only a few Bishops even tried to get the problems solved. Why didn't the other Bishops support them?

It sounds as if you think our parish of St. Michael's is supposed to take the full responsibility for Bishop Adler's fall. I believe, Because The Bishops of the CEC did not take care of the Primate that little St. Michael's church gave you (the CEC), we no longer have our beloved Father Adler/ Bishop Adler at St. Michael's. You are throwing the mess in our laps and saying it's our fault. No one could have run the CEC so alone, with out getting into trouble.

Posted by: Samwise Oct 26 2007, 08:53 AM

I sure do find myself agreeing with Seraph on all these points.
Sam

Posted by: Nemo Oct 26 2007, 09:04 AM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 26 2007, 08:45 AM)

Why didn't the Bishop's take care of this problem years ago if they knew what was happening? Why would they leave the Patriarch to be disciplined by his wife, son, daughter and parish of St. Michael's? How could Betty or Mia have stopped

him???

I thought it was the Bishops responsibility to take care of the Patriarch and the CEC. Was Bishop Adler all by himself in leading the CEC, no wonder the pressure got to him and he became an alcoholic! Where were the men who were supposed to take care of him?

Umm, they did try to address this problem. A couple of years ago, when the IDA mess started to unravel, a council was convened under the auspices of Archbishop Sly, the Senior Bishop at the time, to investigate allegations against Abp. Adler and offer him some sort of help. Somehow an impeachment was avoided, and eventually Sly and the others who took part ended up leaving the Communion.

Then, after another council meeting, Abp Adler was supposed to step down for a while to rest and heal, under the direction of Bp Bates, I think (my memory is fuzzy here - does anyone have more details?). I'm not sure that this "time off" ever really happened.

Later, Bp Painter and Bp Myers raised serious issues concerning Abp Adler before the House. They were not heeded, and they also left.

You cannot fault the House of Bishops. They sincerely tried, but they never really had the power to bring about any changes. It seems that anyone who could help ended up leaving in frustration.

Posted by: Ken Follis Oct 26 2007, 09:07 AM

QUOTE (Samwise @ Oct 26 2007, 08:53 AM)

I sure do find myself agreeing with Seraph on all these points.
Sam

The gall! 😞



Posted by: Celine Oct 26 2007, 09:09 AM

Joni I asked you:

QUOTE

Do you know why Fr. Kevin Barry, Fr. Jim Cuthbertson and Fr. Jeff Olkie have resigned/left St. Michaels?

These are good "inside the beltway" men with decades (!) of service.

Why have they quit the current leadership? Do you know?

And you answered with:

QUOTE

I don't want to comment on them. They are another story...

What other story are they? Have you talked them?

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 26 2007, 09:10 AM

QUOTE (Nemo @ Oct 26 2007, 09:04 AM)

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 26 2007, 08:45 AM)

Why didn't the Bishop's take care of this problem years ago if they knew what was happening? Why would they leave the Patriarch to be disciplined by his wife, son, daughter and parish of St. Michael's? How could Betty or Mia have stopped him???

I thought it was the Bishops responsibility to take care of the Patriarch and the CEC. Was Bishop Adler all by himself in leading the CEC, no wonder the pressure got to him and he became an alcoholic! Where were the men who were supposed to take care of him?

Umm, they did try to address this problem. A couple of years ago, when the IDA mess started to unravel, a council was convened under the auspices of Archbishop Sly, the Senior Bishop at the time, to investigate allegations against Abp. Adler and offer him some sort of help. Somehow an impeachment was avoided, and eventually Sly and the others who took part ended up leaving the Communion.

Then, after another council meeting, Abp Adler was supposed to step down for a while to rest and heal, under the direction of Bp Bates, I think (my memory is fuzzy here - does anyone have more details?). I'm not sure that this "time off" ever really happened.

Later, Bp Painter and Bp Myers raised serious issues concerning Abp Adler before the House. They were not heeded,

and they also left.

You cannot fault the House of Bishops. They sincerely tried, but they never really had the power to bring about any changes. It seems that anyone who could help ended up leaving in frustration.

Well said Nemo

Thanks 🙏🙏

Posted by: Umbriel Oct 26 2007, 09:14 AM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 26 2007, 09:45 AM)

At the Manila convocation, Bishop Frank Costantino, a man of some knowledge in matters of substance abuse, declared quite openly and publicly, for many to hear, that Adler "was prophesying under the influence".

Yes, it is clear the Adler family is now in great pain, but they knew for over 3 years that he was abusing alcohol and drugs and was envisioning Betty's death and his remarriage to another man's wife, was found groping women altogether too often, and generally in no place to be pastoring a parish, a diocese or a denomination and yet, what intervention was done? The tears? Tears of sorrow? Tears of the sense of loss? Tears of regret? There are many emotions.

His wife knew, his son knew, his daughter knew, his fellow bishops knew, his local bishop's council at SM knew.

Why didn't the Bishops take care of this problem years ago if they knew what was happening? Why would they leave the Patriarch to be disciplined by his wife, son, daughter and parish of St. Michael's? How could Betty or Mia have stopped him???

I thought it was the Bishops responsibility to take care of the Patriarch and the CEC. Was Bishop Adler all by himself in leading the CEC, no wonder the pressure got to him and he became an alcoholic! Where were the men who were supposed to take care of him? Were the Bishops afraid of him? The Bishops should have fought with him until everything was settled according to the scripture. That's what they are there for. To make sure everything is running according to scripture, *for the people in the CEC*. It sounds to me that only a few Bishops even tried to get the problems solved. Why didn't the other Bishops support them?

It sounds as if you think our parish of St. Michael's is supposed to take the full responsibility for Bishop Adler's fall.

I believe, Because The Bishops of the CEC did not take care of the Primate that little St. Michael's church gave you (the CEC), we no longer have our beloved Father Adler/ Bishop Adler at St. Michael's. You are throwing the mess in our laps and saying it's our fault. No one could have run the CEC so alone, with out getting into trouble.

You are misunderstanding what is being said.

Bishops tried and were marginalized. No one is saying it is the laity at SM but yes Kessler and Adler's support staff deserve plenty not all but a good bit of the blame for being enablers. Yes Men. Enforcing silence. Spinning the truth.

Look at a year ago. People who were speaking out were called liars.

Look at <http://ceccrisis.info> and look at the HOB/PC Releases. They are lies or at minimum at very dishonest set of statements.

Look at the one released last week where it states Adler retired. You yourself know he was forced to resign. Been told Jones was the only one who wanted to keep him. After all that has been done he wanted to keep him. I really hope I have been misinformed but I am not holding out my breath. I believe in grace but not at the expense of the innocent and not at the expense for any potential healing for Adler and his family. This before the meeting crap is that just crap. The decision was made and then a out was conceived so as little damage as possible would be done to the "Rep" of the ICCEC.

And you know what it has worked by and large. The masses do not even to know to pray for SM because they think everything is hunky dory. They think after so many long years of bringing us the kingdom that Adler is riding off into the sunset after fighting hard to deliver the church through any and all obstacles to the world. Is this overly grandiose idea of what the average pew person thinks. Mabe but it might as well be because what is happening in SM means nothing to them. They are little better than AG people that take communion every Sunday and have cool ripped off logos well now a new one too I guess. What does a primate or patriarch mean to them. Most giggle thinking of a ape in a mitre everytime the word primate comes up in the prayerbook. There has been some defections to Rome and to the east. The p. has retired. Oh well when is the next worship service next prophecy gathering the next ... I am not trying to belittle anyone or anything but last year before I left no one missed a beat. BAU If there is a problem in SC then it must be there fault cause all we hear is everything is OK The Bishops met and the Lord said it is good.

We agree all the remaining Bishops are to blame but little SM will be the scape goat. It will even be forgotten as time goes on a footnote in the history of the CEC if Kessler is passed over for the P.

This is why it is so dangerous to just move on without confronting the issues

update

Thanks Celine for the confirmation and thanks to those who pm me the info

Posted by: Celine Oct 26 2007, 09:24 AM

QUOTE

Look at the one released last week where it states Adler retired. You yourself know he was forced to resign. Been told Jones was the only one who wanted to keep him. After all that has been done he wanted to keep him. I really hope I have

been misinformed but I am not holding out my breath.

No you are informed correctly, unfortunately.

QUOTE

This is why it is so dangerous to just move on without confronting the issues

Yes as we all know that just as on a personal level, unless we deal with our issues, while "moving on" we simply take our "demons" with us. So it is on a corporate level. We "move on" but we end up having to fight the same problems over and over again. When will we learn?

Posted by: Celine Oct 26 2007, 09:33 AM

Joni:

QUOTE

Why didn't the Bishop's take care of this problem years ago if they knew what was happening? Why would they leave the Patriarch to be disciplined by his wife, son, daughter and parish of St. Michael's? How could Betty or Mia have stopped him???

I share you sentiments completely! You are asking the right questions!

QUOTE

Where were the men who were supposed to take care of him? Were the Bishops afraid of him?

Yes I believe many were afraid.

QUOTE

The Bishops should have fought with him until everything was settled according to the scripture. That's what they are there for. To make sure everything is running according to scripture, for the people in the CEC. It sounds to me that only a few Bishops even tried to get the problems solved. Why didn't the other Bishops support them?

Yes a systemic failure due to deep seated dysfunction. When there is no open communication, people live in a web of lies. As the Patriarch he was at the very top, and things trickle down from the top down....

QUOTE

It sounds as if you think our parish of St. Michael's is supposed to take the full responsibility for Bishop Adler's fall. I believe, Because The Bishops of the CEC did not take care of the Primate that little St. Michael's church gave you (the CEC), we no longer have our beloved Father Adler/ Bishop Adler at St. Michael's. You are throwing the mess in our laps and saying it's our fault. No one could have run the CEC so alone, with out getting into trouble.

No Joni, it is a shared responsibility. I have not seen anyone here pointed fingers ONLY at SM, or only at Adler, or only at the PC/HOB. We are all in this mess together. Of course those at the top are held at a higher standard of culpability.....

Posted by: Celine Oct 26 2007, 09:38 AM

Ahhh "Wakeup" you are very perceptive indeed! You are putting your finger right on the heart of what ails us:

QUOTE

This is a MAJOR point that can't be glossed over. These three priests are 'a different story' because they got fed up with the bull had the b***s to stand up and demand answers. Now they, along with the others who have left, are being DEMONIZED for leaving. By whom? The LEADERSHIP. These are the same three men who have been there for decades! Who helped found the church! Great, strong men of God.

Joni and others -- this sounds very much like a cult. Everything is fine until you disagree. God forbid you would ever leave the (true) church. We will smear and shun you.....DUH!!! WAKEUP!!!

For many people, these men (Adler, Kessler, Sharp, House) are used as the standard of truth. As long as the 'leaders' tell them what they want to hear, they give their undying allegiance. No one gets the benefit of the doubt except them. Period. End of story.

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 09:48 AM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 26 2007, 08:45 AM)

b)Why didn't the Bishop's take care of this problem years ago if they knew what was happening? Why would they leave the Patriarch to be disciplined by his wife, son, daughter and parish of St. Michael's? How could Betty or Mia have stopped him???

I thought it was the Bishops responsibility to take care of the Patriarch and the CEC. Was Bishop Adler all by himself in leading the CEC, no wonder the pressure got to him and he became an alcoholic! Where were the men who were supposed to take care of him? Were the Bishops afraid of him? The Bishops should have fought with him until everything was settled according to the scripture. That's what they are there for. To make sure everything is running according to scripture, *for the people in the CEC*. It sounds to me that only a few Bishops even tried to get the problems solved. Why didn't the other Bishops support them?

It sounds as if you think our parish of St. Michael's is supposed to take the full responsibility for Bishop Adler's fall.

I believe, Because The Bishops of the CEC did not take care of the Primate that little St. Michael's church gave you (the CEC), we no longer have our beloved Father Adler/ Bishop Adler at St. Michael's. You are throwing the mess in our laps and saying it's our fault. No one could have run the CEC so alone, with out getting into trouble. [/b]

Dearest Joni:

You have hit on the elephant in the living room...

Bishop Adler and those around him at St. Michael set up the govermental system in the CEC whereby the Patriarch has ultimate authority and any discipline very difficult.

Of course your parish could not discipline him...! Messiah and the SE province could not do that to +Howard either ... AND for years the patriach, the ultimate authority did not either....THAT was/is PART OF THE PROBLEM!

The rest of us in the CEC came into rules of government set up at ST MICHAEL'S...by +Adler, +Kessler and others...rules that protected them, shielded them.....That's all great but when there is a problem it becomes very difficult for anyone to intervene! The HOB tried to voice concerns last year to no avail...the PC handled it!!!!

Our hearts go out to you, we hurt with you....but it was the Patriarch's Council responsibility to respond to the concerns VOICED throughout the communion for years now.....! At least one of those, member of the PC, HOB, Bishops's and rector's council remains in leadership at Saint Michael's and is now the diocesan for San Clemente ...why do you not ask him why they chose not to act??

in all charity

seraph

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 10:13 AM

QUOTE

The Bishops should have fought with him until everything was settled according to the scripture. That's what they are there for. To make sure everything is running according to scripture, for the people in the CEC

I do wish..., maybe selfishly and do apologize if I offend..., that instead of departures there had been continued engagement in battle by all our bishops! Loyal but vocal and active opposition among bishops sure beats any similar concept among lower clergy and laity....!

I am sure those who left acted sincerely after much personal heartache, looking to protect their families, parishes , diocese...and my simplistic viewpoint here does not do justice to those who felt they had to leave...! Unfortunately...there is the rest of the people of the CEC, like Joni says...! We kind of were left to our own fate with no champions among the sheperds to voice our concerns!

Maybe that is a lesson we have learned about being a body.... and will help us stay together in the CEC or wherever God leads us ...as this continues to unfold...

respectfully

seraph

Posted by: Fr. Joe Butler Oct 26 2007, 10:47 AM

QUOTE

do wish..., maybe selfishly and do apologize if I offend..., that instead of departures there had been continued engagement in battle by all our bishops! Loyal but vocal and active opposition among bishops sure beats any similar concept among lower clergy and laity....!

I am sure those who left acted sincerely after much personal heartache, looking to protect their families, parishes , diocese...and my simplistic viewpoint here does not do justice to those who felt they had to leave...! Unfortunately...there is the rest of the people of the CEC, like Joni says...! We kind of were left to our own fate with no champions among the sheperds to voice our concerns!

Maybe that is a lesson we have learned about being a body.... and will help us stay together in the CEC or wherever God leads us ...as this continues to unfold...

respectfully

seraph

Seraph,

As you know the Bishops had no real power. When the Canons were changed in about 1997 to 1999, the House of Bishop lost out big time. The Patriarch had all the power. The House of Bishops was just for advise and prayer. The Primate's Council and Patriarch's Council were not much better. If we knew what we do today when this change occurred we would have made a louder noise about it. But I would guess that the parish priest in most Diocese did not even know it happened. Keep it all a secret.

Posted by: Guest Oct 26 2007, 11:08 AM

The true story of the CEC experiment: The CEC was originally known as the church which materialized Convergence and followed the Chicago Call. However when "our theologians" did not join us, namely Dr. Thomas Oden and Dr. Bob Webber, many asked, "Who are we, really?" In fact, Bishop Wayne and Stephanie were doing a better job at Convergence than we were with their CEEC. Heck, there were Baptist Churches adopting Convergence and their churches were exploding. Not us! We were losing members. We were lucky to get a storefront and out of the basements. But then in 1997, the HOB-bits had a plan. We will parade Government by Consensus. That will be our claim to fame! (This was nothing really; better to have board of deacons or trustees make decisions) So, soon enough, we got storefronts as we grew a bit by having babies born as members of the CEC and youth who were now tithe-paying members. Folks started heading East and West, left and right. What do we do? Well the Patriarch, +Jones, +Holloway and +Davidson were convinced that the CEC had lost its prophetic edge and the prophecies started flowing but so was the booze and the two did not mix well. Bishops start falling like dominoes. First Smith, then Moates and Howard, Constantino dies, and finally Adler-who could oppose the Prophet/ Patriarch and still get a paycheck? The End. 🙄

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 11:13 AM

QUOTE (Fr. Joe Butler @ Oct 26 2007, 10:47 AM)

Seraph,

As you know the Bishops had no real power. When the Canons were changed in about 1997 to 1999, the House of Bishop lost out big time. The Patriarch had all the power. The House of Bishops was just for advise and prayer. The Primate's Council and Patriarch's Council were not much better. If we knew what we do today when this change occurred we would have made a louder noise about it. But I would guess that the parish priest in most Diocese did not even know it happened. Keep it all a secret.

Joseph+ :

Do excuse my momentary wishful thinking...

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Joni Oct 26 2007, 11:16 AM

[I do wish..., maybe selfishly and do apologize if I offend..., that instead of departures there had been continued engagement in battle by all our bishops! Loyal but vocal and active opposition among bishops sure beats any similar concept among lower clergy and laity....!](#)

I agree with you. That's what I wish would have happened.

[The rest of us in the CEC came into rules of government set up at ST MICHAEL'S...by +Adler, +Kessler and others...rules that protected them, shielded them.....That's all great but when there is a problem it becomes very difficult for anyone to intervene! The HOB tried to voice concerns last year to no avail...the PC handled it!!!!](#)

Consensuses Government has been the banner of St. Michael's from the beginning. That's what made me feel secure at St. Michael's. No 'One' person leading us. What happened to that? A group of men keeping each other 'in check'.

[As you know the Bishops had no real power. When the Canons were changed in about 1997 to 1999, the House of Bishop lost out big time. The Patriarch had all the power. The House of Bishops was just for advise and prayer. The Primate's Council and Patriarch's Council were not much better. If we knew what we do today when this change occurred we would have made a louder noise about it. But I would guess that the parish priest in most Diocese did not even know it happened. Keep it all a secret.](#)
I didn't know about this change.

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 11:17 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 26 2007, 11:08 AM)

The true story of the CEC experiment: The CEC was originally known as the church which materialized Convergence and followed the Chicago Call. However when "our theologians" did not join us, namely Dr. Thomas Oden and Dr. Bob Webber, many asked, "Who are we, really?" In fact, Bishop Wayne and Stephanie were doing a better job at Convergence than we were with their CEEC. Heck, there were Baptist Churches adopting Convergence and their churches were exploding. Not us! We were losing members. We were lucky to get a storefront and out of the basements. But then in 1997, the HOB-bits had a plan. We will parade Government by Consensus. That will be our claim to fame! (This was nothing really; better to have board of deacons or trustees make decisions) So, soon enough, we got storefronts as we grew a bit by having babies born as members of the CEC and youth who were now tithe-paying

members. Folks started heading East and West, left and right. What do we do? Well the Patriarch, +Jones, +Holloway and +Davidson were convinced that the CEC had lost its prophetic edge and the prophecies started flowing but so was the booze and the two did not mix well. Bishops start falling like dominoes. First Smith, then Moates and Howard, Constantino dies, and finally Adler-who could oppose the Prophet/ Patriarch and still get a paycheck? The End. 🙄

Dear guest:

I do respect your perspective BUT, as far as consensus, distictly remember when +Adler visited the parish I was part of in the very early 90's . He touted government by consensus as what he had learned from Bishop Kesser, explained it and that was but the beginning...

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Guest Oct 26 2007, 11:19 AM

The predicate verb for that sentence is "parade". Thanks!

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 11:30 AM

QUOTE

Consensus Government has been the banner of St. Michael's from the beginning. That's what made me feel secure at St. Michael's. No 'One' person leading us. What happened to that? A group of men keeping each other 'in check'.

Therein dearest... the spin! The theory sounds great...accountability...among MEN!Or is it among...buddies??

In practice, unfortunately, a strong personality can either control or manipulate the rest, friends are tempted to cover up for each other, the fear of being excluded or out of the group keeps some in check ! And the laity, like you...led like sheep, cared for like children, kept in a dependent and totally irresponsible state...until the pie hits the fan...

For a system like that to work best NO ONE man can have authority to appoint or dismiss the rest, all have to be on equal footing, equal voice and weight of decision making...there has to be true independence in thought and action without fear of consequences.....otherwise it may turn out to be more like ONE controlling and surrounded by either robots, accomplices or bodyguards.

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Guest Oct 26 2007, 11:34 AM

The CDC (Charismatic Democratic Church) with Pope Seraph, the first among equals.

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 12:04 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 26 2007, 11:34 AM)

The CDC (Charismatic Democratic Church) with Pope Seraph, the first among equals.

Dear guest...this sounds wonderful!

My first act as POPE... abolish the papacy...!

democratic....pope? surely you jest!

Is that what a church where all are treated as adults and all orders of ministry including the laity have a valid voice means to you?

I suppose you like the present arrangement...more power to you!

seraph

Posted by: Nemo Oct 26 2007, 12:05 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 26 2007, 11:30 AM)

In practice, unfortunately, a strong personality can either control or manipulate the rest, friends are tempted to cover up for each other, the fear of being excluded or out of the group keeps some in check ! And the laity, like you...led like sheep, cared for like children, kept in a dependent and totally irresponsible state...until the pie hits the fan...

This is really no different from any church government -- all participants can be manipulated somehow, no matter what the model is. What is dangerous about Consensus Government is that it opens the door to allow a person's spirituality to be brought into

question. If you do not agree with me, and certainly I am hearing from God, then what is wrong with you? If I have a "clear word", and you are still looking at pros and cons "in the flesh", then where is your faith?

This sort of pressure is rarely overt, but I think it is subconsciously present in any Rector's Council that seeks to follow the St. Michael's model. Participants may not even be aware of it, but I think it inhibits free discussion for fear of not being "spiritual enough".

Has Consensus Government existed in the past, or did the CEC make it up out of whole cloth?

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 26 2007, 05:04 PM

QUOTE (Nemo @ Oct 26 2007, 12:05 PM)

Has Consensus Government existed in the past, or did the CEC make it up out of whole cloth?

I can only especulate about this having heard +Adler himself say in a public meeting that this form of government was taught to him by +Kessler and adopted in the church that eventually became St. Michael's.

A more definitive answer to this question would be interesting but that would be way above my pay grade and security clearance...

any takers?

seraph

Posted by: **Shirley Myers** Oct 26 2007, 05:24 PM

A google search alone on "Consensus Government" as well as "Consensus Government + church" is pretty insightful. It's clearly not the invention of the CEC.

But hey, addressing this is beyond my pay grade too.

I just get payed to absolve people of their typos. "Mea typo, mea typo, mea maxima typo."

It's a dirty job, but somebody's gotta do it.

Shirley

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 26 2007, 05:30 PM

QUOTE (Shirley Myers @ Oct 26 2007, 05:24 PM)

"Mea typo, mea typo, mea maxima typo."

It's a dirty job, but somebody's gotta do it.

Shirley



Posted by: **Fr. J. FreeMan** Oct 26 2007, 05:34 PM

Joni: [Why didn't the Bishop's take care of this problem years ago if they knew what was happening? Why would they leave the Patriarch to be disciplined by his wife, son, daughter and parish of St. Michael's? How could Betty or Mia have stopped him???](#) I thought it was the Bishops responsibility to take care of the Patriarch and the CEC. Was Bishop Adler all by himself in leading the CEC, no wonder the pressure got to him and he became an alcoholic! Where were the men who were supposed to take care of him? Were the Bishops afraid of him? The Bishops should have fought with him until everything was settled according to the scripture. That's what they are there for. To make sure everything is running according to scripture, for the people in the CEC. It sounds to me that only a few Bishops even tried to get the problems solved. Why didn't the other Bishops support them? It sounds as if you think our parish of St. Michael's is supposed to take the full responsibility for Bishop Adler's fall. I believe, Because The Bishops of the CEC did not take care of the Primate that little St. Michael's church gave you (the CEC), we no longer have our beloved Father Adler/ Bishop Adler at St. Michael's. You are throwing the mess in our laps and saying it's our fault. No one could have run the CEC so alone, with out getting into trouble.

Whoa, whoa, whoa!

It grieves me to hear of the anguish at St. Michael's. I have worshiped there many times. I have known Bp Kessler for 20 or more years. I have known Fr. Cuthbertson for almost the same time. One of my daughters dated one of his sons for a while. I have entertained clergy members from St. Michaels, just as they have entertained my wife and me on occasion. I hurt for Priscilla Sharp. She virtually held the whole ICCEC together while Abp. Adler was abrogating his responsibility to "pray" and "offer incense" on his back porch for months. We bleed the same, but it is no more, nor any deeper than what we suffered under Abp. Moats or under the firestorm that occurred in the CEC a year ago.

The church in Tucson and the Southwest Province underwent a bitter firestorm six years ago at the hands of Abp. Moats. He was

lying to us, and mistreating the clergy and laity, misappropriating money (where did the money from the sale of the Cathedral go???)—into his pockets, I can assure you), and abusing the power of his office. We were powerless against him. For the slightest provocation he would “set us aside” and deny us from ministry. We begged for San Clemente to help us. Instead we were told that they could not interfere. After all, he was “just a cantankerous old cuss, but he is a godly man. Be patient, God will speak to him and correct him.” FINALLY, after he was caught in a lie involving Bp. Kessler, something was done. But not until the Southwest Province and the church in Tucson was in shambles.

A year ago Archbishop Adler was confronted about his “shortcomings,” but we were told that there are “no charges” and “nothing happened.” Some bishops swore that they were there and saw that nothing happened, while other Bishops swore that they too were there and they DID see something transpire. One side was validated, the other side was marginalized. They could not participate in discussions or decisions of the House. Our dear Sister Shirley Myers had to undergo all the ridicule and shunning from people she loved and trusted. Bishop Ken Myers, undeniably one of the most godly men I know, had to undergo unspeakable things from people who should have protected him and “had his back.”

Also please remember, it was NOT St. Michael’s alone who created the CEC. I was there on June 26th, 1992 as one of the THREE churches who founded the CEC. I was a part of the discussions that helped to form what later became the CEC, we all gave and we all sacrificed, not just St. Michaels. Why is that never remembered by the folk at 107 West Marquita? It is heartbreaking to remember those days. Because 14 years later I learned how we were lied to from the very beginning of the CEC. We were told of conversations with Peter Gilquist who allegedly told Abp. Adler to not join the Antiochian Church, but to start a new church. He allegedly spoke of a prophecy and that we were the fulfillment of that prophecy. **All this was lies.** I have spoken to Fr. Gilquist and learned that none of these things were so. We were lied to about the original Apostolic Succession. We were told that it was a good lineage and we were as valid as could be. **Lies! All of it!** We were later told that the new Brazilian connection fixed all of the original inadequacies. Why were we never told of the ex-communication from the Brazilians because of Abp. Adler’s arrogance? We were lied to from the beginning, and in the end were left with credentials that weren’t worth the paper they were written on. Why should we have stayed???? How could I continue to help young men study for the ministry knowing that their ordinations would not be worth the paper they were written on??? After all we suffered from Abp Moats, how could I subject my church to more of the same from Abp Adler?

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 26 2007, 05:37 PM

QUOTE

A google search alone on "Consensus Government" as well as "Consensus Government + church" is pretty insightful. It's clearly not the invention of the CEC.

Terms can be adapted to mean very different things.

Consensus government means pretty specific things in the CEC context, which may not necessarily apply to what the words describe elsewhere.

?? @ @ @ # * & ^ = blessings

seraph

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 26 2007, 05:39 PM

FYI, someone has made it easier to find this Forum. Try typing <http://www.cebcblog.com> or just www.cebcblog.com either, takes one right here. Please feel free to pass that around. It is easier to do than the full addy.

Perhaps that will help others find our humble little discussion threads who will lend their voices.

Great reading to day, BTW.

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 26 2007, 05:55 PM

From VirtueOnline, Gleaned from <http://cechealing.wordpress.com/> blog

QUOTE

This just in from VirtueOnline: “CHARISMATIC EPISCOPAL CHURCH SPLITS”. In today’s digest, a priest leaving the CEC is quoted in the story as leaving for Western Rite Orthodoxy. Click here for the story or see below for the text.

CHARISMATIC EPISCOPAL CHURCH SPLITS. More news. In my last VIEWPOINTS I said the schism in the CEC had resulted in many leaving and going to Rome. A priest who is leaving the CEC himself wrote to say that many of those leaving have gone to Western Rite Orthodoxy, but the most common destination has been for AMiA, CANA and the Anglican Province of America (APA). “Individuals have indeed gone to Rome, but parishes cannot do so. Thus, considering parishes are moving toward Anglican jurisdictions. It is much more accurate to describe the movement as toward Anglicans, including myself. Many former CEC priests have chosen to affiliate with AMiA and are busy planting parishes. Not a few parishes have also chosen to affiliate with AMiA. Lately, others have begun to affiliate with CANA. Eventually, however, it seems likely that a large number of former CEC clergy and parishes are in conversation with APA-REC. In the end, this may result in the largest single quorum of all.” The source told VOL that the total number of parishes being planted by former CEC priests added to the parishes that have/are joining with Anglican bodies could total well over 30 Anglican parishes, when all the dust settles.

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 26 2007, 06:02 PM

Seraph:

"Terms can be adapted to mean very different things.

Consensus government means pretty specific things in the CEC context, which may not necessarily apply to what the words describe elsewhere."

Yeah, I know. Absolutely. It's just interesting to see what it means to various churches and governments. And sort of compare them all and go "hmmmm".

Fr. Jay FreeMan:

Actually nobody could have seen what happened with Adler, because nobody else was there in the room at the time. Other bishops saw other troubling things throughout that day as well as priests and laypersons. But nobody could have seen the actual "incident". Which is why it's so easy to say I misinterpreted an action that was meant to be fatherly.

Shirley Myers

Posted by: collin_nunis Oct 26 2007, 09:50 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 26 2007, 12:04 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 26 2007, 11:34 AM)

The CDC (Charismatic Democratic Church) with Pope Seraph, the first among equals.

Dear guest...this sounds wonderful!

My first act as POPE... abolish the papacy...!

democratic....pope? surely you jest!

Is that what a church where all are treated as adults and all orders of ministry including the laity have a valid voice means to you?

I suppose you like the present arrangement...more power to you!

seraph

Yea yea... Honestly, as a Catholic I don't exactly see the Pope as a very important thing to my salvation but nevertheless, please tell me where or how he's stepped on your toes. Where does your warped image of the Pope come from?

We've seen two Popes in the past 7 years of the new millenium, but tell me where or when he has abused his power. Perhaps that would give me an idea on what you think.

I'm not trying to market Catholicism here and really, I don't have an intention of converting you but if there's nothing beyond rhetoric, best be silent.

Posted by: Ancient Neophyte Oct 26 2007, 11:00 PM

[The true story of the CEC experiment: The CEC was originally known as the church which materialized Convergence and followed the Chicago Call. However when "our theologians" did not join us, namely Dr. Thomas Oden and Dr. Bob Webber, many asked, "Who are we, really?" In fact, Bishop Wayne and Stephanie were doing a better job at Convergence than we were with their CEEC. Heck, there were Baptist Churches adopting Convergence and their churches were exploding. Not us! We were losing members. We were lucky to get a storefront and out of the basements. But then in 1997, the HOB-bits had a plan. We will parade Government by Consensus. That will be our claim to fame! (This was nothing really; better to have board of deacons or trustees make decisions) So, soon enough, we got storefronts as we grew a bit by having babies born as members of the CEC and youth who were now tithe-paying members. Folks started heading East and West, left and right. What do we do? Well the Patriarch, +Jones, +Holloway and +Davidson were convinced that the CEC had lost its prophetic edge and the prophecies started flowing but so was the booze and the two did not mix well. Bishops start falling like dominoes. First Smith, then Moates and Howard, Constantino dies, and finally Adler-who could oppose the Prophet/ Patriarch and still get a paycheck? The End.]

 Ohh, Jesus!

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 11:16 PM

QUOTE (collin_nunis @ Oct 26 2007, 09:50 PM)

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 26 2007, 12:04 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 26 2007, 11:34 AM)

The CDC (Charismatic Democratic Church) with Pope Seraph, the first among equals.

Dear guest...this sounds wonderful!

My first act as POPE... abolish the papacy...!

democratic....pope? surely you jest!

Is that what a church where all are treated as adults and all orders of ministry including the laity have a valid voice means to you?

I suppose you like the present arrangement...more power to you!

seraph

Yea yea... Honestly, as a Catholic I don't exactly see the Pope as a very important thing to my salvation but nevertheless, please tell me where or how he's stepped on your toes. Where does your warped image of the Pope come from?

We've seen two Popes in the past 7 years of the new millenium, but tell me where or when he has abused his power. Perhaps that would give me an idea on what you think.

I'm not trying to market Catholicism here and really, I don't have an intention of converting you but if there's nothing beyond rhetoric, best be silent.

Dear Collin:

The context of my coments had absolutely nothing to do with the Bishop of Rome. It is in response to a poster insinuating a "papacy" in the new Charismatic Democratic Church (CDC), in jest I am sure. It was in that spirit and to that limited context that I made my post!

No reference or insult to you or to His Holines was intended. I am not without respect for the office even if I do not suscribe to the dogmas surrounding it.

I do apologize if there was a misunderstanding but also suggest you measure your words! You really have no basis by which to determine what my idea or image of the papacy, the present Bishop of Rome or his predecessor might be! I have not made any reference to that in this conversation nor do I have any interest at all in engaging in that discussion in this thread!

As for silence....this is not the place for that...! However, we are discussing the CEC, the communion I and many here are a part of! If you have any comments on the topic at hand we await your input! For conversations about Rome, its merits, bishops and the like Mike has made available another thread where you can post with gusto...there is no need to be an apologist for that here. Neither I nor other active members of the CEC seem to have shown any interest in addressing those things in the context of this conversation about our present crisis!

blessings

seraph 🙏

Posted by: seraph Oct 26 2007, 11:24 PM

QUOTE (Ancient Neophyte @ Oct 26 2007, 11:00 PM)

[The true story of the CEC experiment:We were losing members. We were lucky to get a storefront and out of the basements. But then in 1997, the HOB-bits had a plan. We will parade Government by Consensus. That will be our claim to fame!So, soon enough, we got storefronts as we grew a bit by having babies born as members of the CEC and youth who were now tithe-paying members. Folks started heading East and West, left and right. What do we do?... The End.]

This is humorous and probably true to some extent. Of course it must be in reference to your own experience! I have known a healthy, active growing parish since founded as a CEC church with a mere 4 people in 1993no one there has gone East nor West though a few to evangelical churches!

Your characterization here does not apply to all of us! Some parishes have been rather isolated from the politics of the CEC, have been able to communicate their message and experience growth without any reference to the gimmicks you mention here!

blessings

seraph 🙏

Posted by: Ancient Neophyte Oct 26 2007, 11:25 PM

Fr. J FreeMan,

Your part of the story is greatly appreciated! Anyone with a grain of discernment can tell that you are telling the truth!

But then there are the space monkeys..."non nobis domine" is set on repeat in their minds as the perma-theme song while they dream of a time when everyone was wearing the designer frames of deception.

Pointless to argue with them Celina...their only wish is that you would put the frames back on...let that ol' boy anthem play on repeat again. Come on back, Brother! Let Father Judgement and the gang lay hands on ya! You might could get a word, Brother...all you gotta do is surrender.

Oh, SNAP! Jebus is a commin! 🤔

Posted by: kenfollis@juno.com Oct 26 2007, 11:41 PM

🤔 Look busy!

Posted by: kenfollis@juno.com Oct 26 2007, 11:50 PM

With due respect to Mr. Virtue, I believe he has misinterpreted Fr. Stetson's words from Scranton last year. Mr. Virtue writes, "Individuals have indeed gone to Rome, but parishes cannot do so." This is not true, or am I mistaken. If Alex Jones, a Pentecostal preacher without any orders, can do it so can any CEC. This seems to be a diversion tactic of Satan away from unity.

Posted by: Fr. Rusty Oct 27 2007, 12:38 AM

Dear Ken; As far as I know, a Parrish cannot come into Rome. They have to disband, be absorbed into the larger Church and sell thier Building if the Diocese does not want it. Of course I could be wrong, but this was the case in a couple of instances I know of. Anglican/Episcopalians do sometimes have other options through the pastoral provision which does not apply to C.E.C. Clergy and congregations. If there was another course, none of us knew what it was.

Rusty+

Posted by: kenfollis@juno.com Oct 27 2007, 01:35 AM

Thanks for the reply, Fr. Rusty! What Fr. Stetson was saying last year was that Pope JP II set up the PP for the Anglicans. This was not in regards to whole parishes like Pastor- now- Deacon Alex Jones' congregation. The issue was marriages, mainly. If particular parishes or even the CEC wanted to come in as an institution, then the necessary homework and make-up work would need to be done but it was and is still possible. However the PP is a document for Anglicans. It is not about ICAB/ CEC folks two bishops removed.

I have spoken to a Catholic theologian named Dr. David Delaney on this issue who seems to believe the door is wide open, especially since the CEC is two bishops removed from Rome- unlike the Anglicans who are five centuries in schism. As for the Bishops in the CEC, CCC, CCOR/ICAB or MSJ/FACA there remain options. Lipka would have to be a laicized priest since he was originally a RCC priest; Zampino, due to his being a cradle Catholic, would have to be an Abbott/ deacon only; yet for the rest, it may be that all would have some seminary to complete and undergo the psychological exam to be a priest. They would have to likely follow Gilquist's lead and lay aside their mitre or who knows, the married bishop Ferraz was received back with episcopal status.

Whole congregations can undergo the process together, as Alex Jones's did.

It is all about the Cross at this point.

Posted by: Guest Oct 27 2007, 05:55 AM

QUOTE (Shirley Myers @ Oct 26 2007, 06:02 PM)

Actually nobody could have seen what happened with Adler, because nobody else was there in the room at the time. Other bishops saw other troubling things throughout that day as well as priests and laypersons. But nobody could have seen the actual "incident". Which is why it's so easy to say I misinterpreted an action that was meant to be fatherly.

Shirley Myers

Mrs. Myers (if it is really you)

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well. I know that you are taking the current events (as it relates to ++ Adler's retirement) to be all about you and the validation of your charges, however not everyone ties the two together.

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 27 2007, 06:23 AM

A comment on Virtue's site regarding the CEC "petering out"

QUOTE

Petering out?

Well, as a CEC Priest, I have to say "I think not." Our Patriarch has been desperately ill for some time and has just retired. That's very sad, for I remember him as a man of great vigor, unshakeable joy, and boundless energy. But he rightly saw

that he was simply too physically taxed to give us the strong (read "tireless") leadership we need.

May the Lord grant him rest, healing and renewed vigor. And may He reward his servant greatly for his years of selfless service. +

Posted by: Guest Oct 27 2007, 07:06 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 27 2007, 05:55 AM)

Shirley Myers
Mrs. Myers (if it is really you)

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well.

Are you serious? How typical of spin. Let's blame the victims. It is not Adler's fault; he was under the influence of drugs and Alcohol.

Now what about the others, they must have leaded him on!!

There is a LONG history of twisting things around in this church. What ever happened to accountability? I HEARD for myself in the beginning from Adler's own mouth that the clergy needed to be held accountable. Be men of integrity! What a farce.

Take your own advice!! Be a man ADLER and stand up to the things you did wrong and ask forgiveness. It will lead you to a road of healing and forgiveness. Look at this mess! You were at the top of it all. You need to make the move now. You NEED to ask forgiveness of these people. You owe it to your God and these faithful followers.

[COLOR=red]

Posted by: misunderstood Oct 27 2007, 07:14 AM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 26 2007, 08:15 AM)

I am sure you could all add your concerns to mine, and also that in some parishes and dioceses the system has worked well. Yet, for fallible men in a complicated world...there seem to be way too many potential pitfalls for mismanagement, secrecy, abuse, spiritual manipulation, exclusion, lack of accountability, and control.

NO offense is meant for those who believe in the system...but honest criticism and concerns should be heeded.... !!! In my experience consensus government is NO SUCH THING...it is government by "a few men" even a "few good men". After this decade long experiment, I for one, am not okay with that!

blessings

seraph 🙄

I will attempt to discuss this as point/counterpoint

1. rector's councils are **chosen, members appointed** by the rector/bishop/patriarch and serve at his pleasure- dangers: we all tend to pick people we like and agree with us- it makes life easier ...not too healthy for governing a church!

[The option is to make them elected and then the process is political. Many are doing this and it has it's flaws.](#)

2. rector's council are **advisory only**- "ruling elders" do not have to abide by the consensus or input from the "non ruling" elders. There is no voting, debating, negotiating... and after all is been said...the onus is on the rector/bishop/patriarch to say ...this is the word of the Lord.

[But there is a lot of discussion and the "wise ones" will listen](#)

3. rector's councils **exclude from participation** people who could have valuable input- men only, some places only clergy. That creates huge blind spots....there are female perspectives, lay people's perspectives that are lost.

[The wise ones will ask and get input from Godly women. However ECUSA is the place for female bishops. The jury is out on how well it is working.](#)

4. **relationship requirements** for participation in councils- outings, retreats for them only, Adler discussed the importance of this relational aspect of consensus. How concerning....a patriarchal oligarchy...aka good old boys club, ...the few beholden to you by deference to your office, friendship, similarities in thought....a few white guys, conservative, republicans, smoking cigars and drinking scotch always in power...? scary thought!

[Just because they hang out together does not automatically make it "good old boys". And not all drink and smoke.](#)

5. **NO debate, no vote**....there is a spiritualization inherent in the system....tongues and prophecy and "seeking the word of the

Lord" taking precedence over rational, painful discussion and the working over disagreements, difficult compromises that are realistic in the life of all institutions. Great potential for spiritual manipulation...If God says buy that shopping center...to disagree is what...?

This unfortunately has been abused since the early church. One must "discern" and test the "spirits"

6. **Confidentiality v.s Secrecy**- requirements of "no discussions outside the council" taken to extremes lead to a culture where all is secret, questions and dialogue limited to a very narrow space, input limited to that of a select few....! There is a vacuum of information and a culture of silence that can be fostered...we have witnessed some of the fruits of that!

This must be resolved in any setting. Another problem arises when some DEMAND every sordid detail. That is not Godly as well.

7. **Closed system throughout**- my son pointed this out to me...! In reality the only input at the very top is that of the PC members....! Each rector's council is pretty much a closed unit...allowing only the input the ruling elder and his peers allow! A couple of guys really make all the decisions for the CEC based only on the criteria they choose.... does not seem healthy!

OK but most families are "run" this way. In the accepted model Dad has the the final say-so

8. **Spiritualization**- "The Government of God"- how serious that sounds, almost makes you afraid to question its premises. Yet it is no such thing objectively, not really practiced that way in the Bible, nor consistently in history....it is the adaptation denomination wide of a government style which per Adler himself...was taught to him by +kessler and implemented at San Clemente. When did that become GOD's GOVERNMENT? This is a serious concern....How can God's government be questioned ,much less improved upon???? Rome makes such claims, we have neither the history nor the theological underpinnings to come close to that!

Re-read the NT and the early Church Fathers. Jesus spent a lot of time teaching on the Kingdom of God i.e. His rule and reign i.e. His government. It must be important.

I guess my point is NOTHING will be perfect until the perfect comes!!!!!!!

Love to all

misunderstood

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 27 2007, 07:50 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 27 2007, 08:06 AM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 27 2007, 05:55 AM)

Shirley Myers
Mrs. Myers (if it is really you)

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well.

Are you serious? How typical of spin. Let's blame the victims. It is not Adler's fault; he was under the influence of drugs and Alcohol.

Now what about the others, they must have leaded him on!!

There is a LONG history of twisting things around in this church. What ever happened to accountability? I HEARD for myself in the beginning from Adler's own mouth that the clergy needed to be held accountable. Be men of integrity! What a farce.

Take your own advice!! Be a man ADLER and stand up to the things you did wrong and ask forgiveness. It will lead you to a road of healing and forgiveness. Look at this mess! You were at the top of it all. You need to make the move now. You NEED to ask forgiveness of these people. You owe it to your God and these faithful followers.
[COLOR=red]

Amen, Amen!

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 27 2007, 07:56 AM

QUOTE (misunderstood @ Oct 27 2007, 08:14 AM)

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 26 2007, 08:15 AM)

I am sure you could all add your concerns to mine, and also that in some parishes and dioceses the system has

worked well. Yet, for fallible men in a complicated world...there seem to be way too many potential pitfalls for mismanagement, secrecy, abuse, spiritual manipulation, exclusion, lack of accountability, and control.

NO offense is meant for those who believe in the system...but honest criticism and concerns should be heeded.... !!! In my experience consensus government is NO SUCH THING...it is government by "a few men" even a "few good men". After this decade long experiment, I for one, am not okay with that!

blessings

seraph 🙏

I will attempt to discuss this as point/counterpoint

1. rector's councils are **chosen, members appointed** by the rector/bishop/patriarch and serve at his pleasure- dangers: we all tend to pick people we like and agree with us- it makes life easier ...not too healthy for governing a church!

The option is to make them elected and then the process is political. Many are doing this and it has it's flaws.

2. rector's council are **advisory only**- "ruling elders" do not have to abide by the consensus or input from the "non ruling" elders. There is no voting, debating, negotiating... and after all is been said...the onus is on the rector/bishop/patriarch to say ...this is the word of the Lord.

But there is a lot of discussion and the "wise ones" will listen

3. rector's councils **exclude from participation** people who could have valuable input- men only, some places only clergy. That creates huge blind spots....there are female perspectives, lay people's perspectives that are lost.

The wise ones will ask and get input from Godly women. However ECUSA is the place for female bishops. The jury is out on how well it is working.

4. **relationship requirements** for participation in councils- outings, retreats for them only, Adler discussed the importance of this relational aspect of consensus. How concerning....a patriarchal oligarchy...aka good old boys club, ...the few beholden to you by deference to your office, friendship, similarities in thought....a few white guys, conservative, republicans, smoking cigars and drinking scotch always in power...? scary thought!

Just because they hang out together does not automatically make it "good old boys". And not all drink and smoke.

5. **NO debate, no vote**....there is a spiritualization inherent in the system....tongues and prophecy and "seeking the word of the Lord" taking precedence over rational, painful examination of options and the working over disagreements, difficult compromises that are realistic in the life of all institutions. Great potential for spiritual manipulation...If God says buy that shopping center...to disagree is what...?

This unfortunately has been abused since the early church. One must "discern" and test the "spirits"

6. **Confidentiality v.s Secrecy**- requirements of "no discussions outside the council" taken to extremes lead to a culture where all is secret, questions and dialogue limited to a very narrow space, input limited to that of a select few....! There is a vacuum of information and a culture of silence that can be fostered...we have witnessed some of the fruits of that!

This must be resolved in any setting. Another problem arises when some DEMAND every sordid detail. That is not Godly as well.

7. **Closed system throughout**- my son pointed this out to me...! In reality the only input at the very top is that of the PC members....! Each rector's council is pretty much a closed unit...allowing only the input the ruling elder and his peers allow! A couple of guys really make all the decisions for the CEC based only on the criteria they choose.... does not seem healthy!

OK but most families are "run" this way. In the accepted model Dad has the the final say-so

8. **Spiritualization**- "The Government of God"- how serious that sounds, almost makes you afraid to question its premises. Yet it is no such thing objectively, not really practiced that way in the Bible, nor consistently in history....it is the adaptation denomination wide of a government style which per Adler himself...was taught to him by +kessler and implemented at San Clemente. When did that become GOD's GOVERNMENT? This is a serious concern....How can God's government be questioned ,much less improved upon???? Rome makes such claims, we have neither the history nor the theological underpinnings to come close to that!

Re-read the NT and the early Church Fathers. Jesus spent a lot of time teaching on the Kingdom of God i.e. His rule and reign i.e. His government. It must be important.

I guess my point is NOTHING will be perfect until the perfect comes!!!!!!!

Love to all

misunderstood

And yet...the system as it was, FAILED the People miserably, IMHO.

I have been a part of a consensus decision making body on many occasions and in many settings including within the parish council of my Church. They have not been political. They have worked. To work you must work it with diligence to guard against the inherent weak points within any system.

One group I am still associated with that uses consensus decision-making has been around for nearly 75 years. Has grown from a movement within the Catholic Church of a dozen or so people, to thousands, worldwide. That model can work if done correctly. The CEC implementation of that model was not PURE and therefore FAILED>>>(period)!

Posted by: **Shirley Myers** Oct 27 2007, 08:33 AM

"Mrs. Myers (if it is really you)

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well. I know that you are taking the current events (as it relates to ++ Adler's retirement) to be all about you and the validation of your charges, however not everyone ties the two together."

1. It is really me.

2. I am sorry to hear that I have offended. I hope you will tell those who have told you this to seek me out and tell me about whatever it is I have done.

3. You are entirely mistaken about me taking the current events to be all about me and the validation of my "charges". I have said all along, and will continue to say that it is most certainly not about me. It is about a dysfunction. My personal story was and remains less than a drop in this bucket.

If you would like to speak with me further, please feel free to email me through this site.

God's peace,
Shirley

Posted by: **The REAL Guest** Oct 27 2007, 08:54 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 27 2007, 05:55 AM)

QUOTE (Shirley Myers @ Oct 26 2007, 06:02 PM)

Actually nobody could have seen what happened with Adler, because nobody else was there in the room at the time. Other bishops saw other troubling things throughout that day as well as priests and laypersons. But nobody could have seen the actual "incident". Which is why it's so easy to say I misinterpreted an action that was meant to be fatherly.

Shirley Myers

Mrs. Myers (if it is really you)

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well.

I know that you are taking the current events (as it relates to ++ Adler's retirement) to be all about you and the validation of your charges, however not everyone ties the two together.

Yeah, but...

.....She's not a bishop of the church (let alone a patriarch...duh!)

Soooo, your point is???

Posted by: **Guest** Oct 27 2007, 08:54 AM

QUOTE

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well.

Certainly not that night, if ever, since clergy who had not been drinking testify that NOTHING on Shirley's part was provocative. You are bearing false witness against your neighbor! What clergy charges she was inappropriate?

QUOTE

I know that you are taking the current events (as it relates to ++ Adler's retirement) to be all about you and the validation of your charges, however not everyone ties the two together.

The two are certainly related by +Adler's own confession. Of course his indiscretions exceeded the Myer's incident. However you seem to be assuming to know Mrs. Myer's motive. Is this a prophetic insight? Defending +Adler against Shirley's account will find little support from this forum. 😊

Posted by: Guest Oct 27 2007, 08:59 AM

QUOTE (Just Watching @ Oct 27 2007, 06:23 AM)

A comment on Virtue's site regarding the CEC "petering out"

QUOTE

Petering out?

Well, as a CEC Priest, I have to say "I think not." Our Patriarch has been desperately ill for some time and has just retired. That's very sad, for I remember him as a man of great vigor, unshakeable joy, and boundless energy. But he rightly saw that he was simply too physically taxed to give us the strong (read "tireless") leadership we need.

May the Lord grant him rest, healing and renewed vigor. And may He reward his servant greatly for his years of selfless service. +

If this is really what the CEC priest believes then he is in for much more heartache. However if he is right and there was no coercing on the part of the HOB/PC for +Adler's retirement then the parishes that remain are in for much more pain.

Posted by: Brenda Monroe Oct 27 2007, 09:02 AM

I'd like to interject an opinion here. I've noticed many posts, which, in regards to "democratic" government only mention ECUSA. Yes, ECUSA is definitely teetering on the edge of heresy (already there, even?) This is a matter of teaching, not government. With the not-so-consensus government of the CEC, if a bishop gets an itching to teach something teetering on heresy, there is nothing there to stop him, and the CECUSA could end up in the same position as ECUSA (though both seem to have had people and churches leaving in droves in the past year... a different topic altogether, I suppose...) There are a great many denominations/communions/whatever your preferred choice of wording that do employ a more democratic form of government, and it is in fact, working quite well. Of course no church is perfect, but not all churches leave a wake of mass destruction behind them, either.

Brenda Monroe

Posted by: The REAL Guest Oct 27 2007, 09:11 AM

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well.

It is amazing that you would choose to expose this here on the forum - in public - when she is not even the discussion!

I would consider such charges way off topic and offensive. Mike?

I know that you are taking the current events (as it relates to ++ Adler's retirement) to be all about you and the validation of your charges, however not everyone ties the two together.

Most everybody DOES tie the two together...at least those with discernment, intelligence, and having been informed of the issues affecting the CEC and their cause(s).

Your posting simply appears to be a smear attempt to deflect from Adlers horrid behavior and abuses by casting someone ELSE in a bad light. How cowardly! Dude (or dudette), you really need to post your name so that Shirley has the chance to face her accuser.

Your tactic is so well known now as the typical **CEC Response**" to any and all allegations. Your posting is EXACTLY why Howard occurred; Moats occurred, Sharpe occurred, etc., etc.,etc.

It is also the reason I no longer wanted to be part the CULT. (And I haevnt; even gotten to the Barker Satanic connection yet! The connection from which all the orders of the CEC flow.)

Posted by: seraph Oct 27 2007, 09:12 AM

Hi misunderstood...

[/QUOTE]

QUOTE

1. rector's councils are **chosen....The option is to make them elected and then the process is political. Many are doing this and it has it's flaws.**

So the method of [B]me appointing **my** buddies and getting rid of those who did not agree with **me** has worked better for us? All systems have flaws...more participation and independence inherent in the system...seems healthier! The US sure has survived all these years despite petty politics...have kingdoms and oligarchies?

QUOTE

2. rector's council are **advisory only.....But there is a lot of discussion and the "wise ones" will listen**

Oh yes , we have had a wonderful examples of "wise ones" listening in the CEC! Sorry I do not want my destiny or that of my family dependent on the "wise ones" given our track record. We need more accountability and balance...not what ends up being subject to the judgement of one man! For that I could be Roman Catholic...maybe that is one reason people go "home to Rome"....why have no voice in a paper boat when you can have the same in a cruise ship?

QUOTE

3. rector's councils [b]exclude..female perspectives, lay people's perspectives...[The wise ones will ask and get input from Godly women. However ECUSA is the place for female bishops. The jury is out on how well it is working.](#)

Input from all sources should be inherent in the system not dependent on the asking of the "wise ones"...we have no guarantee of wisdom from anyone! *"In a multitude of counselors there is wisdom"*. Who made the rule that ECUSA is the box for ordained womenyou or God? How is the jury leaning about our male only bishops and system after 15 or so years??

QUOTE

4. [b]relationship requirements for participation in councils...a patriarchal oligarchy...[Just because they hang out together does not automatically make it "good old boys". And not all drink and smoke.](#)

It is a danger inherent in this type of concept. Okay for clubs not for churches or other institutions. It is not the smoking but the patriarchal oligarchy I am concerned about!

QUOTE

5. **NO debate, no vote**....there is a spiritualization inherent in the system. [This unfortunately has been abused since the early church. One must "discern" and test the "spirits"](#)

That is a very subjective thing...and after our experience in the CEC...I do not believe in it ...not a lot of us have had that gift apparently! Conversation and thoughtful debate can clarify viewpoints and situations ! Compromise not "discerned words" need to be more an inherent part of the system!

QUOTE

6. **Confidentiality v.s Secrecy**- requirements of "no discussions outside the council" taken to extremes [This must be resolved in any setting. Another problem arises when some DEMAND every sordid detail. That is not Godly as well.](#)

Confidentiality as it relates to pastoral issues is one thing! Secrecy, whereby even questions and legitimate conversation may mean a council rule broken is unhealthy. We should all be entitled to know intimate/sordid details about the church's finances, salaries and benefits, budgets, changes in the canons that affect us and deliberations about the fate of our church!

7

QUOTE

. **Closed system throughout**- A couple of guys really make all the decisions for the CEC based only on the criteria they choose.... does not seem healthy....[OK but most families are "run" this way. In the accepted model Dad has the the final say-so](#)

That is just it....we are not children...we are adults! Dads dont have the final say in the lives of their ADULT children..not at my house! If treated like children maybe then laity should not be expected to tithe to support the Dads...! Let the dada's get a job and meet the need of the kids, pay the rent, the light and manage the rest! Maybe we should try treating each other like adults, where all orders of ministry have an equal , if different, role to play!

8

QUOTE

. **Spiritualization**- "The Government of God"- how serious that sounds, almost makes you afraid to question its premises...[Re-read the NT and the early Church Fathers. Jesus spent a lot of time teaching on the Kingdom of God i.e. His rule and reign i.e. His government. It must be important.](#)

Case in point....!!! please find for me in the Bible where Government by consensus is even referred to or illustrated **as we practice it!!!!** You could also cite a church father or two for good measure!

Just because we use the term DOES NOT GRANT IT OBJECTIVE REALITY. I can call my cat a fish...its okay for me ...and that does not make it so!!!!

QUOTE

9. I guess my point is NOTHING will be perfect until the perfect comes!!!!!!!

So lets leave things just as they are then..no sense in looking to improve anything??? Is that the solution or is there even a problem in your eyes???

QUOTE

"...misunderstood..."

No, methinks I understand you very well!

seraph

P.S "wise ones" ...??? Life is not Lord of the Rings....no wizards or elves down here just us people...very unwise, darkened intellect, fallen.. in need all the help we can get!

Posted by: Umbriel Oct 27 2007, 09:36 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 27 2007, 09:54 AM)

QUOTE

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well.

Certainly not that night, if ever, since clergy who had not been drinking testify that NOTHING on Shirley's part was provocative. You are bearing false witness against your neighbor! What clergy charges she was inappropriate?

I must admit that I have heard clergy out of the Bates camp spew this vile.
I am not saying I heard Bates spew it but guys connected to him.

It is sad.

Posted by: Celine Oct 27 2007, 09:38 AM

Seraph you have said some very powerful things in your post above.

Current CEC'ers, both laity and clergy, **if you love your church as you say you do, if you truly care about its people, you would do well to seriously consider Seraph's comments.**

Posted by: seraph Oct 27 2007, 09:40 AM

oops forgot to log innnnnn...

seraph

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 27 2007, 10:27 AM

How dare the cowardly "Guest" imply that my wife was inappropriate toward Adler, and therefore his actions are on some level tempered.

[A] No one was there to witness, so if there are accusations of inappropriateness [against my wife], they are either made up from whole cloth, or they are false accusations from Adler (a thing I do not believe, nor accuse him of). And if she were making this up, she could have made something up a lot more incriminating.

[B] Freedman refers to something that other bishops witnessed that night. It was actually a couple of nights before, at the church, and it made one bishop so angry he wanted to get physical with Adler. The only thing anyone witnessed that night was drunkenness (and when everyone was gone and I walked back in the house, I witnessed a very upset and shaken wife).

[C] As someone has already noted, it is standard operating procedure for those defending a wrong-doer to suggest that the other person somehow invited it.

[D] My wife has a track record of being a good and godly woman. "Prim"? Dictionary: "Stiffly formal and respectable"; Nah. I would never marry a prim woman. She's Irish, for heaven's sake. But ask anyone who knows her or has spent time with her and they will testify to her character - she is a wise, godly, spiritual, good and beautiful woman.

[E] This is not an isolated case with the man involved. There have been others. Before and after. Enough said.

[F] To suggest that Shirley thinks this is all about her is just stupid. She doesn't think it's all about her, nor do I, nor does anyone in our diocese who has left after 14 year of faithfulness and embracing the vision and giving and sacrificing, only to see it torn to shreds. The matter is not about Shirley (her experience is only a small cog in the machinery of the dysfunction). It's about the subsequent "marginalizing" (a word used by a current CEC bishop regarding how this was dealt with), the spinning, the manipulation, the SOP (Standard Operating Procedure) of how things get done, or undone.

Having said all that, the "southern" boils up in me when I read the ignorant and stupid post by some cowardly guest who suggest that my wife some how invited this abuse. But I guess that's the risk one takes by posting on these forums. I suppose that may well be why so many other bishops just stay away from them. Who needs the extra stupidity in life? My tempted response is neither bishoply, Christian or godly. So I'll just leave it at that.

Bishop Kenneth

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 27 2007, 10:31 AM

Clarification:

(A) should read "if there are accusations against my wife..."

that shouldn't be a stupid little smiley face, it should be "B". Nothing funny about it.

+Kenneth

Posted by: Guest Oct 27 2007, 10:42 AM

QUOTE (Bishop Kenneth Myers @ Oct 27 2007, 10:27 AM)

How dare the cowardly "Guest" imply that my wife was inappropriate toward Adler, and therefore his actions are on some level tempered.

(A) No one was there to witness, so if there are accusations of inappropriateness, they are either made up from whole cloth, or they are false accusations from Adler (a thing I do not believe, nor accuse him of). And if she were making this up, she could have made something up a lot more incriminating.

B Freedman refers to something that other bishops witnessed that night. It was actually a couple of nights before, at the church, and it made one bishop so angry he wanted to get physical with Adler. The only thing anyone witnessed that night was drunkenness (and when everyone was gone and I walked back in the house, I witnessed a very upset and shaken wife).

C As someone has already noted, it is standard operating procedure for those defending a wrong-doer to suggest that the other person somehow invited it.

(D) My wife has a track record of being a good and godly woman. "Prim"? Dictionary: "Stiffly formal and respectable"; Nah. I would never marry a prim woman. She's Irish, for heaven's sake. But ask anyone who knows her or has spent time with her and they will testify to her character - she is a wise, godly, spiritual, good and beautiful woman.

(E) This is not an isolated case with the man involved. There have been others. Before and after. Enough said.

(F) To suggest that Shirley thinks this is all about her is just stupid. She doesn't think it's all about her, nor do I, nor does anyone in our diocese who has left after 14 year of faithfulness and embracing the vision and giving and sacrificing, only to see it torn to shreds. The matter is not about Shirley (her experience is only a small cog in the machinery of the dysfunction). It's about the subsequent "marginalizing" (a word used by a current CEC bishop regarding how this was dealt with), the spinning, the manipulation, the SOP (Standard Operating Procedure) of how things get done, or undone.

Having said all that, the "southern" boils up in me when I read the ignorant and stupid post by some cowardly guest who suggest that my wife some how invited this abuse. But I guess that's the risk one takes by posting on these forums. I suppose that may well be why so many other bishops just stay away from them. Who needs the extra stupidity in life? My tempted response is neither bishoply, Christian or godly. So I'll just leave it at that.

Bishop Kenneth

Amen Bishop!

I am glad to see that someone can come to the defense of his wife, unlike those who allow their wives or even their [B]mother to be publicly dragged through the mud!

Posted by: Grandma Oct 27 2007, 10:56 AM

During my fourteen years in the CEC I was privileged to be in the company of Shirley Myers on several occasions at clergy retreats and general convocations. She is indeed a Godly, sincere woman of integrity - a true lady. Though we live in different parts of the United States, we had many mutual acquaintances during our tenure with the CEC and all who spoke of her did so with affection and admiration. I continue to hold her and Bishop Ken in highest esteem.

Sharon Lavallee

Posted by: Guest Oct 27 2007, 11:22 AM

Amen Bishop!

I am glad to see that someone can come to the defense of his wife, unlike those who allow their wives or even their mother to be publicly dragged through the mud!

sorry for the typo it should read come to the defense of his wife!

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 27 2007, 11:25 AM

Whew, for a minute there I thought we were Mormons.

Nevermind. The typo absolver is here. It's as though it never happened.

Posted by: Nemo Oct 27 2007, 12:04 PM

QUOTE (kenfollis@juno.com @ Oct 27 2007, 01:35 AM)

What Fr. Stetson was saying last year was that Pope JP II set up the PP for the Anglicans. This was not in regards to whole parishes like Pastor- now- Deacon Alex Jones' congregation. The issue was marriages, mainly. If particular parishes or even the CEC wanted to come in as an institution, then the necessary homework and make-up work would need to be done but it was and is still possible. However the PP is a document for Anglicans. It is not about ICAB/ CEC folks two bishops removed.

The Rev. William H. Stetson, Secretary to the Ecclesiastical Delegate for the Pastoral Provision, told some 150 Episcopalians and many who had converted to the Roman Catholic Church that churches like the Traditional Anglican Communion and other Anglo-Catholic churches could apply to Rome, but there were no guarantees that his church would accept them, except on Rome's terms. "I am not sure Rome will gather them in, in one uniate. It is not possible that CEC (Charismatic Episcopal Church) or the TAC (Traditional Anglican Communion) can have their own Pastoral Provisions."
<http://www.virtueonline.org/portal/modules/news/article.php?storyid=4177>

I interpret this to mean that any CEC parish that joined the Roman Catholic Church would be incorporated directly into the diocesan structure and probably merged with the local Roman Catholic parish. There would be no parallel governing structure that would allow them to stand on their own. And, that would be assuming that these married rectors with families to support would be able to find the wherewithal to go back to school full time to complete Rome's seminary requirements.

No, going Home to Rome pretty much means the end of the local CEC congregation.

Posted by: seraph Oct 27 2007, 12:27 PM

Hi everyone

I found these very helpful clues in identifying unhealthy church situations at www.barnabasministry.com. Must admit to recognizing a few in my particular context, Hope it is helpful to our process...

QUOTE

Based upon my own experiences, I have made the following observations about unhealthy and abusive church situations:

- 1. Institutional Pride:** The system is never the problem. If something goes good, the system gets credit for it. But if something goes bad, the system is not at fault, but rather some individual gets blamed for it. If anyone identifies problems with the system, that person will be marginalized, put down and discredited. Nobody is good enough to criticize the system. The church may consider itself the best church or perhaps the One True Church, meaning no others are saved. However, when pressed about its own shortcomings, the group may reluctantly admit that "no church is perfect" and say it is "changing," but do substantive changes that would improve the health of the group ever take place?
- 2. Exploitative:** The system uses the people, often abusing them with harsh and demanding treatment. People serve the system and its agenda, not God. Though deliberate efforts are made to make the group meetings appear "fired-up" or joyful, on the inside the people feel sad and trapped.
- 3. Leader-centric.** Because leaders are the custodians of the system, they are considered superior and often isolate themselves from the members. Leaders usually lead by control and authority, not by nurturing or humble service. Getting closer to the leaders relationally or in the leadership "pyramid" is a goal and sign of advancement in the system; real spirituality and spiritual growth may not be important objectives at all. Subordinate leaders may be more genuine in their faith and approach, but they can be replaced at any time. Look at the highest levels of leadership to see the true values of the church.
- 4. Manipulative.** The objective of leaders is to advance the system, not to do what is best for individuals. Thus, leadership direction that is given to members is biased towards what is best for the system, not the individual. For example, members may be discouraged from moving simply because the leader loses stature (and maybe even his position or salary) if his membership decreases. Leaders may use a call for "unity" to insist that everyone participate in some event or action, warping the Scriptural idea of unity. Failing to conform will lead to shaming and charges of being "independent," "unteachable" or "not a real disciple." Leaders may draw people close to them with encouragement one minute, then tell them they are terrible the next. This is a control ritual that is designed to make people perform in order to get the praise of the leadership. But alas, the member can never do enough to guarantee that praise; no matter what he does the leader can find something wrong with it if he is so inclined.
- 5. Dishonest:** The system does not communicate straight. Communications are ambiguous, events are "spun" the way the leadership wants to present them. Pertinent information is hidden from members. Straight answers are not given; different people may be told different things. Dishonesty may show up in deceptive recruiting or leaving incorrect but favorable impressions uncorrected. Finances may be kept secret, with misleading financial statements that hide where the money really goes. There might be front organizations and secret doctrines or practices that are not normally revealed to outsiders. Frankly, there is so much dishonesty in unhealthy and abusive churches that people may not even know they are being dishonest. The ability to "spin" things to make the system look better or to get people to conform becomes a second language to members.
- 6. Law or Performance Orientation.** This is not the normal obedience that accompanies Christian faith (Romans 1:5), but a whole system where certain behaviors are rewarded and others are punished. Rewards may include salaries, perks, position or status in the system. It is true that there is right and wrong behavior in Christianity; the problem with an unhealthy system is that they have a closely-held subset of values superimposed upon Scriptural Christian values. Other virtues go ignored or might even be punished, and other sins may be ignored or even encouraged. This may even result in a "poisoned well" where even good things become corrupt at the motive level because the perception of performance is so important. For example, members may want to convert people in order to advance in the system, not so that converts will be saved. Members might read the Bible daily so they can say they did it if challenged, not because they are actually wanting to learn something. Actions in unhealthy and abusive churches are eventually motivated by selfish ambition, compulsion, guilt or the desire to avoid trouble with leaders, not by faith, love, grace or concern about God. The possibility of being shamed publicly or in front of one's peers for any failure manipulates people to work their hardest in doing what the leaders tell them and to avoid getting on their bad side.
- 7. Thwarts Individual Growth:** The objective of the system is to glorify the system and maintain dependency upon the leadership, not to train members into mature spiritual adults. Unhealthy systems continue to treat even mature Christians as though they were children. The system short-cuts growth by demanding certain behaviors without concern for the correct motivation or spiritual depth. Then it points to that behavior to glorify itself. There is a kernel of truth behind almost all abuses, and churches are good at using certain Scriptures to support their positions. The problem isn't the kernel of truth, the problem is when these things get out of balance or get warped to an extreme. These problems may not be seen until a system is in place for several years and its long-term fruit is seen in the destruction of people that have been a part of the system. Unhealthy churches may have problems with some of these issues I've discussed.

Abusive churches will have more severe, deliberate and intransigent problems with these issues.

I almost wondered if the author was ex-CEC ...how sad!

Lord come to our assistance..O Lord make haste to save us!

seraph 🙄

Posted by: Celine Oct 27 2007, 12:33 PM

I agree wholeheartedly with you +Ken, that was a very mean spirited, cowardly act by whoever posted that.

QUOTE

But I guess that's the risk one takes by posting on these forums. I suppose that may well be why so many other bishops just stay away from them. Who needs the extra stupidity in life?

Yes that is indeed the risk, that is the price of being open. But I would venture to say that certainly does not outweigh the benefit of hearing from you and Shirley firsthand. And of voicing your perspective. I am sure that is why you are sharing with us here. You see I think that the bishops should not stay away from these open discussion. If you stay away and continue to be silent, you are only participating in the dysfunction. This fear of speaking up openly, to all publicly, is at the heart of what is wrong with our communion. Why only now do you feel free to share?

The people being nasty and cowardly, they are seen for what they are.

Posted by: seraph Oct 27 2007, 12:41 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 27 2007, 12:27 PM)

I almost wondered if the author was ex-CEC ...how sad!

seraph 🙄

This really is not completely fair....The laundry list may not be applicable to all areas of the CEC....to some in my experience yes!

sorry..

seraph

Posted by: Celine Oct 27 2007, 12:47 PM

Thank you Seraph for sharing that, a scary read. It slices right down to the bone.

Its pointing a finger at me.

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 27 2007, 12:49 PM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 27 2007, 12:33 PM)

I agree wholeheartedly with you +Ken, that was a very mean spirited, cowardly act by whoever posted that.

QUOTE

But I guess that's the risk one takes by posting on these forums. I suppose that may well be why so many other bishops just stay away from them. Who needs the extra stupidity in life?

Yes that is indeed the risk, that is the price of being open. But I would venture to say that certainly does not outweigh the benefit of hearing from you and Shirley firsthand. And of voicing your perspective. I am sure that is why you are sharing with us here. You see I think that the bishops should not stay away from these open discussion. If you stay away and continue to be silent, you are only participating in the dysfunction. This fear of speaking up openly, to all publicly, is at the heart of what is wrong with our communion. Why only now do you feel free to share?

The people being nasty and cowardly, they are seen for what they are.

Dear Celine:

For the record, I haven't been silent until now. I have been very open and public, just not in this particular venue. Others can testify to that.

+Ken

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 27 2007, 12:54 PM

Here's a link for marks of a cult, a link with no connection whatsoever to the CEC. It's kind of chilling. At the same time, honestly, many of these marks could be equally spoken of the Roman Catholic Church. PLEASE, before anyone flames me, I'm not knocking the RCC. I'm just saying that when reading any list of checkmarks, it has to be done with a certain measure of objectivity. I'm also saying that even the best of organizations can have problems, and even the worst can have some good things.

Painting with broad brush strokes basically doesn't work.

Having said that, the link DOES give some guidelines for comparison.

<http://www.rickross.com/warningsigns.html>

+Ken

Posted by: Celine Oct 27 2007, 01:07 PM

That is good to hear, +Ken, more power to you. I never meant to imply that you were not open or public.

From within the CEC, **officially** we have heard nothing about your departure.

Oh sure, "everyone" knows this that and the other, but publicly nothing has been said. NOTHING as in ZERO.

A common theme has emerged over the last few days, something that I have observed firsthand. In asking for answers I have been repeatedly told by several people, "well everyone knows what is going on," or "well everyone knows why +Adler retired," or "well I will tell you anything you want to know." Thus, it is implied that everything is known, there is no need for a meeting. To this I reply that publicly, officially we know nearly nothing. I don't want to hear information thru the rumor mill. I don't want to hear this whispered to me by my priest. I don't want someone to tell me this stuff "in confidence." We need to deal with this together as the body of Christ. Not privately. In the open, member to member.

We are behaving likes slaves, not free men. We are have become like Communist subjects, not American citizens. What the hell is the matter with us?

Posted by: seraph Oct 27 2007, 01:32 PM

This is simple and helpful...

QUOTE

[B\]What Do You Do If Your Group is Unhealthy or Abusive?\[/B\]](#)
Do the "good" things outweigh the "bad" things for you? Only you can make this decision.

You might make this evaluation and find many bad things, but that the good outweighs the bad for you. That's OK-- that's your decision and evaluation, and you can be secure that you came to that conclusion after an honest evaluation.

But what if the the bad outweighs the good? Now what do you do? I'd suggest reading Scriptures that address these issues, and praying that God would help you know what to do and how to do it.

As far as I can tell, you have three options:

You can ignore what you know, ignore your feelings and conscience, and maintain the status quo. Keep going to your church.

You can confront the "bad" issues by speaking with leaders and attempting to make changes.

You can look for another church that better reflects your own values.

There are pros and cons to each of these options...What is important at this stage is to tell yourself the truth about your own church-- is it unhealthy, abusive or cultic for you?.

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 27 2007, 01:32 PM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 27 2007, 01:07 PM)

We are behaving likes slaves, not free men. We are have become like Communist subjects, not American citizens. What the hell is the matter with us?

GO OUT RIGHT NOW and get a copy of The Open Society, Volume 1, by Karl Popper. You can get a copy TODAY - any decent bookstore carries it; Barnes and Noble, Borders, whatever. Seriously. You owe it to yourself to read the book. It's lifechanging. It answers the questions you're asking.

+Ken

Posted by: seraph Oct 27 2007, 01:42 PM

QUOTE

From within the CEC, officially we have heard nothing about your departure

To some unofficial reports of his leaving may be just malicious rumors or gossip!!!...All was well as of our last communication from the PC.....Isn't +Myers in charge of the theology committee or something???? 😏

Does anyone else but Celine and me think there is something reaaaaallllly WRONG with that???? 🤔

Why should Wikipedia be the source of information for the departure of a beloved bishop and his entire diocese????

seraph 😏

Posted by: seraph Oct 27 2007, 02:00 PM

Sorry I had to post this hereI had to pinch myself when reading it!

QUOTE

Ten signs of a safe group/leader.

- A safe group/leader will answer your questions without becoming judgmental and punitive.
- A safe group/leader will disclose information such as finances and often offer an independently audited financial statement regarding budget and expenses. Safe groups and leaders will tell you more than you want to know.
- A safe group/leader is often democratic, sharing decision making and encouraging accountability and oversight.
- A safe group/leader may have disgruntled former followers, but will not vilify, excommunicate and forbid others from associating with them.
- A safe group/leader will not have a paper trail of overwhelmingly negative records, books, articles and statements about them.
- A safe group/leader will encourage family communication, community interaction and existing friendships and not feel threatened.
- A safe group/leader will recognize reasonable boundaries and limitations when dealing with others.
- A safe group/leader will encourage critical thinking, individual autonomy and feelings of self-esteem.
- A safe group/leader will admit failings and mistakes and accept constructive criticism and advice.
- A safe group/leader will not be the only source of knowledge and learning excluding everyone else, but value dialogue and the free exchange of ideas.

Wow if more of these things could be said of us...!!! Hope springs eternal ...!

seraph

Posted by: Just Interested Oct 27 2007, 02:17 PM

QUOTE (Grandma @ Oct 27 2007, 10:56 AM)

Sharon Lavallee

Side Note: Your signature is Lavallee. Are you by any chance related in any way to Tammy Faye LaValley Bakker Messner? I know the spelling is a bit different but have seen that in connection in families before. Just interested as it is an uncommon name.

Signed: Just interested

Posted by: The REAL Guest Oct 27 2007, 05:36 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 27 2007, 01:42 PM)

QUOTE

From within the CEC, officially we have heard nothing about your departure

To some unofficial reports of his leaving may be just malicious rumors or gossip!!!...All was well as of our last communication from the PC.....Isn't +Myers in charge of the theology committee or something???? 😏

Does anyone else but Celine and me think there is something reaaaaallllly WRONG with that???? 🤔

Why should Wikipedia be the source of information for the departure of a beloved bishop and his entire diocese????

seraph 

perhaps it is time for all of us - en masse - to raid the Wiki article on the CEC and correct it.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 27 2007, 06:09 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 27 2007, 09:54 AM)

QUOTE

Some who were there that night and some who have been with you in similar settings through out the years have called your behavior at times less than prim, proper and "daughterly/sisterly". Maybe your actions have been misinterpreted by them as well.

Certainly not that night, if ever, since clergy who had not been drinking testify that NOTHING on Shirley's part was provocative. You are bearing false witness against your neighbor! What clergy charges she was inappropriate?

QUOTE

I know that you are taking the current events (as it relates to ++ Adler's retirement) to be all about you and the validation of your charges, however not everyone ties the two together.

The two are certainly related by +Adler's own confession. Of course his indiscretions exceeded the Myer's incident. However you seem to be assuming to know Mrs. Myer's motive. Is this a prophetic insight? Defending +Adler against Shirley's account will find little support from this forum. 

Amen! No support from me!!! Rather, as a former sexual abuse counsellor, I resent your insinuations that any victim brought advances upon themselves. Your rhetoric is tasteless, all too common CEC spin. Might you be a Bishop or one of their "minions"?

Furthermore, Mrs. Myers has identified herself and proven her identity to my satisfaction and to the satisfaction of all but you-- Guest. You, on the other hand have not identified either yourself or your sources of information, therefore if not already baseless per the above, you have completely discredited yourself and any association you may still have with the CEC.

Shirley Myers' posts have mostly been concern for those who remain. She and her husband and many many others left already more than a year ago...or hadn't you noticed.

Posted by: Guest Oct 27 2007, 06:19 PM

That is not what Fr. Stetson said. Please re-read it. Also note that Fr. Stetson's words are incomplete here, they were edited for Mr. Virtue.

Posted by: misunderstood Oct 27 2007, 07:46 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 27 2007, 06:09 PM)

The two are certainly related by +Adler's own confession. Of course his indiscretions exceeded the Myer's incident.

Please help enlighten me on this. I have looked over the past pages and cannot find anyone reporting exactly what ++Adler "confessed" to. I have seen some guesses but nothing of real substance.

Side Note

In the settings I have found myself with Mrs Myers through the years she has always conducted herself in a very proper way. She and ++Adler are the only two that really know what happened between them. Just because you may not like her version does not mean she should be a target of scandal herself!

misunderstood

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 27 2007, 09:07 PM

Unless the guest who wrote has spoken to me or has somehow been made privy to correspondence that I sent to the Bishops, there is no way he/she could truly know "my version".

Which is as it should be.

Posted by: Celine Oct 27 2007, 10:36 PM

Ok I am a bit confused now, are you saying Shirley that your version is different from what we already know from the unofficial sources? Maybe it is getting late I am tired. But it sounds from your last post, that there is more to the story (?). If there is information we don't already know, and it is material, perhaps you can clarify.

Perhaps I just misunderstood your response to Guest's post.

Posted by: Celine Oct 27 2007, 10:50 PM

I want to add, once again we have never received any official information. Was this incident so scandalous that the members of this communion do not have a right to know what charges exactly were leveled against its patriarch? If not than what's the big deal other than to protect the id of the alleged victim? The id could have been left out., and the full report published.

Once again another situation in which we are left dangling, groping in the dark, going on blind faith.

Posted by: Guest Oct 28 2007, 05:33 AM

celine

Did you read the post on Virtue Online, reprinted also on CEC Healing by a Denver CEC priest? Bear in mind, this fellow's "parish" consists of a handful of people who meet in his living room, but still. Doesn't his cheerful take on the events of the past few weeks tell you everything about how information is shared? While you may be frustrated in getting straight answers, it seems the CEC faithful out in the hinterlands have all the information that they require.

[FONT=Geneva][COLOR=green]

Petering out?

Well, as a CEC Priest, I have to say "I think not." Our Patriarch has been desperately ill for some time and has just retired. That's very sad, for I remember him as a man of great vigor, unshakeable joy, and boundless energy. But he rightly saw that he was simply too physically taxed to give us the strong (read "tireless") leadership we need.

May the Lord grant him rest, healing and renewed vigor. And may He reward his servant greatly for his years of selfless service. +

We are in the prayerful process of selecting our communion's second Patriarch. Your prayers too, Brethren are coveted as we do so.

Right now with the splitting and chipping away, we seem like everybody else in the non-Roman, but sacramental churches. I could paraphrase that old song from THE WIZARD OF OZ: "Chip chip here. Split split there! And a couple of Coups de etat! That's how it is, but let's not think we've heard the Last Hurrah!"

Perhaps the restructuring was to be expected. I trust it is 'growing pains' not 'death throes!' Our Bishops seem quite unified now, and more focused on the tasks at hand. I think this is a wholesome development in the midsts of a great deal of confusing pother.

Now, if I can just get our little Parish to outgrow my living room!

(PS: I just noticed I am approaching my third full year coming to this site. It hardly seems like more than a few months. I must really enjoy it here! Thanks to all of you for making it so.)

Posted by: Guest Oct 28 2007, 05:54 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 28 2007, 05:33 AM)

Well, as a CEC Priest, I have to say "I think not." Our Patriarch has been desperately ill for some time and has just retired. That's very sad, for I remember him as a man of great vigor, unshakeable joy, and boundless energy. But he rightly saw that he was simply too physically taxed to give us the strong (read "tireless") leadership we need.

May the Lord grant him rest, healing and renewed vigor. And may He reward his servant greatly for his years of selfless service. +

We are in the prayerful process of selecting our communion's second Patriarch. Your prayers too, Brethren are coveted as we do so.

Right now with the splitting and chipping away, we seem like everybody else in the non-Roman, but sacramental churches. I could paraphrase that old song from THE WIZARD OF OZ: "Chip chip here. Split split there! And a couple of Coups de etat! That's how it is, but let's not think we've heard the Last Hurrah!"

Perhaps the restructuring was to be expected. I trust it is 'growing pains' not 'death throes!' Our Bishops seem quite unified now, and more focused on the tasks at hand. I think this is a wholesome development in the midsts of a great deal of confusing pother.

Now, if I can just get our little Parish to outgrow my living room!

(PS: I just noticed I am approaching my third full year coming to this site. It hardly seems like more than a few months. I must really enjoy it here! Thanks to all of you for making it so.)

[/b]

a beautiful example of SPIN

poor guy

Posted by: misunderstood Oct 28 2007, 05:58 AM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 27 2007, 10:36 PM)

Ok I am a bit confused now, are you saying Shirley that your version is different from what we already know from the unofficial sources? Maybe it is getting late I am tired. But it sounds from your last post, that there is more to the story (?). If there is information we don't already know, and it is material, perhaps you can clarify.

Perhaps I just misunderstood your response to Guest's post.

If my memory serves me correct, +Meyers letter last year referred to "inappropriate stroking of the hair" making his wife feel very uncomfortable. I believe we were told that it was +Adler's contention at the time it was done in a "fatherly" fashion and misread to be more.

Again I ask if anyone knows if +Adler has "confessed" to more than this now or just what did he confess to in the recent meeting at SC?

misunderstood

Posted by: Guest Oct 28 2007, 09:26 AM

At the Patriarch's Council last year +Adler did say he had run his fingers through Mrs. Myer's hair while drunk. It came across as "icky" to Mrs. Myers. This was not technically sexual harassment but had it happened in an office setting, it would be beyond appropriate. You should read Mrs. Myer's letter to the Council.

Recently, +Adler admitted to his congregation that he had fondled a woman, the wife of a friend. Those in the know have understood this to be a separate incident than Mrs. Myer's.

His alcohol and prescribed/ non-prescribed drug mix addiction rendered him incompetent to oversee a parish, even more a communion. Hence, we have experienced this schism and what could have effectively shaped the spiritual landscape of the US has dwindled into a sad caricature of Protestantism.

Posted by: Celine Oct 28 2007, 10:30 AM

In my view, the most telling point as it relates to the CEC (courtesy barnabasministry.com):

QUOTE

5. Dishonest: The system does not communicate straight. Communications are ambiguous, events are "spun" the way the leadership wants to present them. Pertinent information is hidden from members. Straight answers are not given; different people may be told different things. Dishonesty may show up in deceptive recruiting or leaving incorrect but favorable impressions uncorrected. Finances may be kept secret, with misleading financial statements that hide where the money really goes. There might be front organizations and secret doctrines or practices that are not normally revealed to outsiders. Frankly, there is so much dishonesty in unhealthy and abusive churches that people may not even know they are being dishonest. The ability to "spin" things to make the system look better or to get people to conform becomes a second language to members.

Fellow CEC'ers, you may think this does not apply, but take a good hard honest look at ourselves. This affects our whole communion, not just St. Michaels. Take a look at how careful information is released from the top down. How careful, how manipulated, how little, how measured.

mea maxima culpa

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 28 2007, 02:13 PM

It made me feel "icky", huh? Ay, ay, ay.

I've heard a lot of words attached to the incident, but this is the first time I've heard that one.

Y'know ... my intention in speaking out was never to defame or defrock or de-anything any particular man. I spoke out initially to

my husband, who took it to an individual, then to the "powers that be" (or be'd). Even my closest family members and dearest friends did not hear of what had happened from me until we had gone through that entire process.

Still my intentions were not to lambaste any one person.

My intentions were to:

1. Address a personal offense as prescribed by Scripture.
2. Address, through my personal experience, a singular symptom of a complex disease in the leadership of the CEC.
3. Seek, through addressing these things, to effect real and lasting change.

The results were:

1. The offender, after having been approached multiple times, did not respond.
2. The leadership, having been approached, did not respond with any meaningful measures, but rather with promises which were never kept.
3. The extended leadership, (House of Bishops) were contacted. Some had already left, and others chose to leave upon learning of the series of events, after already having known there were severe problems above and beyond one singular incident.
4. I received an post from Kessler's email address which was theoretically from Adler (I seriously doubt that it was penned by Adler) which was labeled an apology and seemed to be a formality, but what it really stated was "I'm horrified that I upset you", and "It's always been my intention to speak with you in person at House of Bishops in October". (Which would have been a full year after the incident.) It was hardly recognition of wrongdoing or repentance, rather an attempt at damage control.
5. The issues were subsequently, in various ways, made public and continue to be the topic of much speculation and debate.

Celine, what you read in my post was my frustration at the insane number of "versions" or interpretations of this event. I've heard so many different takes on it. I've heard it downplayed. I've heard it exaggerated, I've been mocked and ridiculed. I've been asked "Were you wearing something low-cut?" (The answer is no.) I've heard "Even if he raped my wife, I wouldn't have left the CEC", I've heard spin like you wouldn't believe on the context of the event and the meaning behind it. On and on. So, my point in the post you're referring to was just to say that people like the guest who posted can pretend to know me ... presume to know what happened... but they weren't there. I was.

But, having said that, we are zooming in on a miniscule part of a massive puzzle here. Zoom out. Look at the whole thing in context. It isn't about me. It isn't about what happened to me that night, as real and as disturbing as that was. It's about a very sick system that was very dangerous and damaging to people that I love. It's about a very sick system that was calling itself the Church, and I was only one person out of many who was saying ENOUGH!!!!

My particular situation became public, but it was an itsy bitsy drop in a gigantic bucket. And, Celine, you're right. You guys deserve the truth, and not some spin or lies.

So, if you or anyone else feels they have been lied to, please send a self addressed stamped envelope to:

Shirley Myers
561 S. Sharp Rd.
Denison, TX 75021

I will return to you the statement I sent to the House of Bishops on October 2, 2006.

It will be 4 pages long (printed on front and back), so I don't think it will require extra postage.

If you don't see me on the forum for a few days, it's because I'm heading to Zapata, Texas (50 miles south of Laredo) to care for my 77 year old mom, the beautiful wonderful Betty June Kennedy McSorley, who is recovering from hip-replacement surgery. I may have internet access while I'm there, but I may not have time.

God's peace to you all.

Happy Reformation Sunday. 😊

Shirley McSorley Kennedy Myers

Posted by: Guest Oct 28 2007, 05:03 PM

Shirley, would you describe what happened to you as a "pass" by a drunken married man? That's "icky" to me. However, all things considered, there was much more than just the your incident but why did Bishop Myers not bring all these issues in a diatribe at the PC? Why did it hinge on your issue and lack of accountability only? Shouldn't all things be open so the communicants of the CEC know what they are a part of?

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 28 2007, 05:25 PM

Hi, Guest.

There's nothing wrong with the word "icky". The use of it here just struck me sort of funny.

Long before the incident with me ever occurred there was much discussion among the PC about problems in the leadership. My husband (and others) did address other problems, both one on one with those concerned, and within the context of PC meetings. But that's something to discuss with Bp. Ken.

His email address has been posted, so please feel free to ask him questions you might have about that.
(bishopkenneth@sbcglobal.net)

And yes. I agree that there should be more open communication. That's why I'm offering to make my statement available to those who are truly serious about knowing what was in it. Not for the sake of gossip in or order to have a scoop, but to provide facts for those who feel they've been deceived and want to read for themselves the information that went out to all the bishops.

God's peace,
Shirley

Posted by: Nemo Oct 28 2007, 08:29 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 26 2007, 11:08 AM)

The true story of the CEC experiment: The CEC was originally known as the church which materialized Convergence and followed the Chicago Call. However when "our theologians" did not join us, namely Dr. Thomas Oden and Dr. Bob Webber, many asked, "Who are we, really?" In fact, Bishop Wayne and Stephanie were doing a better job at Convergence than we were with their CEEC. Heck, there were Baptist Churches adopting Convergence and their churches were exploding. Not us! We were losing members. We were lucky to get a storefront and out of the basements. But then in 1997, the HOB-bits had a plan. We will parade Government by Consensus. That will be our claim to fame! (This was nothing really; better to have board of deacons or trustees make decisions)

Interesting. The following is found on the back page of the ICCEC 2008 Calendar:

The ICCEC: Who are we? Why are we Unique?

We are unique because we are a Church born out of Obedience.

We first obeyed. We came to be a Sacramental / Evangelical / Charismatic church not because of dogma, or personal preferences, but because God said so. We are unique in that our government in our Parish's, Diocese's, Province's, House of Bishop's and Patriarch's councils is a place of prayer, waiting upon God to speak. We are not governed by people, committees, agendas, preferences, but by God through men, who with courage of conviction, wait for Him. Consensus Government makes the ICCEC unique in that we don't need to make decisions; we need to hear from God.

From this Obedience the Three Streams were Birthed

A Church fully Sacramental/Liturgical

We draw upon the traditions and wisdom of the Historic Church since we are part of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. At the center of worship is the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist (The Lord's Supper) in which we believe in the real presence of Christ. We practice the living historic forms of the liturgies of the Church and the Seven Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist (the Lord's Supper), Confession, Healing, Holy Orders and Marriage.

A Church fully Evangelical

We are a church that holds a high view of Holy Scripture, believing they contain all things necessary for salvation and godly living. We are committed to the faithful reading, studying, teaching, and preaching from the Scriptures. The Holy Scriptures are the wellspring for spiritual maturity, calling us to a personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

A Church fully Charismatic

We are a church submitted to the will of God. We need to hear Him. We are a church open to the work of the Holy Spirit and that believe God's people have always been a spiritually gifted people. We not only allow, but expect the Holy Spirit's presence and working through His gifting in government, worship and daily acts of service.

This seems to me to be a slight change of tune from the early days of "making visible the Kingdom". What does everyone else think?

Posted by: Nemo Oct 28 2007, 08:59 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 27 2007, 06:19 PM)

That is not what Fr. Stetson said. Please re-read it. Also note that Fr. Stetson's words are incomplete here, they were edited for Mr. Virtue.

OK, I read it again. There is a Pastoral Provision for parishes that join the RCC to remain independent so that they can use the approved Anglican Rite, correct? This would still put a crimp in the CEC parish's style -- are they still under the restrictions of GIRM?

Of course, this assumes that the CEC priests would be accepted by Rome. Very few have accredited master's degrees, and a large number don't even have bachelor's degrees of any sort.

Sorry, Ken. It's fun to think about, but I don't see it happening except in highly isolated cases.

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 02:57 AM

How does this notion of consensus government ("We are unique in that our government in our Parish's, Diocese's, Province's, House of Bishop's and Patriarch's councils is a place of prayer, waiting upon God to speak. We are not governed by people, committees, agendas, preferences, but by God through men, who with courage of conviction, wait for Him. Consensus Government makes the ICCEC unique in that we don't need to make decisions; we need to hear from God.") in the CEC hold up?

"They all joined together....along with the women and Mary...Peter stood up among the believers...and said'it is necessary to choose one of the men...'. So they proposed two men....Then they cast lots (!)...."
Acts 1:13-26

"So the twelve gathered all the disciples together and said....'Brothers, choose seven men from among you....They presented these men to the apostles, who prayed and laid their hands on them.'" Acts 6:2-6

"Then the apostles and elders, with the whole church, decided to choose some of their own men..." Acts 15:22

It appears consensus government as practiced in the CEC, where the anointed chosen few (PC/HOB) make all the decisions and sporadically issue piecemeal information to the faithful is quite foreign to Holy Scripture.

Perhaps being unique is not all that good.

What say you?

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 29 2007, 06:37 AM

I am posting this fro CEC Healing and I thought is was very good...

Someone else claimed that all who left are coward and this is the person's Response and I decided to post it here. 😊

jzhnutz,

It's all too easy to just call everyone who left a coward. Look at the "cowardly" company - Sly, Lipka, Zampino, Fick, Myers, Miles, Painter. You were not there when they tried to save something that they had poured their hearts and souls into for over a decade. In the end, they made a stand for their principles and kept their integrity. Not cowardly acts, definitely not cowardly men. I might suggest that the ones who stayed, allowing themselves to be manipulated and spun, in the end, displayed a lack of courage to stand for what is right.

I say bravo with this person's response

Have a great day all Tony 🍕

Posted by: Ken Follis Oct 29 2007, 09:39 AM

Couldn't the CEC have done something similar?

Pani Rose writes: I just noticed this was not posted on here, and I thought it might be beneficial. They would enter by a provision that is already in place, most likely maintaining their liturgy, and small 't' traditions...

PORTSMOUTH, UK: Traditional Anglican Communion Seeks Full Union With Rome

Statement authorized by the TAC Primate

16th October 2007

"The College of Bishops of the Traditional Anglican Communion (TAC) met in Plenary Session in Portsmouth, England, in the first week of October 2007. The Bishops and Vicars-General unanimously agreed to the text of a letter to the See of Rome seeking full, corporate, sacramental union. The letter was signed solemnly by all the College and en-trusted to the Primate and two bishops chosen by the College to be presented to the Holy See.

The letter was cordially received at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. The Primate of the TAC has agreed that no member of the College will give interviews until the Holy See has considered the letter and responded."

+ John Hepworth
Primate TAC

<http://www.chnetwork.org/forums/forum54/2426.html>

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 09:48 AM

Quiet insightful, Celine. Thanks!

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 09:51 AM

QUOTE

Peter stood up among the believers

Hmmm... very Romish and Papist sounding. 😊

Posted by: Ken Follis Oct 29 2007, 10:09 AM

QUOTE (Shirley Myers @ Oct 27 2007, 09:07 PM)

Unless the guest who wrote has spoken to me or has somehow been made privy to correspondence that I sent to the Bishops, there is no way he/she could truly know "my version".

Which is as it should be.

Many folks have read Shirley's version from the letter sent to the PC. Even I have a copy of it.

The funny thing is that the Tsunami (last year's fiasco) seems to hinge not on Abp. Sly's supposed *coup de etat* or Bishops Fick, Painter and Zampino's resignations but on Shirley's incident. It is similar to the War in Iraq being based on one or two points of Gen./ State Secretary Powell's speech at the U.N.. Yet, the issue with Iraq was much larger than just potential WMD, as any military intelligence will tell you. However the media will repeatedly broadcast an issue to get ratings and folks will take those frequent soundbites but forget the context and the exogenous variables. It is always necessary to consider all of the issues before making a sound judgment. The HOB/PC had many issues to consider, for which their judgments are now being accounted for.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 10:14 AM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 25 2007, 03:10 PM)

Joni you said:

"I make this assumption, because I know Bishop Adler. He isn't evil."

I agree he isn't evil (evil as in a wolf in sheep's clothing).

But even by his own admission he has had blackouts due to alcohol and drug problems, and admitted to fondling This show some very serious lapses in sound judgement. Lapses of judgement that have affected his ability to lead (indeed he is not leading anymore!). This raises more questions and concerns about how this has affected our current leadership, both on a local and national/international level. Wouldn't you agree?

I know this is an older post but I disagree with it. There is an old saying: "Hate the sin love the person." Not a bad saying but I don't think that is the problem here. The sin we see is only the result of the dysfunction, and the dysfunction is EVIL! That is why it produces such sin in our midst. It's not just Dan and Randy. Joni should know by now about all the other stuff they have been hiding and covering up (like Chris, Autumn, Josh & baby or your own daughter's situation for example – if you are who I think you are). Let's be real here! Here is another even older saying: If it's not of God it's of the devil!

I wish that sin were the issue here. Then it could be easily dealt with. But what is going on is demonic. So much so that we cannot see things for what they are. All of a sudden we've gone from having a spiritual discernment to relating all these things with psycho-babel. They say, "He's sick." What, does he have cold? No, sick = demonic. My cold doesn't make me touch and abuse folks; then mislead the sheep to build up my persona.

This whole thing reminds me of the Théoden King, in Lord of the Rings II. He was sick to, but it aint no cold type sickness, it's rather sickening as in disgusting! -NSV



So maybe he's just a sheep in wolves clothing? A thought...

"You put the wrong emPHAsis on the wrong sylLAbLe."

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 10:24 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 29 2007, 09:51 AM)

QUOTE

Peter stood up among the believers

Hmmm... very Romish and Papist sounding. 😊

I think not, it says *they* chose, *they* cast lots.

When was the last time you chose anything in the CEC?

When was the last time you cast lots to decide on anything in the CEC?

When was the last time the "whole church" has picked men to represent them as in Acts chapter 6 and chapter 15?

Quite powerful.

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 29 2007, 10:26 AM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 29 2007, 10:14 AM)

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 25 2007, 03:10 PM)

Joni you said:

"I make this assumption, because I know Bishop Adler. He isn't evil."

I agree he isn't evil (evil as in a wolf in sheep's clothing).

But even by his own admission he has had blackouts due to alcohol and drug problems, and admitted to fondling This show some very serious lapses in sound judgement. Lapses of judgement that have affected his ability to lead (indeed he is not leading anymore!). This raises more questions and concerns about how this has affected our current leadership, both on a local and national/international level. Wouldn't you agree?

I know this is an older post but I disagree with it. There is an old saying: "Hate the sin love the person." Not a bad saying but I don't think that is the problem here. The sin we see is only the result of the dysfunction, and the dysfunction is EVIL! That is why it produces such sin in our midst. It's not just Dan and Randy. Joni should know by now about all the other stuff they have been hiding and covering up (like Chris, Autumn, Josh& baby or your own daughter's situation for example – if you are who I think you are). Let's be real here! He is another even older saying: If it's not of God it's of the devil!

I wish that sin were the issue here. Then it could be easily dealt with. But what is going on is demonic. So much so that we cannot see things for what they are. All of a sudden we've gone from having a spiritual discernment to relating all these things with psycho-babel. They say, "He's sick." What, does he have cold? No, sick = demonic. My cold doesn't make me touch and abuse folks; then mislead the sheep to build up my persona.

This whole thing reminds me of the Théoden King, in Lord of the Rings II. He was sick to, but it aint no cold type sickness, it's rather sickening as in disgusting! -NSV



So maybe he's just a sheep in wolves clothing? A thought...

"You put the wrong emPHAsis on the wrong sylLable."

Nat Sherman,

Very nice post 😊

The Baloney Man 🍷

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 10:28 AM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 26 2007, 11:16 AM)

Consensuses Government has been the banner of St. Michael's from the beginning. That's what made me feel secure at St. Michael's. No 'One' person leading us. What happened to that? A group of men keeping each other 'in check'.

Actually, true Consensuses Government is supposed to be ONE person leading, Jesus. However, this only happens in the immediate when men are surrendered. We are far frm being surrendered to Jesus. They would even teach us how to really hear Jesus. They wanted to control everything. NOT Consensuses. -NSV



Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 10:29 AM

<http://www.themessenger.com.au/Video/20070329.htm>

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 10:41 AM

Last Sunday's Journey Home profiled Father Eric Bergman from Pennsylvania. He was an Anglican priest who converted to Roman Catholicism. He was able to use the pastoral provision. He had a big enough group with him to sustain a parish, and he is using the Anglican Rite. You can listen to his story here.

<http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/seriessearchprog.asp?seriesID=-6892289&T1=journey+home>

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 29 2007, 10:51 AM

Hey, Ken: (Follis, that is)

Hope you and your beautiful, sweet wife are well. Tell her hi for me.

Out of curiosity ... are you saying you have a copy of what I initially sent out, only to the PC, or of the final statement to the HOB in its entirety (8 pgs.)?

Love,
Shirley

Posted by: Nemo Oct 29 2007, 11:04 AM

QUOTE (Ken Follis @ Oct 29 2007, 09:39 AM)

Couldn't the CEC have done something similar?

PORTSMOUTH, UK: Traditional Anglican Communion Seeks Full Union With Rome

Bp Zampino was pursuing high-level talks with the Vatican to achieve an inter-communion status between the ICCEC and the RCC, similar to the status enjoyed by the Polish National Catholic Church. This relationship is clearly spelled out in the Roman Catholic Canon 844.

It looks like the TAC is doing something similar.

The problem that Bp Zampino found was that the CEC's teaching on the Eucharist at the time was so unclear that he could not vouch for the entire Communion. He is probably having more luck on his own in the CCC.

Posted by: Ken Follis Oct 29 2007, 11:07 AM

Shirley,
I will pass your greetings on to Ceila. The letter I have was sent to me by Fr. Ken Tanner when I was compiling the LOA that Roaring Oasis took charge over. I do not recall the length or whether it was to the HOB or PC. What I do recall is that it was your account of that evening's event. Let me verify the data and get back to you.
Blessings!

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 11:12 AM

Wasn't another roadblock to the reunion because of the divorce/remarriage of some CEC bishop and that +Z was raised Catholic? + Lipka would likely have had to be a laicized priest only since he is a Roman Catholic priest already.

Posted by: Nemo Oct 29 2007, 11:28 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 29 2007, 11:12 AM)

Wasn't another roadblock to the reunion because of the divorce/remarriage of some CEC bishop and that +Z was raised Catholic? + Lipka would likely have had to be a laicized priest only since he is a Roman Catholic priest already.

+Z never wanted to become Roman Catholic. All he ever wanted to do was establish a protocol for intercommunion. His model at the time was the PNCC.

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 11:29 AM

The RCC was willing to work with the CEC and resolve some of these issues as they are doing with the TAC. However after Mike Baldwin and Bishop Zampino returned from Rome addressing these matters, +Adler forbid them to tell the communion. They were silenced, I believe, because +Adler was convinced, based on prophesy, that the RCC was going to join the CEC rather than *vice versa*. In fact, it became an oft repeated maxim "We don't need Rome, Rome needs us!"

While it is true that the CEC would and could be a major blessing to the RCC, I think, by its preeminence, the See of Peter must always be the first among equals.

St. Bishop Irenaeus of Lyons said of the Church of Rome: "For with this church, by reason of its preeminence, the whole Church, that is the faithful everywhere, must necessarily be in accord"

In another scenario, + Adler told us that Fr. Peter Gilquist, who attended his consecration, had told him not to join the Evangelical Orthodox Church because the CEC was a fulfillment of prophesy-one that the CEC would unite East and West.

That would have been something.

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 11:30 AM

QUOTE

Actually, true Consensus Government is supposed to be ONE person leading, Jesus. However, this only happens in the immediate when men are surrendered. We are far from being surrendered to Jesus. They would even teach us how to really hear Jesus. They wanted to control everything. NOT Consensus. -NSV

From my reading in the Book of Acts, I don't see this whole "consensus" thing. Or at the least on many important occasions, and I quote, "the whole church" was involved in the decision making. Perhaps that is the true meaning of consensus. The whole church.

None of this "the few chosen ones" making all the decisions without input from the whole church.

As far as Nat Sherman's comments about this "sickness" not being called evil, I think he is so right. Why are we now calling this "sickness" and not for what it is, evil behavior? But, on the other hand, we are ready to demonize anyone who doesn't agree with the party line! Matt's got a demon man!

Are we afraid once again? Can't we handle the truth?

Posted by: Joni Oct 29 2007, 11:41 AM

Hello everyone,

I have a daughter who I adopted when she was 7 years old. She came from an extremely sad background full of trauma. (I also have 4 other adopted children with similar pasts and one biological daughter.) This daughter that Nate Sherman is referring to was brought to St. Michael's as a wounded emotionally dysfunctional soul. Everyone, who has loved her, has known this and has worked with our family to get her through adolescence to adulthood. She just turned eighteen. It has been a very bumpy road for her and still is. Her disfunction has to do with her past. Nothing has ever been 'covered up'. I know the things she has done and it's been 'hell' for our entire family, but who else is going to stick with her and help her? We have tried to protect her so she could have as normal of life as possible. Therefore, we didn't always announce her transgressions to everyone. Those at St. Michael's who love her have tried to do the same. I think most people do that for children don't they? Church isn't always about finding sin and punishing it. It's about healing and restoration too.

I'm shocked that Nate would bring a CHILD into this conversation. Is he saying my daughter is 'of the devil'? Was he trying to put the focus on me to discredit my words? Is that the way this forum works? If I have another viewpoint that others disagree with, my daughter is exposed?

I don't think I've attacked or exposed anyone with my words on this forum. That has not been my intent. My intent was to sort out my thoughts and feelings on the matter of Bishop Adler resigning and how it affects me, my children and my church. Everyone has known about Chris, Autum and Josh. I can hardly think that was covered up. I don't know the details of how that was handled. I haven't asked yet. So, I can't comment on the situation. All I can say, is I've known Chris and his family for 17 years. I want the best for them and I still count them as good friends. They are a wonderful family.

I know there has been 'sin' at St. Michael's. (If you know how to keep it out let me know.)

I still believe that Bishop Adler is not evil or 'of the devil'. I've never said 'He's sick or has an illness'. He is a 'Just Man' who fell down.

I have 6 children to care for. I don't have time to post to answer craziness. I won't be posting as much. I have to get on with my life.

Joni LeClear

A Mom

Posted by: Joni Oct 29 2007, 11:50 AM

Celine or should I say R...

I hope you were safe from the fires and didn't have to evacuate. 😊

I haven't heard anyone be 'demonized' for not staying at St. Michael's. or are you talking about the ICCEC?

I've only heard sadness that they left. Those who left were loved and will be missed by everyone.

Who is demonizing them?

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 12:01 PM

QUOTE (Fr. J. FreeMan @ Oct 26 2007, 05:34 PM)

Lies! All of it! We were later told that the new Brazilian connection fixed all of the original inadequacies. Why were we never told of the ex-communication from the Brazilians because of Abp. Adler's arrogance? We were lied to from the beginning, and in the end were left with credentials that weren't worth the paper they were written on. Why should we have stayed???? How could I continue to help young men study for the ministry knowing that their ordinations would not be worth the paper they were written on???

((This is not meant to validate the CEC in other matter.))

The CEC's order are not worthless.

Sorry for the late response but I must disagree with you Father, on this part of your post. (You are still calling yourself Father, so the orders must still have some significance to you.) Our moderator is well versed in this issue (a good old Jesuit/Benedictine brother) and can add to the pot.

The CEC was never under the Brazilian churches jurisdiction. After much conversation, the Brazilians agreed to "help" the CEC with their Succession issue. Now, just because a bishop consecrates a set of bishops doesn't mean he can recall, or excommunicate, or invalidate their orders, even if he made a mistake. (BTW: Costa himself is the product of an "excommunicate" but his orders are still valid.) The only way a bishop can be set down is by the jurisdiction he is under. (This is one of the dangers of having each Bishop be autonomous. There must be a spiritual father or system with some kind of check.) However, he is still a bishop.

((It is important to note that the Catholic Catechism notes that someone in dire need can have confession with an Orthodox or excommunicated priest.))

I was in Maryland; I saw the ordinations and consecrations (they were ordained priests, and then made bishops by the original catholic rite in Latin – it was way cool!!!!). The catholic archdiocese (Cardinal Keeler) sent their canon lawyer to witness it and he affirmed it.

The only agreement was one of intercommunion at the table. Where the CEC did fail, was building the CEC in Brazil without them.

If you wish to use the term "excommunication" as a breaking of our intercommunion at the table, fine & dandie. However, this does not mean the CEC's orders are invalid. -Natty



Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 12:09 PM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 29 2007, 11:30 AM)

From my reading in the Book of Acts, I don't see this whole "consensus" thing. Or at the least on many important occasions, and I quote, "the whole church" was involved in the decision making. Perhaps that is the true meaning of consensus. The whole church. None of this "the few chosen ones" making all the decisions without input from the whole church.

It does say in acts that they were in one accord, that accord was the Holy Spirit, the ONE leading. That is quintessential consensus. We're on the same page... –NSV



Posted by: Ken Follis Oct 29 2007, 12:13 PM

QUOTE

QUOTE

(Guest @ Oct 29 2007, 11:12 AM)

Wasn't another roadblock to the reunion because of the divorce/remarriage of some CEC bishop and that +Z was raised Catholic? + Lipka would likely have had to be a laicized priest only since he is a Roman Catholic priest already.

+Z never wanted to become Roman Catholic. All he ever wanted to do was establish a protocol for intercommunion. His model at the time was the PNCC.

During our (PNCC-RCC) century-long division we have grown apart in ways that at first glance make reconciliation appear to be difficult. The Polish National Catholic Church, which during most of its existence was a member of the Union of Utrecht, has developed a strong sense of autonomy and the desire to preserve its distinctive traditions, including the vital role played by the laity in church governance. Even though the **primacy and infallibility of the Bishop of Rome was not an issue at the time of our division**, our churches today have different understandings of the Pope's role in the Church. Another complicating factor is the presence of a significant number of former Roman Catholic priests in the ranks of the Polish National Catholic clergy. Such is the legacy of the divisions of the past that remain with us today.

At this point in our relationship, therefore, we the members of the Polish National Catholic-Roman Catholic dialogue wish to reaffirm our resolve to overcome what still divides us, and to state clearly that **our goal is full communion between our churches**. We wish to emphasize that "full communion" does not imply absorption or uniformity, but a unity that fully recognizes differing traditions that are consistent with our common apostolic faith. It must still be determined if any of our divergent traditions are truly church-dividing, or simply examples of legitimate diversity which, in the words of Pope John Paul II, "is in no way opposed to the Church's unity, but rather enhances her splendor and contributes greatly to the fulfillment of her mission" (Ut Unum Sint, n. 50). We plan to give further consideration to other concrete steps concerning reciprocity in regard to the sacraments, acting as godparents, and the requirement of canonical form for lawfulness only in mixed marriages. We are equally committed to a thorough examination of the theological concepts of primacy and conciliarity. This will include searching for a common understanding of the ministry of the Bishop of Rome in the Church.

<http://www.usccb.org/seia/jointdeclaration.shtml>

This limited communion will be tested once they address the issue of Petrine primacy.

The question will then be, "What is the difference between absorption and full communion?"

A dialogue between the two is great. However I think TAC just bypassed PNCC by about 60 years.

Posted by: wakeup Oct 29 2007, 12:21 PM

QUOTE

Who is demonizing them?

This comes directly from a young elder in training at St. Michael's. In other words, the leadership.

You may have a role too, Joni. Why did you say Fr Cuthbertson, Fr Olkie, and Fr Barry leaving the church is 'another story'? All great men with great families who have been there for decades.

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 29 2007, 12:21 PM

Actually, Nat is correct as far as I am concerned. Part of the problem from thence forward is this: While the Bishops who were consecrated by the Brazilians agreed to not build a church in Brazil...makes sense. They were also told to ONLY use the Roman Ordinal in the future consecrations of Bishops and other clergy. I believe Randy Sly continued this practice and went so far as to "confirm" parishioners according to the Roman Rite and Bless all Marriages. He did this retroactively.

Unfortunately, it has been confirmed to me that Randy's practice may have been the exception. Therefore, just like other "catholic" churches, the trace of Apostolic Succession is now difficult. To the point that it has been reported that a former CEC priest going to another catholic jurisdiction can't yet prove he was validly confirmed prior to being ordained a priest.

If you are clergy out there, who were ordained prior to the Brazilian "strengthening", please tell us if you were also subsequently strengthened in your Priestly, Diaconal ordinations. If you were ordained after the the "strengthening" was the Roman Ordinal used precisely? "Just curious" as well.

Soon, I hope to post what I know of the investigation of the original lines of successions, the Brazilian "brush/touch" and the subsequent unravelling of the process of the CEC's move toward Catholicism. Whether you like to hear it or not...there was a CEC officially sanctioned (from the highest level) investigation of the possibility of the CEC gaining "status" with the RCC. Many have been told otherwise, and many thought it was with the Orthodox or this or that group. I was there!!! I will share what I know about this and hope others will chime in. I think it should be on a separate thread, however. That discussion, taken as a whole might help or might be of help for those clergy and parishes now considering departing for other catholic jurisdictions.

I do not have time to start the thread myself, today. If someone else would like to start it, please do. I will write what I know about this, including my trip to Rome/Vatican with Bp. Phil Zampino and "company".

Posted by: **Nat Sherman** Oct 29 2007, 12:27 PM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 29 2007, 11:41 AM)

I'm shocked that Nate would bring a CHILD into this conversation. Is he saying my daughter is 'of the devil'? Was he trying to put the focus on me to discredit my words? Is that the way this forum works? If I have another viewpoint that others disagree with, my daughter is exposed?

I don't think I've attacked or exposed anyone with my words on this forum. That has not been my intent. My intent was to sort out my thoughts and feelings on the matter of Bishop Adler resigning and how it affects me, my children and my church.

Everyone has known about Chris, Autum and Josh. I can hardly think that was covered up. I don't know the details of how that was handled. I haven't asked yet. So, I can't comment on the situation. All I can say, is I've known Chris and his family for 17 years. I want the best for them and I still count them as good friends. They are a wonderful family.

I know there has been 'sin' at St. Michael's. (If you know how to keep it out let me know.)

I still believe that Bishop Adler is not evil or 'of the devil'. I've never said 'He's sick or has an illness'. He is a 'Just Man' who fell down.

I have 6 children to care for. I don't have time to post to answer craziness. I won't be posting as much. I have to get on with my life.

Joni LeClear
A Mom

((Writing fast for give typos please.))

Sorry Joni, I see your point. I wasn't trying to expose her or her behavior. Rather I was trying to point out the Churches behavior. She is not evil. She's a great person and has come a long way, and I love her. And she is no longer a child!

BUT (not to loose focus), I was dealing more with the Churches (SM's) response to the issue with a boy. Sometimes love can be sick love. For some time SM's has chosen the path (at Abp Adler's direction) for sick love. The truth is that though love works when they know they are loved. Remember how Fr. Dan used to be. It was hard but his love was real for us. Something changed and just like children, we loved that our Father had become our friend, our buddy Dan. When daddy becomes our buddy; the biggest thing we loose is direction. What happened to us Joni?

Now everyone knows but how did this happen and why does it continue. SM's was in the dark for 6 months! Now he lives at Bp. Adler's NO he lives with Autum (still covering up).

How does a man in ministry (not a priest): sleep with another man's wife, get her pregnant, then move in with her, sit in church and kiss on her, dance the dirty with her at Church gatherings, and nothing is done? The SM response: Let them be, let them marry, don't judge them.

What about the husband's concerns or that of his child being subjected to this crap? Is there no one to respond to this the RIGHT way! Why? That is the evil in our midst. -NSV

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 12:34 PM

To all those on this thread who are contributing to the discussion of the CEC's relationship with RCC. Can we collaborate on another thread--one topic? I am hoping to chime in when I have more time. The discussion seems particularly vital in the light of the disclosure to me that another CEC parish is looking toward the Vatican.

Or is it better to keep it all right here? I would love to have the various posts about the Apostolic Succession etc. in one place. I know of a couple of folks reading this forum who have a particular interest in understanding what happened since the Brazilian "brush". Some of our current readers are RCC diocesan office people doing a little research.

A big shout out to them (the aforementioned diocesans) for peering in!

Posted by: Fr. Joe Butler Oct 29 2007, 12:34 PM

QUOTE

Actually, Nat is correct as far as I am concerned. Part of the problem from thence forward is this: While the Bishops who were consecrated by the Brazilians agreed to not build a church in Brazil...makes sense. They were also told to ONLY use the Roman Ordinal in the future consecrations of Bishops and other clergy. I believe Randy Sly continued this practice and went so far as to "confirm" parishioners according to the Roman Rite and Bless all Marriages. He did this retroactively.

Unfortunately, it has been confirmed to me that Randy's practice may have been the exception. Therefore, just like other "catholic" churches, the trace of Apostolic Succession is now difficult. To the point that it has been reported that a former CEC priest going to another catholic jurisdiction can't yet prove he was validly confirmed prior to being ordained a priest.

If you are clergy out there, who were ordained prior to the Brazilian "strengthening", please tell us if you were also subsequently strengthened in your Priestly, Diaconal ordinations. If you were ordained after the the "strengthening" was the Roman Ordinal used precisely? "Just curious" as well.

Soon, I hope to post what I know of the investigation of the original lines of successions, the Brazilian "brush/touch" and the subsequent unravelling of the process of the CEC's move toward Catholicism. Whether you like to hear it or not...there was a CEC officially sanctioned (from the highest level) investigation of the possibility of the CEC gaining "status" with the RCC. Many have been told otherwise, and many thought it was with the Orthodox or this or that group. I was there!!! I will share what I know about this and hope others will chime in. I think it should be on a separate thread, however. That discussion, taken as a whole might help or might be of help for those clergy and parishes now considering departing for other catholic jurisdictions.

I do not have time to start the thread myself, today. If someone else would like to start it, please do. I will write what I know about this, including my trip to Rome/Vatican with Bp. Phil Zampino and "company".

After the event with Patriarch Costa and the Bishops in Maryland and the next HoB meeting, then Abp. Dale Howard had all the SEP, during the Lenten retreat in NC, have hands laid on them to "strengthen" the "line." He used the Roman Rite.

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 12:41 PM

Yes Joni I have heard some pretty bad stuff, firsthand.

QUOTE

I haven't heard anyone be 'demonized' for not staying at St. Michael's. or are you talking about the ICCEC?

I've only heard sadness that they left. Those who left were loved and will be missed by everyone.

Who is demonizing them?

"Wakeup" is making an interesting point:

QUOTE

You may have a role too, Joni. Why did you say Fr Cuthbertson, Fr Olkie, and Fr Barry leaving the church is 'another story'? All great men with great families who have been there for decades.

Why are they "another story"? Are they guilty of subversion? Always were planning to leave the CEC? Always were planning to go to Orthodoxy? Why so ready to point the finger all of a sudden?

BTW Joni, I don't agree with dragging your daughter into this conversation. I think you and Mike are amazing people for the selfless path you have chosen. More power to you! On more than one occasion have I bragged about you two!

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 12:49 PM

QUOTE (Fr. Joe Butler @ Oct 29 2007, 12:34 PM)

QUOTE

Actually, Nat is correct as far as I am concerned. Part of the problem from thence forward is this: While the Bishops who were consecrated by the Brazilians agreed to not build a church in Brazil...makes sense. They were also told to ONLY use the Roman Ordinal in the future consecrations of Bishops and other clergy. I believe Randy Sly continued this practice and went so far as to "confirm" parishioners according to the Roman Rite and Bless all Marriages. He did this retroactively.

Unfortunately, it has been confirmed to me that Randy's practice may have been the exception. Therefore, just like other "catholic" churches, the trace of Apostolic Succession is now difficult. To the point that it has been reported that a former CEC priest going to another catholic jurisdiction can't yet prove he was validly confirmed prior to being ordained a priest.

If you are clergy out there, who were ordained prior to the Brazilian "strengthening", please tell us if you were also subsequently strengthened in your Priestly, Diaconal ordinations. If you were ordained after the the "strengthening" was the Roman Ordinal used precisely? "Just curious" as well.

Soon, I hope to post what I know of the investigation of the original lines of successions, the Brazilian "brush/touch" and the subsequent unravelling of the process of the CEC's move toward Catholicism. Whether you like to hear it or not...there was a CEC officially sanctioned (from the highest level) investigation of the possibility of the CEC gaining "status" with the RCC. Many have been told otherwise, and many thought it was with the Orthodox or this or that group. I was there!!! I will share what I know about this and hope others will chime in. I think it should be on a separate thread, however. That discussion, taken as a whole might help or might be of help for those clergy and parishes now considering departing for other catholic jurisdictions.

I do not have time to start the thread myself, today. If someone else would like to start it, please do. I will write what I know about this, including my trip to Rome/Vatican with Bp. Phil Zampino and "company".

After the event with Patriarch Costa and the Bishops in Maryland and the next HoB meeting, then Abp. Dale Howard had all the SEP, during the Lenten retreat in NC, have hands laid on them to "strengthen" the "line." He used the Roman Rite.

What about Confirmations?

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 12:51 PM

Yes Joni I have heard some pretty bad stuff, firsthand.

QUOTE

I haven't heard anyone be 'demonized' for not staying at St. Michael's. or are you talking about the ICCEC?

I've only heard sadness that they left. Those who left were loved and will be missed by everyone.

Who is demonizing them?

"Wakeup" is making an interesting point:

QUOTE

You may have a role too, Joni. Why did you say Fr Cuthbertson, Fr Olkie, and Fr Barry leaving the church is 'another story'? All great men with great families who have been there for decades.

Why are they "another story"? Are they guilty of subversion? Always were planning to leave the CEC? Always were planning to go to Orthodoxy? Why so ready to point the finger all of a sudden?

BTW Joni, I don't agree with dragging your daughter into this conversation. I think you and Mike are amazing people for the selfless path you have chosen. More power to you! On more than one occasion have I bragged about you two!

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 12:54 PM

Yes Joni I have heard some pretty bad stuff, firsthand.

QUOTE

I haven't heard anyone be 'demonized' for not staying at St. Michael's. or are you talking about the ICCEC?

I've only heard sadness that they left. Those who left were loved and will be missed by everyone.

Who is demonizing them?

"Wakeup" is making an interesting point:

QUOTE

You may have a role too, Joni. Why did you say Fr Cuthbertson, Fr Olkie, and Fr Barry leaving the church is 'another story'? All great men with great families who have been there for decades.

Why are they "another story"? Are they guilty of subversion? Always were planning to leave the CEC? Always were planning to go to Orthodoxy? Why so ready to point the finger all of a sudden?

BTW Joni, I don't agree with dragging your daughter into this conversation. I think you and Mike are amazing people for the selfless path you have chosen. More power to you! On more than one occasion have I bragged about you two!

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 12:55 PM

Here is where I would like to discuss issues directly related to those among the CEC who have gone or would like to go to Rome: http://z6.invisionfree.com/On_Our_Way_Home/index.php?showtopic=105

If you have posted information about the RCC view of CEC orders or other items, please copy and paste them over there. I just don't have time right now.

Thanks.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 12:55 PM

I am already getting a ton of flack here, probably from CECers.

Come on Folks, Joni's response to my post shows the dysfunctional at work. I never said anything in detail about her adult daughter. And she marginalizes the seriously sick issues with people in the church, including how her daughter's situation was dealt with. It is sad. Try looking at this with tough love and not love sick, I mean sick love. All of us have been given these 3D glasses in SM's but the show is over! I can see clearly now! My prayer is that others will. -NSV



Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 12:55 PM

Here is where I would like to discuss issues directly related to those among the CEC who have gone or would like to go to Rome: http://z6.invisionfree.com/On_Our_Way_Home/index.php?showtopic=105

If you have posted information about the RCC view of CEC orders or other items, please copy and paste them over there. I just don't have time right now.

Thanks.

Posted by: Nemo Oct 29 2007, 12:57 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 29 2007, 12:34 PM)

To all those on this thread who are contributing to the discussion of the CEC's relationship with RCC. Can we collaborate on another thread--one topic? I am hoping to chime in when I have more time. The discussion seems particularly vital in the light of the disclosure to me that another CEC parish is looking toward the Vatican.

I would be glad to hear what you have to say -- I had not known that you were directly involved! The whole affair was so hush-hush and quickly forgotten....

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 12:58 PM

Nemo, I am intrigued about your knowledge of this as well. Please feel free to email me mbroute66@charter.net.

Thanks.

Posted by: mryl Oct 29 2007, 01:03 PM

To Nat Sherman

How dare you slander my granddaughter on a public forum. At the time she was a child. Now you have exposed her. She is not evil. St. Michael's has helped Joni and Mike raise her. It has been a safer haven for her, than if she were out in the world without the church.

I am angry and ashamed of your gossip, slander and defamation of her, whether true or untrue is beside the point. Her growing up actions are none of your business.

Your apology cannot undo the hurt and damage you have done.

Grandma Love

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 01:11 PM

Nat never mentioned her by name. Your exaggeration is causing more harm to your grand-daughter- still the vast majority do not know her by name so chill out. 

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 01:15 PM

mryl, welcome to the discussion.

First of all slander is not in operation here. Please read the definition of slander and then retract your statement. I don't blame you for being angry. However I also encourage you to be angry at the correct parties!--the CEC/SM/3-D glasses wearing crowd.

Second, Nat's point about "**love sick/sick love**" is at the heart of the problem within SM and wherever that virus of sick love was allowed to spread unchecked.

Third, Nat also brought out the issues without mentioning any details about the young woman in question. By your, Joni and others joining in the fray, we now know much more than we needed to know about the young woman.

more later.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 01:17 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 29 2007, 02:11 PM)

Nat never mentioned her by name. Your exaggeration is causing more harm to your grand-daughter- still the vast majority do not know her by name so chill out. 

Exactly! Thank you Guest!

Posted by: Fr. Joe Butler Oct 29 2007, 01:21 PM

Mike,

I remember that Sly gave a presentation at the 2000 International Convocation to priest and bishops and spoke of the CEC and RCC talks. We were told that we could not discuss this yet because it was still being worked on. In August 2000, I saw Bishop Robert Baker (RCC) in St. Augustine. As we talked, he said that he had heard that our two churches had been in talks. He prayed that they would go well.

Well, we all know now that they didn't. It is so sad to sit back now and see what has happened to some thing that could have been really used by God to touch the world more than it did.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 01:24 PM

QUOTE (mryl @ Oct 29 2007, 01:03 PM)

How dare you slander my granddaughter on a public forum. At the time she was a child. Now you have exposed her. She is not evil.

I am angry and ashamed of your gossip, slander and defamation of her, whether true or untrue is beside the point. Her growing up actions are none of your business.

Your apology cannot undo the hurt and damage you have done.

Grandma Love

Well, I reread my post and I only suggested that Joni consider the issue (a recent one known to her) with her daughter and how it was dealt with. I didn't mention one single detail or even allude to one. Maybe you should reread it. Joni revealed some things but not me Ma'am. -NSV



Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 01:27 PM

Nat Sherma: I just don't think it is right to lump a minor (my understanding she was at the time of the problems) into the mix with the adults misbehaving at SM.

But yes you are right it is all messed up for sure!

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 01:32 PM

The 3D glasses are still in full effect I see. -NSV



Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 01:36 PM

Nat no need to get nasty because I disagree with you.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 01:36 PM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 29 2007, 01:27 PM)

Nat Sherma: I just don't think it is right to lump a minor (my understanding she was at the time of the problems) into the mix with the adults misbehaving at SM.

You have no idea what you're talking about because I didn't go into details. It is very recent. BUT, the issue in question is the issue. There's no 3rd dimension to it. It has to do with how sick love has infected our response to things, kind of like right now. - NSV



Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 01:40 PM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 29 2007, 01:36 PM)

Nat no need to get nasty because I disagree with you.

No harm, no foul Ms. Celine. -NSV



Posted by: Joni Oct 29 2007, 01:40 PM

Actually Mike Balwin, and others who don't give their names, I haven't really told you anything about my daughter except that St. Michael's didn't cause her problems.

Nate knows that, many people who know her, read this forum. He was out of line to even mention her as I've always given my name on this forum. Of course everyone could figure out who he was talking about. We only defended her as any mother or grandmother would.

I'm beginning to see the real direction of the forum is to attack people who have differing opinions. Some of you talk of those who have stayed with S.M as criticizing and slandering those who have left, yet I've only heard slander on this forum not at S.M. I don't get it.

Nat Sherman, You seem to know so much about my family and yet no one in my family even knows who you are...My family has been at S.M. for over 30 years. Who are you?

I leave you all to fight and speculate. I'm done...

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 01:40 PM

Nat, the fact is you used Joni's daughter in the same breath as the adults:

QUOTE

like Chris, Autumn, Josh & baby or your own daughter's situation for example

The inference you make, at best, is highly questionable my friend.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 01:41 PM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 29 2007, 01:36 PM)

Nat no need to get nasty because I disagree with you.

No harm, no foul Ms. Celine. -NSV



Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 01:45 PM

QUOTE

No harm, no foul Ms. Celine. -NSV

Actually it was you getting foul

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 01:50 PM

QUOTE

I'm done

And the typical St. Mikey's response lives on...

Question: Why did you say Fr Cuhbertson, Fr Olkie, and Fr Barry leaving the church is 'another story'?

Answer:

.
. .
.

Question: Again (for the third time), why did you say Fr Cuhbertson, Fr Olkie, and Fr Barry leaving the church is 'another story'?

Answer:

.
. .
.

Gotta love it!!!

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 01:51 PM

yes Guest you are right, they don't want to talk about it

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 01:56 PM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 29 2007, 02:40 PM)

Actually Mike Balwin, and others who don't give their names, I haven't really told you anything about my daughter except that St. Michael's didn't cause her problems. Nate knows that, many people who know her, read this forum. He was out of line to even mention her as I've always given my name on this forum. Of course everyone could figure out who he was talking about. We only defended her as any mother or grandmother would.

Joni,

For the record, my name is Mike Baldwin--not Balwin

Your posts and those defending your posts along with your near exposure of another anonymous poster all seem a little disingenuous to me. The original point was exposure of the dysfunction in operation at SM. And you say that was not an influence in your child's problems? Hard to believe.

Only warning: I will begin editing out the word "slander" if you cannot do so yourselves. Since I really don't have the time to edit, I will more likely delete your post.

QUOTE

Nat Sherman, You seem to know so much about my family and yet no one in my family even knows who you are...My family has been at S.M. for over 30 years. Who are you?

I leave you all to fight and speculate. I'm done...

That is probably just as well, because the longer you keep this up, the more exposure of your "child" there will be. I suggest you stop while you are behind and discuss the issues. Do you see dysfunction at SM? Have you experienced it? Do you have thoughts about how it led to the diminishment of the CEC USA?

QUOTE

I'm beginning to see the real direction of the forum is to attack people who have differing opinions. Some of you talk of those who have stayed with S.M as criticizing and slandering those who have left, yet I've only heard slander on this forum not at S.M.
I don't get it.

Do you want to read bad-mouthing of departed CECers by CECers? If so there are thousands of posts on the Ancient Future forum, among them are many who were maligned by those who continue(d) to identify with the CEC. Some even appear here, as well. That, my dear is not what we are about. So, please refrain from it and stop trying to expose others!

The purpose of this Forum is to get the truth about the news of the current state of affairs (no pun intended) within the CEC and

what people want to do about it. You, Joni, appear to be quite happy with the information you have received and obviously content to live with the status quo.

I will tell you that without this forum and other forums and blogs...(+)Adler would still be Patriarch today.

Posted by: Joni Oct 29 2007, 01:56 PM

'Brave guest',

Like I have said before many times. I didn't come to this forum to gossip, slander or drag other people into the discussion. I came to sort out my thoughts about my church.

You can't bait me with 'name calling' to talk about other people. I won't do it.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 01:56 PM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 29 2007, 01:40 PM)

Actually Mike Balwin, and others who don't give their names, I haven't really told you anything about my daughter except that St. Michael's didn't cause her problems.

Nate knows that, many people who know her, read this forum. He was out of line to even mention her as I've always given my name on this forum. Of course everyone could figure out who he was talking about. We only defended her as any mother or grandmother would.

I'm beginning to see the real direction of the forum is to attack people who have differing opinions. Some of you talk of those who have stayed with S.M as criticizing and slandering those who have left, yet I've only heard slander on this forum not at S.M.

I don't get it.

Nat Sherman, You seem to know so much about my family and yet no one in my family even knows who you are...My family has been at S.M. for over 30 years. Who are you?

I leave you all to fight and speculate. I'm done...

Joni, I am sorry for "lumping" your daughter in with things. I don't want to attack you guys. I really just wished that you could've seen how things have been dysfunctional over the past few years. They have been way off base. I TOTALLY disagree with how we dealt with the issues surrounding your daughter, she was the victim. In my opinion we didn't do the hard work of showing the wrong and addressing it. We did this to save face and cover our sins. Maybe my perception is wrong. Again, I don't have any ill will toward your family. -NSV



I am not apologizing for my comments only the effect of them!

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 29 2007, 02:07 PM

I do disagree with you but the 3D comment was in jest. Sorry Celine. -NSV



Posted by: jdshingl Oct 29 2007, 02:15 PM

It saddens me to see (adults) acting like some of you on here are. You are not showing good Christian stewardship to the youth of this generation and they are watching how you handle this problem. When they see you acting this way they think why should I become a Christian when all they see is backstabbing and hypocrisy on the part of so called Christians. Now I don't normally post on here but I read everything. I,m no longer with the cec but I still care about the people that still are. I think I'll go back to reading now before I say something that is not very Christ like.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 29 2007, 02:22 PM

It seems pretty obvious that Nat Sherman was by no means trying to hurt your daughter/granddaughter. He did not single her out or even state her name. He was simply trying to give an example (among many others) of how the good ole folks at SM are notorious for mishandling issues.

If you guys hadn't gone on and on about it, she probably would have never been mentioned again. But instead, we have now gone on about her for a page and a half of posts! If you are so worried about your precious daughter just drop it!

QUOTE

Your apology cannot undo the hurt and damage you have done.

I doubt it has done that much damage, and it probably wouldn't have done any if you didn't bring it up again!

ANYWAYS.... lets get back to the real topics at hand!

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 03:01 PM

Good point! 😊

Posted by: misunderstood Oct 29 2007, 03:18 PM

QUOTE (Joni @ Oct 29 2007, 11:41 AM)

Church isn't always about finding sin and punishing it. It's about healing and restoration too.

Thank you for this reminder of our role as the "Bride of Christ".

Blessings to you, your daughter and your family.

misunderstood

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 03:25 PM

QUOTE

There is a Pastoral Provision for parishes that join the RCC to remain independent so that they can use the approved Anglican Rite, correct?

The priest and parish, as with Fr. Bergman and Fr. Chris Philips, can use the Anglican-Use Book of Divine Worship approved by the USCCB. However, not all have to. They are free to use the GIRM approved Novos Ordo or even a Latin-rite now.

QUOTE

This would still put a crimp in the CEC parish's style -- are they still under the restrictions of GIRM?

Yes, all worship is subject to the RCC GIRM. The Anglican-Use parishes do not comprise a uniate Church like the PNCC is in the process to become. Anglican-Use parishes are fully Roman Catholic. The Chaldaen, Syro-M and the Maronite are uniate churches. The PNCC and Assyrian Church of the East (Nestorian) are at different levels of dialogue and communion with Rome. It appears TAC/ACA has joined this latter group. It could lead to limited communion and then on to full communion.

However, there is "no crimping" necessary. The GIRM allows for the Charismatic expression.

QUOTE

Of course, this assumes that the CEC priests would be accepted by Rome. Very few have accredited master's degrees, and a large number don't even have bachelor's degrees of any sort.

This is true but, as illustrated with Alex Jones, the Church will work with you until you complete the training necessary. Contact him for advise. Also, I would suggest contacting Fr. Steve Anderson, a former CEC priest who is now a Roman Catholic priest, and discuss the potentials.

Posted by: Nemo Oct 29 2007, 03:43 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 29 2007, 03:25 PM)

QUOTE

This would still put a crimp in the CEC parish's style -- are they still under the restrictions of GIRM?

However, there is "no crimping" necessary. The GIRM allows for the Charismatic expression.

Well, most of the CEC priests that I know feel free to rearrange the service to suit the move of the Spirit. I really don't know much about the GIRM, but I remember reading it and finding it awfully strict by CEC standards.

Maybe there is some middle ground.

QUOTE

This is true but, as illustrated with Alex Jones, the Church will work with you until you complete the training necessary.

What do you mean by "working with" -- certainly not allowing a priest to celebrate Mass before he has fulfilled all the requirements?

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 03:54 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 24 2007, 07:29 AM)

I do not want to turn this thread into another Home to Rome thread.

LOL. Congratulations! You actually got two whole posts in here before someone turned it into a "Home to Rome" discussion. Is that some kind of record?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 04:56 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 29 2007, 01:55 PM)

Here is where I would like to discuss issues directly related to those among the CEC who have gone or would like to go to Rome: http://z6.invisionfree.com/On_Our_Way_Home/index.php?showtopic=105

If you have posted information about the RCC view of CEC orders or other items, please copy and paste them over there. I just don't have time right now.

Thanks.

Reminder.

Posted by: Celine Oct 29 2007, 06:50 PM

To all:

I have been posting on this site as "Celine"

St. Michael's has been my church home for close to 25 years - and counting.

My intent in participating is to discuss the problems we face at St. Michael's on the local level, and the ICCEC on a broader level. My sincere desire is to see us face our faults, make the necessary changes, and to heal and grow from our mistakes.

I believe we have been arrogant. Arrogant at St. Michael's and arrogant as a communion.

This has come at a price. Spiritually, we are not well. We have failed. We have failed eachother.

We have not been forthright and we have stuck our collective heads in the sand hoping it will all go away. Instead we are go around in circles, lost in the desert like the Israelites of old.

I believe constructive criticism is a necessary part of a healthy, functioning Church. Questioning does not equal rebellion.

Timely, open communication - from top to bottom - is essential to "consensus government" on all levels.

I believe an active, participating laity is essential to the health of the Church.

I believe lay people in the ICCEC have been treated all too often as subjects or as children, not as adults. I believe this is wrong and it must end.

Therefore, CEC'ers stand up. Don't be afraid! Let us be a part of the solution. Let us participate in the conversation, at your church, here online or wherever you can.

Robert F. Fortuin
rfortuin@speakeasy.net

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 29 2007, 07:21 PM

Bravo

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 29 2007, 07:32 PM

Sorry. Logged in from an old bookmark on phone from when I posted as Firewheel. Anyway, bravo, Robert!

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 07:34 PM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 29 2007, 08:21 PM)

Bravo

Thanks **Robert!** I echo Firewheel. You are a valuable conversationalist on this Forum.

Anyone else want to clue us in on who you are and become part of the solution?

You can use www.cecblog.com to let others know where this conversation is happening.

Posted by: Royedw Oct 29 2007, 07:40 PM

What I find to be strangely revealing, and I say this after following this CEC/RCC (& other denomination) commentary for the past year, is this: look at how people are attacking one another for what is being said by one to the other! 😞 It was no different last year. Some "minor" attempts at bringing healing conversation, and prayer, into the mix, yet last year and again now, the vitriol just flows.

If this is what the CEC brings to all of us, on either side, perhaps we really need to take a look at whether or not Our Lord is really present in this. Separate the wheat from the chaff, (sp?? 🙄), make sure Satan isn't using this to turn the hearts of Godly men and women away from where they should be, and that is towards building His Church, in His Name, for His Holiness and Presence in all of our lives!!

Find the **healing** people, pray and find the healing... 🙏

In Him,

Roy

Posted by: Joni Oct 29 2007, 07:50 PM

Robert, I'm going to email you, but my email isn't working right now. It's a problem with Verizon. I'll write to you as soon as it's working again.
Your sister, Joni

Posted by: seraph Oct 29 2007, 08:32 PM

Its been busy I see....!

blessings and peace to all

seraph 🙏

Posted by: Victoria LeClear (Kinney) Oct 29 2007, 08:47 PM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 29 2007, 01:56 PM)

Who are you?

I leave you all to fight and speculate. I'm done... [/QUOTE]

Joni, I am sorry for "lumping" your daughter in with things. I don't want to attack you guys. I really just wished that you could've seen how things have been dysfunctional over the past few years. They have been way off base. I **TOTALLY** disagree with how we dealt with the issues surrounding your daughter, she was the victim. In my opinion we didn't do the hard work of showing the wrong and addressing it. We did this to save face and cover our sins. Maybe my perception is wrong. Again, I don't have any ill will toward your family. -NSV



I am not apologizing for my comments only the effect of them!

Dear Nat Sherman and all members and ex members of the CEC

First off, Nat I would like to thank you for your compassion care and concern about my family and particularly my sister. **[B]Your love is evident in your words[B]**. I would also like to ask why, if you are, and were so concerned about her situation and victimization by a clergy member at St. Michaels, why do you wait until now to bring it up on a blog rather than actually attempting to remedy the situation when it occurred, since you seem to be in some position of leadership which would explain why you know so much about the situation. Perhaps was it because you are or were a loyal member of St. Michaels church who actively participated in the all too frequent drunken celebrations where members, clergy and leaders encouraged underage drinking and smoking which led clergy members (such as the one who engaged my sister) to act indiscreetly and in an extremely harmful way?

Were you one of the Church Members, Priests, Deacons or Bishops who I have seen with my own eyes (In my mere 21 years of life, that I have spent entirely at St. Michaels church) drunk, stumbling, encouraging underage drinking and smoking and then felt guilty **when the ignorant brainwashed children and adults you lead astray, went on to harm one another? They are guilty of their own actions ofcourse, as are you or all members of the church whoe participated in and perpetuated the alcoholism and acts leading to self destruction.**

I am in so much pain and I am so devastated with myself for not standing up to this sooner and not saying what was on my heart sooner, I am just as guilty as Bishop Adler, Dan Sharp and all the other Bishops and clergy in the CEC who saw each other on a path toward destruction covered it up and did little or nothing to stop it.

Now as a result of the Patriarchal, male dominated, provincial minded governing at St. Michaels, the encouragement of alcoholism and illegal underage smoking, covering up of Priests having affairs, Priests actually having the affairs, men prophesying insanity and attributing it to God to make their insanity sound more valid:

1) I now have no pastor because all or most of the priests, clergy and members of my church, encouraged and participated in alcoholism and promiscuity and then when one of them took it too far they all jumped back and shifted the blame to him and then left. I am not "demonizing" anyone in any way, I think it's great they have left, St. Michaels has had HUGE problems, but they need to know that they perpetuated it and participated in it as well. They all saw the lies, destruction, cover up, alcoholism and insanity and weird prophesies and marriages of 17 year old children to 27 year old men and they ENCOURAGED IT AND ALLOWED IT!

2) My brother and sister were encouraged to go behind my parents back and smoke and are now addicted to cigarettes because the insanity at my church lead them to thinking it was alright. I am so angry at you all for that, I love you but it hurts! I've cried so much over this, why did you do this if you love me.

3) My sister was harmed by a member of the church and no one did anything about it except put the offender in time out so to speak.

4) My mom was harmed by finding that the men she was supposed to believe in were liars and insane.

5) My Dad and Mom remain loyal to the church in order to begin healing with the remaining members of the church. They loves them and recognizes their hurt and pain and refuses to leave or abandon them. He and my Mother want to pick up the pieces of the destruction left behind and I can only commend them for that, however I do not think that all of the church's issues are resolved and unless there is some reform in the practices and in the actions mentioned above, I can not stand by and pretend that everything is alright anymore.

I've learned my lesson, and that lesson is that I should have stood up long ago. I am educated, I am smart and I am very capable of getting in front of a large group of church members and lovingly voicing my fears, pain and concerns at what I have seen happen in the church, the denomination and also in my family.

The affairs and the sexual advances and the cover ups and the lies were just the volcano eruption from the fire raging underneath the surface. Alcoholism was a huge part of that fire and was engaged in by almost everyone in my church. I'm 21 and I have been there my entire life, I saw it, my Mom saw it and then I went to college was able to step back from the church see that what was happening there was wrong on so many levels and that it was already beginning to harm my friends, loved ones, and eventually the clergy and my beloved Pastor.

I didn't ask for any of this. **I am so tired of all the lies and all the leaders thinking that the mere congregation and the mere women in the church are not worthy of hearing and knowing the truth about their leaders, their denomination and their pastor.**

I have cried so much for my church and for my friends and family and I do not want to do it anymore.

Why did you lead us into this? Why did you hurt my family, why did you hurt other people and why did you hurt yourselves? Please know that I love you all and I love you Randy Adler with all of my heart, I have known you my entire life and I will always love you, but what you did was wrong, and you have lead a lot of innocent, naive people astray. Christ loves and Christ heals and he will heal the people hurt and affected by the deceit and we will all move on and learn from our mistakes, I have learned from mine.

I love you all and I know that you are all hurting, and Nat I even love you, I know that you probably are experiencing a lot of pain as we all are. Everyone in my church and who has left my church, please when you move forward,

1. Do not encourage underage drinking, or any form of alcoholism, it leads even the most respectful gentlemen to the most horrible of crimes

2. Do not encourage children, the children or siblings of others, or even your own children to participate in illegal activities of any kind, but particularly cancer causing smoking. When you love people you don't let them hurt themselves.

3. Do not perpetuate male dominated, hierarchical, provincial minded forms of governing a church. We are all children of Christ and we all are important and have a voice. Hold forums and inform the adults (not the children, that is left to their parents discretion) of all the events, both good and bad, taking place in the church in a spirit of openness and honesty. It is the right thing to do.

4. Do not encourage men and women to lie and cover up molestation.

5. Do not encourage young, smart, intelligent women to sacrifice any chance at obtaining an education which would allow them to help support their future dream of having a huge family, of achieving personal fulfillment, of helping others or making the world a better place (along with caring for their family which is one of the most difficult and meaningful jobs in the world). We have seen that affairs and pregnancy by other men not their husbands, may be the result when children or emotionally immature young women attempt to sustain a marriage. Not every case, but many, and as it has been said before, patience is a virtue, if you love your daughters so much, help them to be wise and become educated and financially self sufficient, it will be better for them and their marriages in the long run in most cases.

7. Please do not prophesy strange things pertaining to marriage or anything of any kind. If I had a nickel for every time I have been prophesied that I was supposed to marry a young man in my church I would be a millionaire. Thank God for college, education, discernment and a wise mother.

6. Stay with your roots of love, compassion, scripture, sacraments and worship; that is what makes you beautiful and pure.

I love you, I love all of you and I know that many people may be upset with my honesty, but these things have been on my heart for longer than you know, I may be wrong I may not be, I am not so arrogant to think that I have it all perfect, I know that I don't, I am

just one more hurt, silly, young ignorant girl among the rest who wants to stop crying and stop hurting and who wants her church, her family and her life back. Love

Victoria LeClear (Kinney)

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 29 2007, 08:56 PM

QUOTE (Royedw @ Oct 29 2007, 07:40 PM)

If this is what the CEC brings to all of us, on either side, perhaps we really need to take a look at whether or not Our Lord is really present in this. Separate the wheat from the chaff, (sp?? 🙄), make sure Satan isn't using this to turn the hearts of Godly men and women away from where they should be, and that is towards building His Church, in His Name, for His Holiness and Presence in all of our lives!!

Find the **healing** people, pray and find the healing... 🙏

In Him,

Roy

Roy,

God bless you brother.

I think what all this shows is a people with a lot of passion. Unfortunately there is a lot of pain at present, and many need to work through this, the second (or third?) major upheaval in the CEC. It will continue until all bend the knee to the Lord and give up their own lordship.

I have to disagree with you about the image though. The image was already damaged by those in leadership within the broken communion known as the ICCEC. The fallout is what you are witnessing here in this forum and I highly doubt that these folks' faith and Christian witness is tarnished "out in the real world" (as opposed to this forum.) I suspect they are still worshipping the Lord and doing acts of charity, and trying to listen for His leading.

This, and other forums like it, provide what should be a safe haven for those that are hurting to vent and discuss and argue/debate. Nothing at all wrong with that in and of itself. It is a necessary human activity. And if it truly helps those of us that have been deeply hurt to come out the other side in a better place, so be it. The problem has come primarily from those still in the CEC who do not know - or refuse to acknowledge that they are still trapped in the nightmare of a cultish group. It's kind of like the Matrix (the CEC Matrix) where all of them are "hooked up" to the Matrix for a simulated reality created by sentient machines in order to pacify and subdue the human population while their body heat is used as an energy source. Only those who have been freed from the tubes and wires such as Neo or Trinity actually see what the real world and situation looks like. Bp. Ken was kind of a Morpheus and all the current CEC attackers are the Agent's Brown, Smith and Jones and the many iterations of them.

So let the clash continue as it will not destroy, only strengthen and possibly free others from the Matrix and into the real world.

Blessings.

Dcn. Chic Harmon+

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 09:08 PM

"ofcourse, as are you or all members of the church who participated in and perpetuated the alcoholism and acts leading to self destruction"

I Meant WHO (so much for being smart and capable)

"They loves them and recognizes their hurt and pain and refuses to leave or abandon them. "

I Meant HE (again so much for the smart blonde comments)

Victoria LeClear (Kinney)

Again, if anyone has anything mean or nice to say about me my family or my comments please do so. Honesty is the best policy, however I am a college student, working and interning as well so I will not be able to say anything more on this lovely blog site. Again I love you all, Love in Christ

Victoria LeClear (Kinney)

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 29 2007, 09:08 PM

Such courage Victoria! God bless you. You are in our prayers.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 29 2007, 09:10 PM

QUOTE (Shirley Myers @ Oct 29 2007, 10:08 PM)

Such courage Victoria! God bless you. You are in our prayers.

Courage and Grace.

Please post when you can.

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 29 2007, 09:15 PM

QUOTE (Victoria LeClear (Kinney) @ Oct 29 2007, 08:47 PM)

Victoria,

My heart goes out to you in your crisis of faith. Please know that the Lord weeps over this disaster in the CEC as so many of His innocent lambs - the ones He shed blood for - are hurt in the process.

You made a profound statement in your confession and cry -

The affairs and the sexual advances and the cover ups and the lies were just the volcano eruption from the fire raging underneath the surface. Alcoholism was a huge part of that fire and was engaged in by almost everyone in my church.

I too finally had my eyes opened to the "cigars and scotch" events which many times turned out a drunken bishop. It was all excused by other clergy as an isolated event to relieve stress. I believed them until I was around them more often in seminary and retreats where the booze flowed freely. One priest even showing up with a trunkload of liquor. It was THE thing it seemed that everyone looked forward to. I took part as well.

But the key was your statement about the "**Alcoholism being a huge part of the fire.**"

Alcohol fires are nearly invisible and can be recognized (in most cases) only once you have been burned. In drag racing that is a major fear as many have been seriously burned by something they could not see. Such is the danger of alcohol and Paul's admonition to not be drunk. A person's spirit is exposed to other spirits when they are drunk, some of which cling for a long time. I think this has happened in the CEC and has hardened many hearts against the weaker brothers and sisters and has caused many serious "burns."

I pray you are healed and strengthened and that God in his infinite mercy leads you to safe harbor where you will find shelter.

The Lord Bless you,

Dcn. Chic Harmon+

Posted by: Victoria LeClear (Kinney) Oct 29 2007, 10:02 PM

In the light of honesty I also feel it necessary to add that while the incidences that I listed that took place at my church were very painful, the offenders (all of the offenders) no longer attend St. Michaels church.

Many of the members who perpetuated the pain and the activities that led to so much harm are also no longer there. Along with members who didnt cause pain to anyone at all.

I feel that St. Michaels is on the road to recovery and that the people and leaders there now will hopefully learn from past mistakes and will take these words of pain and comments for improvement from a young, unimportant 21 year old girl, as words of love and words of forgiveness and reconciliation in the hopes of moving forward. I feel for the first time that my family and my church are becoming safe once again and that things are on the mend. Love

Victoria LeClear (Kinney)

Posted by: Guest Oct 29 2007, 10:18 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 25 2007, 12:09 PM)

As the events unfold it seems more clear to me that the CEC's change in top leadership which we may view with gladness, relief, anger, mistrust, boredom or with pain from experiences we have lived it probably does not directly affect the life of our parish! For St. Michael's Church it is a very great and personal crisis...and a lot of complex situations we really need to pray for maybe leaving our own personal peeves about the CEC aside for now....

very complicated and sad

seraph

Seraph,

I have heard from a St. Michael's parishoner that this coming Sunday all of the homegroups will be gathering for a potluck and a meeting over which +Kessler will preside to answer questions.

Can you confirm this?

If this is true, will you attend? Will you speak up about these matters?

Just curious.

Posted by: Out of Love Oct 29 2007, 10:30 PM

QUOTE (Victoria LeClear (Kinney) @ Oct 29 2007, 10:02 PM)

In the light of honesty I also feel it necessary to add that while the incidences that I listed that took place at my church were very painful, the offenders (all of the offenders) no longer attend St. Michaels church.

Many of the members who perpetuated the pain and the activities that led to so much harm are also no longer there. Along with members who didnt cause pain to anyone at all.

Excuse me if I doubt this portion of the revelation you give us

Kessler, House, etc.. who know said nothing allowed the silence and slaughter of the lambs.

You not speaking out is different than their voices towing the party line.

If they allowed it once ...

These were men in trusted postions ordained to protect. I agree they can repent and do a better job, but don't ignore or belittle their own participation. You have put more guilt on yourself in a public setting than any of them at any time have. Though opportunity again and again presented itself for them to do so.

On another note the idea a bishop can go or atleast publicly speak out to people in another diocese is crazy. Paul did it over and over again. To the church at fill in the blank. Yes he founded many of these churches and erected the leadership to govern them. Others were in charge of these churches when out of love he wrote them. He never shyed away from proclaiming the gospel anywhere anytime. The truth shall set you free. Thank God he did it makes up most of the new testament. John wrote to the seven Churches in Revelation. Need I go on. This is pure insanity to say these leaders who covered their brothers at the expense of the innocent can not atleast lend a voice of comfort to those in despair.

This is their mess as well. Leave the 99 and go after the 1 IOW leave your diocese for a few days and go and rectify the situation at SM go on hand and knee and beg forgiveness for allowing this evil to prevail for so long. Go to Randy Adler and express what this brave 21 year old did. We failed you Randy by not loving you enough to step in and say you are out of line. We must live with what we have done until we die. It will be for us a thorn in the flesh that reminds us of our humanity before the Almighty and how closely we must guard ourselves, our flocks and each other.

V. I am praying for you SM the HOB, PC ICCEC, and Adler.
Thank you for your courage

Posted by: JCS Oct 29 2007, 10:57 PM

Celine - Dude, I love you. You crack me up with all your anonymity. I was beginning to get a bit paranoid, really.

I appreciate all your comments on this blog and I was honestly beginning to wonder why you were pushing me toward confronting the leadership (which it looks like I'll get a chance to do this weekend if this meeting is going to happen) rather than taking the lead yourself. Now I unerstand. Thanks for revealing yourself. Will you call me tomorrow?

I do actually have an observation. Regardless of whether all the bad eggs have left or still remain, the fellowship at St Michael's has been poisoned and the venom of that poison cannot be removed unless there is open and honest communication between the upper-class priesthood and those of us in the proletariat.

In Henry V when Scroop, Grey and Cambridge were revealed as traitors who sought to take the king's life and subsequently arrested, Henry's address included these lines:

"And thus thy fall hath left a kind of blot,
To mark the full-fraught man and best indued with some suspicion."

And so it has seemed to me these past few weeks. Odd, for this "band of brothers" to have fallen into such a role.

Having been drawn out of ignorance and into the realm of pain, accusations and having confirmed some things for myself, it is impossible for me to listen to anyone from the pulpit without wondering if they are trying to help in the healing process or if their words are really another form of spin and manipulation. It is very hard for me to think such things of men that I have known and trust and it obscures our ability to worship. Sundays have become oppressive for us.

Like Victoria, I want a church where we can live in community, where my children will grow and enjoy good spiritual food as well as lifelong friendships. To be perfectly honest, I know in my heart that the Lord has called us to St. Michael's and I have to remain faithful in believing that if He leads us elsewhere that He will make it known to us.

And yes, Robert, we do miss you and your family as you know.

Please pray for us to have wisdom in how to proceed should a meeting occur. Mostly pray that the leaders will be overwhelmed with meekness, honesty, and a contrite heart rather than defending an untenable position.

Posted by: JCS Oct 29 2007, 11:24 PM

QUOTE (Out of Love @ Oct 29 2007, 10:30 PM)

We failed you Randy by not loving you enough to step in and say you are out of line.

Not to add salt to your wound but I think a lot of people who were in the know, whether they were in leadership or not, failed those of us who had no clue and who are now scrambling to understand the enormity of the situation.

The acts of concealment didn't stop with the ordained. This has put a burden on us lesser mortals. Those of us in steerage aren't going to avoid drowning when the ship sinks just because the captain, crew, and first-class passengers thought it best not to let us know that the iceberg we slammed into caused a gaping, irreparable hole.

Our first real warning came when people who had been at St. Michael's since the beginning had taken to the lifeboats and we were left behind without explanation or warning from anyone; now the function of addressing issues without a full arsenal of information at hand has been left to us.

How anyone expects much to come of this is beyond me. I am hoping that those with the most intimate knowledge will not fail to appear when the time for questions arises. I don't recall a time when I have felt less adequate for the task at hand.

<http://www.despair.com/mis24x30prin.html> ☹️

Posted by: Celine Oct 30 2007, 12:31 AM

Hi JCS!

QUOTE

St Michael's has been poisoned and the venom of that poison cannot be removed unless there is open and honest communication between the upper-class priesthood and those of us in the proletariat.

I share your pessimism. A poison indeed.

I sincerely hope if we are going to have a truly "tell all" meeting at SM soon, this meeting will be the Perestroika of the CEC.

Let it be a small start that will cause the evil system to crumble to give way to what the Lord has established our church for. We have to start somewhere. Perhaps the Lord in His mercy can yet use us.

And yes, sadly we have all been blotted.

PS. If it is truly a potluck, I will be bringing a barf bag. Hardly an occasion for a meal.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 30 2007, 01:16 AM

Lots of stuff coming out now... this is just the tip of the iceberg. The only way we can move on is when this kind of stuff is brought out into the light, not for exposure sake but for healing. -NSV



John 3: 19-21 (NIV)

"This is the verdict: Light has come into the world, but men loved darkness instead of light because their deeds were evil. Everyone who does evil hates the light, **and will not come into the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed.** But whoever lives by the truth comes into the light, so that it may be seen plainly that what he has done has been done through God."

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 30 2007, 01:40 AM

QUOTE (Victoria LeClear (Kinney) @ Oct 29 2007, 08:47 PM)

First off, Nat I would like to thank you for your compassion care and concern about my family and particularly my sister. **[B] Your love is evident in your words**[/B]. I would also like to ask why, if you are, and were so concerned about her situation and victimization by a clergy member at St. Michaels, why do you wait until now to bring it up on a blog rather than actually attempting to remedy the situation when it occurred, since you seem to be in some position of leadership which would explain why you know so much about the situation.

Hi Tori,

You said a lot in this post, so I only referenced a little of it, but all of it was very moving, and very necessary. Thank you.

As for your questions: I am a-nobody, a fly on the wall at best. If you were not one of the big 4 (Adler, Kessler, House, Sharp) forget it. They wouldn't even listen to my brother Matt (I am not Phil).

Most of this I found out about after the fact. I want you to know that I lit as many fuses as I could, once I found these things to be true. The only reason for bringing up your sister is because I felt it was a very valid issue. It typified the behavior and reaction to that behavior at SMS. I didn't share a single detail and wouldn't, ever! It appears that even referencing her (not by name) was a mistake because it hurt your mom (& grandmother) and that really sucks.

Now, sometimes I feel like I am the lone man in the room (seems this way at times but Jesus is with us). Everyone I felt would speak up, other than Robert F. left. Now, I pray, I post satire to relieve my frustrations, and share what I can with those who would engage me.

I love everyone too. BUT, these are things that are worth fighting for, and these people are worth fighting for too. Thanks again! - NSV

Posted by: Fr. Rusty Oct 30 2007, 05:08 AM

Dear all: I have not read every post in these threads, however, I have read most of them. In light of that, I thought I might post a few thoughts, observances, facts and recommendations. Recognizing rightly what is/was wrong is very important, taking the proper course of action based on that information is more important.

It has been stated that Bishop Kessler cannot look out into a sea of faces and the innocent children and cover these hard issues.

There needs to be a "town hall" type of meeting with the adults, and no, it does not need to be a "bash the Patriarch" meeting. Then the parents can explain things to the Children at home and in Children's Church meetings as well.

This can only happen if the leadership offers to convene an open meeting with the adults of St Michael's and lets the pain of betrayal be washed in the blood of the lamb.

The fact is that it should be painful but more importantly it never had to happen. The pain comes from the loss of the innocence of the church family and the complicity on the part of the leadership. What needs to happen now is the open confession coming from the contrite heart of the leadership and a process created where the church can offer forgiveness and the Holy Spirit can offer absolution.

++ Adler made mistakes, and other Leadership was certainly complicit in those mistakes. This is not the time for an inquisition, now is the time for reconciliation which will rise out of the pain of the truth and the healing provided by that self same truth. Healing can only come from those involved seeking forgiveness for their complicity in the whole process, and the church offering forgiveness.

Here are some insights/opinions from already having been through this situation:

1. The Patriarch was not cared for properly after the death of his children and Grandchildren. Some false sense of strength was allowed to foster in this situation and his pain was not properly processed. From my perspective, the Psychologists that we had/have in the ranks of the leadership apparently failed, and did not do their part in assisting in the healing process. Instead of healing, it appears that there was some hidden agenda's present in this process.

2. In the Addiction/s treatment process: The other Bishops were made aware of the situations, we had/have Bishops trained in Substance abuse treatment who did not deal with this situation in an appropriate matter.

We also have/had other people/clergy trained in this area that could have helped, again the Leadership failed and others were not consulted. Some Bishops that are Psychologists/Counselors as well as others in the upper leadership knew well of the substance abuse by the Patriarch, knew what should have been done by them for ++Adler but did not take appropriate actions. We must remember that they could not and cannot "make him" get clean and sober, that responsibility is/was Patriarch Adler's, however, they should have heeded the situation and taken the proper actions for his health and the health of the whole Church. This needs to be addressed, and guidelines put in place to make sure it cannot happen again to this degree.

3. Patriarch Adler's condition became worse, memory functions declining, wrong appropriations of scriptural text, wrong use of personal "visions" falling down under the influence, the abandoning of set agendas for meetings, not keeping to the Canons for Government, side meetings on agenda topics to build coalitions (which is contrary to Canons), so forth and so on, again, other Bishops were quite aware, but did nothing.

4. Changed personality with presenting behaviors- again, trained professionals in the ranks of the leadership did not take action to help this man.

Ok, that's a short list of what brought us to this point and perhaps the reason Kessler feels such guilt, and some of the reasons there needs to be hard questions as to "who" might be able to lead the C.E.C.

Next:

It is not "Christian" at all, in any shape, form or factor to enable the ill to stay in the condition the Patriarch was in.

This should lead us to questions of why this was allowed to happen and fester to the point you see today, why were the proper things not done, were there other agendas?

Ok, Testimony (man am I opening a can of worms).

These very issues were discussed openly with Bishop Ken before his meetings with the Patriarch and the other Bishops.

Bishop Ken went to those meeting to try and get ++Adler to get the help he needed, and most likely still needs.

Bishop Ken did not go to try and "power play" an overthrow of ++Adler, but rather to get a man he loved the help he needed, an intervention if you will.

He also went there to do that for the good of the Communion.

We had just lost Bishop Zampino in a situation that should not have happened, he did nothing wrong.

Bishop Sly had just been reduced to a shell in a situation that should not have happened, Bishop Fick had pulled out due to the illness he saw in the overall situation and did not feel there was a way for it to be healed.

Bishop Painter had first hand knowledge that the upper end of the Government had become corrupt and had turned into a personality cult.

The Patriarch had gone through some terrible experiences and did not take, nor was given the time to heal properly and the people best equipped to help with that did not do their Jobs. Our Government did not do what it was created to do-Govern, even itself. (Perhaps trying to copy something ancient without being taught about it and formed by it is a core issue?)

Bishop Frank Constantino understood some of the problems, and he exposed some of the results in the IDA and other areas as well.

The bottom line is there was a core group that could have made a "proper difference" but did not.

In our Diocese, we had several open meeting's of the Clergy on these issues, we processed on it, and we helped Bishop Ken prepare for his meetings.

We had clergy with him there (who were not allowed into some of the meetings but were there for the Dinner talk). We knew from that meeting that the illness ran very deep and there was no vehicle of change available to us within the C.E.C.

Ok, why post all of this;

As I said to Bishop Ken in front of all of our Clergy, this situation did not get to this point by itself, ++Adler is not and has not been the whole problem, but is rather an indication and example that our Government did not work, the checks and balances failed. The Whole HOB and Patriarchs Council "Process of Government" had in some measure failed. Some had tried; they were forced out by the power cells within the government that were not supposed to exist within our way of government.

Politics, and bad Politics at that, were well entrenched.

Lack of Christian love abounded. And we had to realize this is/was not a Patristic way of Government.

Folks, it is not and never has been Christian love to enable the ill (the addicted, psychologically distracted, wounded, so forth and so on) to stay in the condition they are in, and that is what has happened in the C.E.C.

We need to understand that all the "evidence" you see and keep discussing are the "presenting symptoms" of the real illness.

Recommendations;

1. Someone well trained needs to be tending to ++Adler and his wife, retired or not, he still needs the help of the Church to deal with the situation he faces, which are many and they are difficult. I would hate to wake up some morning and hear he has overdosed or fell to his death. He has just faced yet another really hard situation in his life and is probably poorly equipped to deal with it, he needs proper help now as he did in the past, not "enabling" and 'oh poor pitiful you', but rather good proper cognitive therapeutic help. (which is hard to get these days it seems)
2. S.M. (And other Church's) needs to have an open meeting with its Bishop, clergy and all the lay faithful adults in a town hall fashion.
3. Ask the hard questions, do not let up until you are satisfied you have the truth and a plan for the correction, an no, this meeting should not be for the purpose of "playing the blame game", but rather of finding out what went wrong, why, and what can be done to make sure it cannot happen again and to put in place checks and balances to that effect.
4. From this you can decide – sanely- weather to stay or to go. In this way healing can begin in a proper fashion.

Ok, lastly, folks the exchanged life is hard, if anyone tells you different, they are bringing you a false Gospel, a lie.

Death hurts, the grace of God is free to us, yet it cost Jesus His Life, painfully so.

The Grace of God is free to us, yet we must die to it, through it, and it is painful.

This is what will have to happen for the C.E.C to survive, it must enter into a Transformed life, something has to die for there to be new Life, and that is not easy.

For a Communion to enter into transformation, everything has to get on the table.

Part of that "all" was that instead of people loving ++Adler enough to tell him-No- and you need help, he was instead enabled, and for that to happen on such a wide scale, others had to be complicit for their own reasons and or agendas.

Part of the dysfunction was/is leaders that were not thinking of the good of the Communion and the people in the Pews.

So one of the questions has to be "how and why" the Structures in place for the good of all, did not serve the whole communion correctly, what stopped them, who honestly tried to do what was right, so forth and so on.

Where are the Minutes of the meetings, why were minutes not taken if they were not, so forth and so on?

Biblical, Christian confrontational therapy is in order in my opinion.

Therapy is again the key word.

You are looking for what happened from the standpoint of creating a proper treatment plan for healing.

The events that have happened are the presenting symptoms of what is really wrong.

Find those openly, explore them, find the root causes that produced the presenting symptoms, deal with those core issues and you can create a plan for healing.

Work the plan.

It's hard, it's painful, its truth.

Look, you can take a drunk, lock him up where he cannot drink, and what do you have?

A drunk that cannot drink.

As soon as he can drink again, he will.

The only way that changes is if something is done to help him find out why/how he became a drunk and those core issues are dealt with.

God does not come along and wave a magic wand and say; there you go, you are no longer a drunk!

God forbid that so many think this way!

God takes us on a journey of healing that allows us to see what caused our pain/issues that we tried to cover up and deal with ourselves in the wrong manner.

When this happens, those things are Transformed by the Renewing of our Minds and we can know wholeness in a new life.

The C.E.C. is ill, ask God for His help to see the core issues, to understand them, then healing can come.

If this is not done, you will continue to run down the symptom path chasing things from behind the events.

Find the core issues of the dysfunction that produces the behaviors (symptoms) and then transformation can take place.

Ask the questions.

Find the right questions and the correct answers will become apparent.

My love to you all,
Rusty+

Alcohol, youthful Smoking and other behaviors were ABSOLUTELY witness by the entire communion as represented in Manila 2004.

So dysfunctional was the behavior of both the patriarch and so dysfunctional was the behavior of the youth of SM at the Manila Convocation that many throughout the communion were upset, disturbed, concerned and revolted by what they witnessed FIRST HAND. They did not have to believe "rumors", they saw it with their own eyes.

Those who returned home after witnessing these sick displays were very vocal. These concerns were addressed to the current leadership, including Bishop Adler personally. There was a firestorm of concern expressed. All was denied. All was down played. Those who brought the concerns forward were repressed.

The good people of SM were unaware, perhaps, of just widely THIS VERY ISSUE reached throughout the communion with horrific results. People in other CEC congregations returned from Manila and said to themselves, "If this is the CEC and this is the witness of its patriarch and if this is the result of his ministry among the youth of St Michael's, then NO THANK YOU.

Frankly, the damage was done and irreparable. Many, many clergy and many parishes left the CEC that day in their hearts.

To provide a youthful presence and to have a ready made mosh pit for the evening services, the youth of SM were flown at some expense, to Manila. The apparent intent was to show the rest of the CEC how "worshipful and passionate" the youth of SM were, but the result was to expose to many in the rest of the communion the dysfunction of illegal youth smoking, drinking and obnoxious behavior.

For many parishes that left the CEC last year, the stench of the SM youth "witness" in Manila, along with their pastor, the patriarch's prophesies and bizarre "ministry" was still very fresh in their minds.

So, SM was indeed somewhat the "flagship" parish for many. Unfortunately, it was not for the reasons that many people thought.

Let me say again, these concerns were loudly expressed. The response was spin, denial and rebuke.

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 30 2007, 06:34 AM

QUOTE (guest @ Oct 30 2007, 05:55 AM)

Alcohol, youthful Smoking and other behaviors were ABSOLUTELY witness by the entire communion as represented in Manila 2004.

So dysfunctional was the behavior of both the patriarch and so dysfunctional was the behavior of the youth of SM at the Manila Convocation that many throughout the communion were upset, disturbed, concerned and revolted by what they witnessed FIRST HAND. They did not have to believe "rumors", they saw it with their own eyes.

Those who returned home after witnessing these sick displays were very vocal. These concerns were addressed to the current leadership, including Bishop Adler personally. There was a firestorm of concern expressed. All was denied. All was down played. Those who brought the concerns forward were repressed.

The good people of SM were unaware, perhaps, of just widely THIS VERY ISSUE reached throughout the communion with horrific results. People in other CEC congregations returned from Manila and said to themselves, "If this is the CEC and this is the witness of its patriarch and if this is the result of his ministry among the youth of St Michael's, then NO THANK YOU.

Frankly, the damage was done and irreparable. Many, many clergy and many parishes left the CEC that day in their hearts.

To provide a youthful presence and to have a ready made mosh pit for the evening services, the youth of SM were flown at some expense, to Manila. The apparent intent was to show the rest of the CEC how "worshipful and passionate" the youth of SM were, but the result was to expose to many in the rest of the communion the dysfunction of illegal youth smoking, drinking and obnoxious behavior.

For many parishes that left the CEC last year, the stench of the SM youth "witness" in Manila, along with their pastor, the patriarch's prophesies and bizarre "ministry" was still very fresh in their minds.

So, SM was indeed somewhat the "flagship" parish for many. Unfortunately, it was not for the reasons that many people thought.

Let me say again, these concerns were loudly expressed. The response was spin, denial and rebuke.

Thank You Guest and I couldn't agree with you more Way to post.....

Lord In Your Mercy Here Our Prayer. ☹️

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 06:47 AM

QUOTE

"...The Whole HOB and Patriarchs Council "Process of Government" had in some measure failed...."

You are kidding....the "Government of God" ...fail? Oh no!

The system has no built in accountability, bishops are not accountable to clergy or laity...and apparently, have not been to each other!

QUOTE

Alcohol, youthful Smoking and other behaviors were ABSOLUTELY witness by the entire communion as represented in Manila 2004.

Sorry to burst any bubbles...but aren't youth a little reckless at times, or is that just at churches I have been a part of? I remember smoking and sneaking out a window at a fundamentalist Baptist camp at 16....I was not the only one!!! You would be surprised what high schoolers...church attenders or not, are capable of. Why is this surprising? With patience and encouragement, prayer and good counsel most church kids do turn out okay! I guess the question for me would bewere the clergy encouraging or tolerating these behaviours?

QUOTE

Let me say again, these concerns were loudly expressed. The response was spin, denial and rebuke.

This is of course very concerning and part of the problem.

blessings

seraph 🙏

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 07:04 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 29 2007, 10:18 PM)

Seraph,

I have heard from a St. Michael's parishoner that this coming Sunday all of the homegroups will be gathering for a potluck and a meeting over which +Kessler will preside to answer questions.

Can you confirm this?

If this is true, will you attend? Will you speak up about these matters?

Just curious.

I do not attend St. Michael's!

As to speaking up, the opinions I have expressed here are quite known to the clergy and bishop of the parish and diocese where I live...! I am certain not all agree...

The question is....will others raise similar questions and demand solutions and answers or, after the dust settles, will the CEC be smaller, new leadership, same game??? It really would be a tragedy at this juncture, to not acknowledge it is not just a "dysfunctional person" problem, but a system and a culture where dysfunction can flourish. I am not talking about underage smoking or drinking either....

May God have mercy on all of us!

blessings

seraph 🙏

Posted by: Tony aka: The Baloney Man Oct 30 2007, 07:43 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 06:47 AM)

QUOTE

"...The Whole HOB and Patriarchs Council "Process of Government" had in some measure failed...."

You are kidding....the "Government of God"...fail? Oh no!

The system has no built in accountability, bishops are not accountable to clergy or laity...and apparently, have not been to each other!

QUOTE

Alcohol, youthful Smoking and other behaviors were ABSOLUTELY witness by the entire communion as represented in Manila 2004.

Sorry to burst any bubbles...but aren't youth a little reckless at times, or is that just at churches I have been a part of? I remember smoking and sneaking out a window at a fundamentalist Baptist camp at 16....I was not the only one!!! You would be surprised what high schoolers...church attenders or not, are capable of. Why is this surprising? With patience and encouragement, prayer and good counsel most church kids do turn out okay! I guess the question for me would bewere the clergy encouraging or tolerating these behaviours?

QUOTE

Let me say again, these concerns were loudly expressed. The response was spin, denial and rebuke.

This is of course very concerning and part of the problem.

blessings

seraph 🙏

Seraph

So you don't believe Victoria.....

I sure do after what I have been hearing here regarding all the goings on at SM.

I will agree teenagers will do what they and sneak around such it is part of there growing up and such.

Also regarding some of the stories I heard about the youth from SM while in Manila in 2004.

It sounds like it was and still is very very DYSFUNCTIONAL and definately NOT A HEALTHY PLACE 🙏🙏🙏

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 30 2007, 07:52 AM

Seraph,

I do hear you on being a typical teenager and they will do what they do. I for on was not a typical teenager but that is just me.... On another note I really feel her pain and her heartache

Lord In Your Mercy Hear Our Prayer.

Tony

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 08:16 AM

QUOTE (Tony aka: The Baloney Man @ Oct 30 2007, 07:43 AM)

So you don't believe Victoria.....

I sure do after what I have been hearing here regarding all the goings on at SM.

I will agree teenagers will do what they and sneak around such it is part of there growing up and such.

Also regarding some of the stories I heard about the youth from SM while in Manila in 2004.

It sounds like it was and still is very very DYSFUNCTIONAL and definately NOT A HEALTHY PLACE 🙏🙏🙏

Tony do not put words in my mouth !

My comments were in reference to the Manila Convocation. If kids were drunk and smoking , my first question would be...were they properly chaperoned?

I would not think it proper that teenagers be drinking and smoking at church sponsored events...yet it is parents that have the primary role of disciplining their children....not clergy!!! If I see my underage kid smoking or drinking at a church event...I am not going to wait for Fr. Dan to correct him, that is my job! It is also my job to make sure my children are not at unsupervised activities even at church!

I do believe Victoria as I do anyone who posts here...realizing I do not know many of these situations nor persons up close.

Having been a rowdy teen, and having teenagers of my own I am seldom surprised at what kids get themselves into. Unfortunately not all kids go to church for prayer and for the praise...they go for the gurls and the boyz, for the social life, because their parents force them and a host of other reasons. Take a bunch like these and drop them unsupervised at any major city...and you may get Manila!

I do not know the kids from SM and was not at the convocation....maybe the priests were lighting the cigarettes and serving the tequila shots...? If the kids were being rowdy and the clergy silent about it...I can see how that would have been a problem!!

IMHO

EVEN IF THE KIDS FROM ST MICHAELS WERE ROSARY TOTING SAINTS OR drunken , cavorting little devils....the problems

with the CEC are not related to the youth ministry, nor the behaviour of kids bad as it may be...kids grow up...it is old men who make and enforce rules that have trouble with change!!!!

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 30 2007, 08:49 AM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 30 2007, 08:16 AM)

QUOTE (Tony aka: The Baloney Man @ Oct 30 2007, 07:43 AM)

So you don't believe Victoria.....

I sure do after what I have been hearing here regarding all the goings on at SM.

I will agree teenagers will do what they and sneak around such it is part of there growing up and such.

Also regarding some of the stories I heard about the youth from SM while in Manila in 2004.

It sounds like it was and still is very very DYSFUNCTIONAL and definately NOT A HEALTHY PLACE 🙄 🙄 🙄

Tony do not put words in my mouth !

My comments were in reference to the Manila Convocation. If kids were drunk and smoking , my first question would be...were they properly chaperoned?

I would not think it proper that teenagers be drinking and smoking at church sponsored events...yet it is parents that have the primary role of disciplining their children....not clergy!!! If I see my underage kid smoking or drinking at a church event...I am not going to wait for Fr. Dan to correct him, that is my job! It is also my job to make sure my children are not at unsupervised activities even at church!

I do believe Victoria as I do anyone who posts here...realizing I do not know many of these situations nor persons up close.

Having been a rowdy teen, and having teenagers of my own I am seldom surprised at what kids get themselves into. Unfortunately not all kids go to church for prayer and for the praise...they go for the gurls and the boyz, for the social life, because their parents force them and a host of other reasons. Take a bunch like these and drop them unsupervised at any major city...and you may get Manila!

I do not know the kids from SM and was not at the convocation....maybe the priests were lighting the cigarettes and serving the tequila shots...? If the kids were being rowdy and the clergy silent about it...I can see how that would have been a problem!!

IMHO

EVEN IF THE KIDS FROM ST MICHAELS WERE ROSARY TOTING SAINTS OR drunken , cavorting little devils....the problems with the CEC are not related to the youth ministry, nor the behaviour of kids bad as it may be...kids grow up...it is old men who make and enforce rules that have trouble with change!!!!

blessings

seraph

Thanks Seraph for clarifying....

It is truly sad to see what is happening here....

Especially Victoria story she posted.....

I am sorry if I sounded a bit harsh 😊

Again thanks for the clarification...

Tony 🙄

Posted by: Joni Oct 30 2007, 08:54 AM

Father Rusty your post was wonderful! Thank you so much.
Joni LeClear

Posted by: Joni Oct 30 2007, 09:02 AM

QUOTE

Alcohol, youthful Smoking and other behaviors were ABSOLUTELY witness by the entire communion as represented in Manila 2004.

So dysfunctional was the behavior of both the patriarch and so dysfunctional was the behavior of the youth of SM at the Manila Convocation that many throughout the communion were upset, disturbed, concerned and revolted by what they witnessed FIRST HAND. They did not have to believe "rumors", they saw it with their own eyes.

Those who returned home after witnessing these sick displays were very vocal. These concerns were addressed to the current leadership, including Bishop Adler personally. There was a firestorm of concern expressed. All was denied. All was down played. Those who brought the concerns forward were repressed.

The good people of SM were unaware, perhaps, of just widely THIS VERY ISSUE reached throughout the communion with horrific results. People in other CEC congregations returned from Manila and said to themselves, "If this is the CEC and this is the witness of its patriarch and if this is the result of his ministry among the youth of St Michael's, then NO THANK YOU.

Frankly, the damage was done and irreparable. Many, many clergy and many parishes left the CEC that day in their hearts.

To provide a youthful presence and to have a ready made mosh pit for the evening services, the youth of SM were flown at some expense, to Manila. The apparent intent was to show the rest of the CEC how "worshipful and passionate" the youth of SM were, but the result was to expose to many in the rest of the communion the dysfunction of illegal youth smoking, drinking and obnoxious behavior.

For many parishes that left the CEC last year, the stench of the SM youth "witness" in Manila, along with their pastor, the patriarch's prophesies and bizarre "ministry" was still very fresh in their minds.

So, SM was indeed somewhat the "flagship" parish for many. Unfortunately, it was not for the reasons that many people thought.

Let me say again, these concerns were loudly expressed. The response was spin, denial and rebuke.

Guest, Just so you know. There is a core group of St. Michael's families who have never behaved or participated in what you have described above. Good families who are raising wonderful Christian children. My family has also been upset by the 'goings on' you are talking about.

Posted by: Joni Oct 30 2007, 09:07 AM

Seraph, I like you and what you have to say. 😊

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 09:11 AM

Victoria, Robert, Joni, JCS and all from SM,

My heart broke reading this and tears flow as I type. The abuse of drugs (alcohol, nicotine, ambien, percocet etc.) by youth and adults is not the real issue here. I think it is bad theology. The issue is licentiousness. We took on a license to sin; we abused our liberties believing that grace would just cover it. Contrary to what Bishop Adler said, God is against us if we continue to practice sin. Whoever sins repeatedly without seeking change is of the devil. "The person who lives a sinful life belongs to the devil, because the devil has been committing sin since the beginning. The reason that the Son of God appeared was to destroy what the devil does." (1 John 3:8)

"Where sin abounds grace does much more abound. However, should we continue in sin so that grace should all the more abound, God forbid." (Rom. 6)

The wages sin pays, after its season of fun is over, is in death. However God can reverse it through the Sacrament of Reconciliation which involves amendment of life.

Posted by: Samwise Oct 30 2007, 09:16 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 09:11 AM)

The issue is licentiousness. We took on a license to sin; we abused our liberties believing that grace would just cover it. Contrary to what Bishop Adler said, God is against us if we continue to practice sin.

Curious:

How was the sacrament of confession done at St. Michael's? Was it widely practiced? Or ignored? Did clergy go? Did they (clergy or laity) go to priests outside that church or within the church for this?

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 09:20 AM

QUOTE

Yet it is parents that have the primary role of disciplining their children....not clergy!!! If I see my underage kid smoking or

drinking at a church event...I am not going to wait for Fr. Dan to correct him, that is my job! It is also my job to make sure my children are not at unsupervised activities even at church!

Amen. However, if the deacons and priests, as well as the bishop, is sinning by abusing alcohol in the presence of my children, year after year, and I have let them live in this ecclesiastical environment then I am guilty as well. There are other churches to attend.

We should have left the fold long ago.

Posted by: Celine Oct 30 2007, 09:42 AM

Guest if you are a current CEC'er, I would say that now is not the time to leave. You have stuck it out this long for a reason.

Now is the time to let your voice be heard. Stand up and let your voice be counted.

-- Robert F.

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 09:48 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 09:20 AM)

Amen. However, if the deacons and priests, as well as the bishop, is sinning by abusing alcohol in the presence of my children, year after year, and I have let them live in this ecclesiastical environment then I am guilty as well. There are other churches to attend.

We should have left the fold long ago.

Why should they be doing it in the presence of your children?

Alcohol and smoking at mass? ...Doubtful!

Where were you when this happened year after year?....I would have though one year would have been enough! Social events are optional in churches...!If you know there is going to be alcohol and do not want your underage kids to go that certainly is within your prerogative.

If the priests or deacons get drunk at parties I would not know.....I have seldom attended and my children never did. Our contacts were at church activities where people should not be intoxicated!

Mind you, one should expect clergy to set the example at public functions....BUT use one's wisdom in what to expose kids to.

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Joni Oct 30 2007, 09:56 AM

QUOTE

Guest if you are a current CEC'er, I would say that now is not the time to leave. You have stuck it out this long for a reason.

Now is the time to let your voice be heard. Stand up and let your voice be counted.

-- Robert F.

Yes guest, please come and help us. If you don't see change then you should leave.

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 09:57 AM

Seraph, are you married and do you have kids? Be candid and tell us who you are since you live in Jacksonville and attend a CEC parish.

Posted by: Guest 2000 Oct 30 2007, 10:02 AM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 30 2007, 09:48 AM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 09:20 AM)

Amen. However, if the deacons and priests, as well as the bishop, is sinning by abusing alcohol in the presence of my children, year after year, and I have let them live in this ecclesiastical environment then I am guilty as well. There are other churches to attend.

We should have left the fold long ago.

Why should they be doing it in the presence of your children?

Alcohol and smoking at mass? ...Doubtful!

Where were you when this happened year after year?...I would have though one year would have been enough! Social events are optional in churches...!If you know there is going to be alcohol and do not want your underage kids to go that certainly is within your prerogative.

If the priests or deacons get drunk at parties I would not know.....I have seldom attended and my children never did. Our contacts were at church activities where people should not be intoxicated!

Mind you, one should expect clergy to set the example at public functions....BUT use one's wisdom in what to expose kids to.

blessings

seraph

Oh buddy it has been going on at verious church events and clergy houses.

Clergy kids who drank and were over those clergy houses were left to choose for themselves whether or not they would participate. In other words the juice was on the table and the children could take or not take. No judgement was coming from the hosts. And this is just the tip of it.

No one thought about these kids driving home or the damaging longterm effects caused by this behaviour.

Parents may have been unknowingly sending there kids to unsafe houses thinking they were protected. BTW this has been seen in other dioceses (sp?) as well.

Our clergy were so impressed in the latest quality of whiskey they had bought they decided the kids needed to know for when they were older wink wink what they should look for in good quality label.

This same approach was taken in regards to cigars and pipe tobacco. It was just natural for kids to follow the trail to more easily accessible and cheaper cancer sticks.

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 10:07 AM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 09:57 AM)

Seraph, are you married and do you have kids? Be candid and tell us who you are since you live in Jacksonville and attend a CEC parish.

* Married with children 2 of them over 18....I survived that...! One to go!

* Unmarried and available....not looking....!

blessings

seraph 🙄

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 10:34 AM

QUOTE

Be candid and tell us who you are

which version ?



blessings

seraph

Posted by: Nemo Oct 30 2007, 10:36 AM

QUOTE (Celine @ Oct 30 2007, 09:42 AM)

Guest if you are a current CEC'er, I would say that now is not the time to leave. You have stuck it out this long for a reason.

Now is the time to let your voice be heard. Stand up and let your voice be counted.

-- Robert F.

OK, please help me process here.

By all credible accounts, San Clemente is a mess. Addictive behavior seems to be running rampant among adults and youth alike, and not only are the top clergy not addressing it, they seem to be enabling the sin in their midst. Members of St. Michael'

have a right to be upset and demanding of action to redress this terrible problem.

Now, what does this mean to the rest of the CEC? Will a transfer of power from the San Clemente leadership contain the problem? Or, is there a systemic flaw in the theology or practice of the CEC that needs to be addressed?

One problem I see emerging is akin to the sub-prime mortgage problem. For those of you who don't read the news, a number of banks have recently revealed that they lost a lot of money by using bad judgment in making loans. Now, all banks are afraid to loan to each other -- not because they have proof that the others have bad judgment, but because they don't know the quality of loans the other banks are holding. *All* loans, and the officials who approve them, are now suspect.

The same is coming true for the CEC. We know that San Clemente has exercised terrible pastoral judgment. But, what about Malverne? Selma? Olathe? What (if anything) aren't *they* telling us? How complicit were they in the San Clemente mess? What else has been covered up? We just don't know.

All this silence is breeding a big crisis of confidence in the CEC leadership.

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 10:55 AM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 30 2007, 10:34 AM)

QUOTE

Be candid and tell us who you are

which version ?



blessings

seraph

As much as I love the attention...this thread is about the CEC and the crises that face us! Maybe we can open a "Guess Who Thread" and adress it there.

Plus, you would rob me of the fun of posting pretending no one can remotely guess who I am...How enjoyable would it be then?

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 12:06 PM

Seraph, you're a "poser"! How can we take you serious. You probably aren't even vaguely familiar with the CEC or its going ons. Find another forum or be real! 🙄

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 12:08 PM

QUOTE (Nemo @ Oct 30 2007, 10:36 AM)

OK, please help me process here.

By all credible accounts, San Clemente is a mess. Addictive behavior seems to be running rampant among adults and youth alike, and not only are the top clergy not addressing it, they seem to be enabling the sin in their midst. Members of St. Michael' have a right to be upset and demanding of action to redress this terrible problem.

Now, what does this mean to the rest of the CEC? Will a transfer of power from the San Clemente leadership contain the problem? Or, is there a systemic flaw in the theology or practice of the CEC that needs to be addressed?

One problem I see emerging is akin to the sub-prime mortgage problem. For those of you who don't read the news, a number of banks have recently revealed that they lost a lot of money by using bad judgment in making loans. Now, all banks are afraid to loan to each other -- not because they have proof that the others have bad judgment, but because they don't know the quality of loans the other banks are holding. *All* loans, and the officials who approve them, are now suspect.

The same is coming true for the CEC. We know that San Clemente has exercised terrible pastoral judgment. But, what about Malverne? Selma? Olathe? What (if anything) aren't *they* telling us? How complicit were they in the San Clemente mess? What else has been covered up? We just don't know.

All this silence is breeding a big crisis of confidence in the CEC leadership.

Nemo, your writings are very intelligent and articulate! Thanks! 😊

Posted by: jdshingl Oct 30 2007, 12:09 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 11:06 AM)

Seraph, you're a "poser"! How can we take you serious. You probably aren't even vaguely familiar with the CEC or its going ons. Find another forum or be real! 🗨️

guest look whose talking get real and register and tell us your real name or just quit being a troll.

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 12:12 PM

QUOTE (jdshingl @ Oct 30 2007, 12:09 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 11:06 AM)

Seraph, you're a "poser"! How can we take you serious. You probably aren't even vaguely familiar with the CEC or its going ons. Find another forum or be real! 🗨️

guest look whose talking get real and register and tell us your real name or just quit being a troll.

James Shingleton

jdshingl?... ah so revealing yourself! The pot calls the kettle black while the skillet laughs.

Posted by: jdshingl Oct 30 2007, 12:14 PM

read my signature I have registered and signed my name to every thing I post and for your info jdshingl is my first ,middle initial and part of my last name.

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 12:17 PM

Victoria says....

QUOTE

Now as a result of the Patriarchal, male dominated, provincial minded governing at St. Michaels, the encouragement of alcoholism and illegal underage smoking, covering up of Priests having affairs, Priests actually having the affairs, men prophesying insanity and attributing it to God to make their insanity sound more valid....

Wow...quite a statement...!

I wonder if what she means when she says "patriarchal , male dominated provincial minded governing" is her perception of the rector's and bishop's councils or something else?

This does not sound in any way like an Episcopal Church...more like some sort of Pentecostals into shepperding and prophesy with liturgy and booze. Please forgive the characterization its just that these depictions paint a horrid picture. Fortunately I have not had this experience in the CEC so far...Lord shield and deliver us!

QUOTE

I've learned my lesson, and that lesson is that I should have stood up long ago. .

Have we?

QUOTE

Why did you lead us into this? Why did you hurt my family, why did you hurt other people and why did you hurt yourselves? Please know that I love you all and I love you Randy Adler with all of my heart, I have known you my entire life and I will

always love you, but what you did was wrong, and you have lead a lot of innocent, naive people astray.

Lord have mercy on us all, heal us, specially the young...! "...have mercy on us and forgive us that we may delight in your will and walk in your ways, to the glory of your name, Amen!

This whole thing is so heartbreaking....

seraph

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 30 2007, 12:18 PM

Let's not get into that again. Some have given their names others have not each for their own reasons. At some point it would be nice to get to know each other without the pseudonyms.

BTW, Shout out to Robert F. for dropping the screen name!

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 12:18 PM

I'd register but who would believe that I am Elmer J. Fudd. 😊

Posted by: guest Oct 30 2007, 12:34 PM

I just want you all to know, nothing is being said in our SE diocese. We got a oh by the way Adler resigned 2 Sundays ago and nothing since. Be quiet and it will go away attitude. Just enough to send us to blog sites looking for answers and finding more heartache. So much we do not know and are oblivious to. I am sick, with grief. SM you are in our prayers for this is truly all we can do right now pray.

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 12:37 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 12:06 PM)

Seraph, you're a "poser"! How can we take you serious. You probably aren't even vaguely familiar with the CEC or its going ons. Find another forum or be real! 🙄

Dear guest:

Now, now, no name calling specially when we probably are not even friends!

FYI my son and I have both used this "nick" over the past year....neither of us is a "poser" and both know the CECour little corner of it and its near surroundings quite intimately.

Even if that were not the case, everyone is free to give their opinion, add their thoughts and prayers to the topic at hand! You should take me seriously considering what I write, not who you suppose me to be, OR wether I CHOOSE or not to make my identity clear ! (a no brainer to those who know me/us).

Do you have anything to add to the discussion..do so! Would you like to talk to me personally e-mail me! Your comment here would appear to be either to cause provocation or because you are clueless (very doubtful).....which is it?

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Samwise Oct 30 2007, 12:56 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 30 2007, 12:37 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 12:06 PM)

Seraph, you're a "poser"! How can we take you serious. You probably aren't even vaguely familiar with the CEC or its going ons. Find another forum or be real! 🙄

Dear guest:

Now, now, no name calling specially when we probably are not even friends!

FYI my son and I have both used this "nick" over the past year....neither of us is a "poser" and both know the CECour little corner of it and its near surroundings quite intimately.

Even if that were not the case, everyone is free to give their opinion, add their thoughts and prayers to the topic at hand! You should take me seriously considering what I write, not who you suppose me to be, OR wether I CHOOSE or not to make my identity clear ! (a no brainer to those who know me/us).

Do you have anything to add to the discussion..do so! Would you like to talk to me personally e-mail me! Your comment here would appear to be either to cause provocation or because you are clueless (very doubtful).....which is it?

blessings

seraph

And particularly so if this is at least one of the same "Seraphs" who also wrote in the other forum, many of us have found his contributions informative, balanced, pastoral, and insightful over the last year.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 30 2007, 12:56 PM

QUOTE (guest @ Oct 30 2007, 01:34 PM)

I just want you all to know, nothing is being said in our SE diocese. We got a oh by the way Adler resigned 2 Sundays ago and nothing since. Be quiet and it will go away attitude. Just enough to send us to blog sites looking for answers and finding more heartache. So much we do not know and are oblivious to. I am sick, with grief. SM you are in our prayers for this is truly all we can do right now pray.

This is similar to what I have heard from some who live in the Central Diocese. Is there still such a thing...it stretches to the East Coast and????

A person related to a clergyman in the Central Diocese told me that the Bishop told them the internet is nothing but lies. If they want the truth...ask him. Then he recited the "retirement" spin.

How can we get this information to those who live under the spell of "no knowledge" is a good thing. Again, it (the CEC) is similar to SM in many other areas of the US. Since it is not the actions of the Patriarch and others that matter, it is the denial and the deafening sounds of silence. Have you ever woken up from a sleep because it was too quiet? 😞

I wonder what those without internet capability (Philippines, Africa, South America...)know? They may not even know their patriarch "retired" under pressure.

Email everyone this web address: <http://cecblog.com> it will take them here and there are many references to other sites as well from here.

Posted by: odyssey Oct 30 2007, 01:20 PM

QUOTE (guest @ Oct 30 2007, 12:34 PM)

I just want you all to know, nothing is being said in our SE diocese. We got a oh by the way Adler resigned 2 Sundays ago and nothing since. Be quiet and it will go away attitude. Just enough to send us to blog sites looking for answers and finding more heartache. So much we do not know and are oblivious to. I am sick, with grief. SM you are in our prayers for this is truly all we can do right now pray.

Shame Shame why are you even on here if you are from the SE. 😞

Guess we will not here anything at the convocation that we can rely on.

BAU here in the SE. I do remember a couple of years ago it was said that Adler prophesied Olivia Jones would die. Thank God she did not. I hear she is getting better. Can anyone confirm that she is? Blessing SE Guest!!! I guess we will have to hope someone or ones in our area breaks the code of sience to find out what has been happening in our neck of the woods.

Peace

Posted by: Celine Oct 30 2007, 01:23 PM

Yes I too would like to add that Seraph has been very insightful, well behaved and offered constructive criticism.

Dear Guest in the SE: thank you for your prayers. Sorry to hear you are experiencing similar "black out" of information. A communion wide problem for sure.

Break the silence! Come out of the shadows. Refuse to settle for anything less than what is right and true. We are the body of Christ, we are the CEC. If we all stand up and refuse to accept the status quo, things will change. God is not mocked, He is hearing our prayers!

All that is necessary for evil to triumph is that good men do nothing

Joni I have received your email, thank you kindly, I will respond (she is having problem receiving messages)

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 01:48 PM

Silence is been broken ..see here... 😞

http://www.iccec.com/dnews/newsletter_nov_07.pdf

Are not many of the things said about Adler here trueas well as the others we have read about or seen? People seem to

always have a shoddy mixture of vice/virtues... some you can see some only God!

It makes it so hard, there are admirable/terrible/godly/unhealthy things about +Adler that you admire/fear/love/loathe. The same for my previous bishop lovable/hateful/giving/selfish....very confusing!

I can accept errors in judgement as part of our common humanity, we all have the potential of really blowing it! What is unacceptable is an attachment to system which hides and perpetrates dysfunction by making accountability and openness difficult.

We do ourselves or those we love no favors if we do not seek to make whatever changes necessary so things do not have to almost complete be destroyed before we acknowledge there is a problem.

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 30 2007, 01:51 PM

Seraph:

Bp. Ken and I have found your posts to be very insightful and "sharp".

Fr. Rusty!

Such great insights and wisdom for moving forward. Thanks. We love and miss you!

Victoria:

Your post was so important. Probably more than you realize. I found myself praying for you every time I woke up last night, and for the meetings that are to take place. May God give you all courage and wisdom and discernment.

Love and peace,

Shirley

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 02:02 PM

Radical Sabbatical • Laura Henning

She decided to take the long ago announced sabbatical the Patriarch planned to take. 12 years as a Roman Catholic taught her to do other people's penance. Actually a sabbatical is a good way to get lost from the mess of SM. Think about it! Let's all take a sabbatical from the CEC.

Get 'er done. 😊

Posted by: Celine Oct 30 2007, 02:10 PM

QUOTE

I can accept errors in judgement as part of our common humanity, we all have the potential of really blowing it! What is unacceptable is an attachment to system which hides and perpetrates dysfunction by making accountability and openness difficult.

We do ourselves or those we love no favors if we do not seek to make whatever changes necessary so things do not have to almost complete be destroyed before we acknowledge there is a problem.

Yes therein lies our complicity. From top to bottom. We cannot pretend all is business as usual. We cannot ignore the problems, we cannot continue to enable a system that is flawed.

The CEC canons already call for the establishment of Parish Councils. For those parishes without a Parish Council, insist you get one!

The canons are rather vague about these parish councils. Very little detail about the mechanics. I suggest frequent (monthly?) meetings open to all members who wish to attend. This means we lay persons will have to get involved, we will need to be active and become willing participants.

Of course I may be putting the cart before the horse. No sense of having a parish council if there is not a fundamental change (read Fr. Rusty's long post above!) at the top.

What say you?

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 02:18 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 30 2007, 02:02 PM)

maybe our newest "guest"

blessings

seraph

Posted by: seraph Oct 30 2007, 04:39 PM

QUOTE (misunderstood @ Oct 30 2007, 04:35 PM)

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 30 2007, 04:04 PM)

Do love potlucks and some desserts...hmmm but I'm on a diet anyway... 😊

thanks

seraph1

I have noticed a bit of a "pouch" lately



misunderstood



me!

Posted by: Shirley Myers Oct 30 2007, 04:46 PM

Hi again, Ken: (Follis, that is) 😊

Thanks. Since posting that question, I've received a copy via email of what Ken Tanner sent out. And yes, it was a a snip ... a small one ... from the 8 pg. statement.

Top of the mornin' to ye. (Or evenin', as the case may be!)

Shirley

Posted by: Ken Follis Oct 30 2007, 05:08 PM

Alberta,

We see you snooping. How are you? 🤖

Posted by: Royedw Oct 30 2007, 05:31 PM

QUOTE (Ken Follis @ Oct 30 2007, 05:08 PM)

Alberta,

We see you snooping. How are you? 🤖

Yes my friend Alberta,... how are you indeed??? And your better half as well??? Haven't heard from you in a long time, are you here?? Boy, J must have loved the Ok State score... 🤖 I do hope all is well, J and the "boys" remain in my prayers!!! Hi to him!

Roy

Posted by: Joni Oct 30 2007, 06:24 PM

Shirley,

Thank you for praying for and encouraging Victoria. That means so much to me.

I told you I'd taught my kids to do their own thinking! 😊

Joni

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 30 2007, 09:17 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 30 2007, 12:56 PM)

I wonder what those without internet capability (Philippines, Africa, South America...) know? They may not even know their patriarch "retired" under pressure.

Wow, you need to read Thomas Freedman's "The World is Flat"; the "third world" is NOT internet and technology deprived. Kids in the Philippines can "thumb" on their cell phones FASTER than the average American can type on the computer. Fact.

Posted by: Bishop Kenneth Myers Oct 30 2007, 09:23 PM

Bob Dylan is a prophet. I don't care what ANYONE says. He's also the most important poet/songwriter in the 20th century. Period. But I'll refrain from a litany of praise to Robert Zimmerman, and instead give you a verse from his powerful song, "Ring Them Bells":

Ring them bells for the blind and the deaf,
Ring them bells for all of us who are left,
Ring them bells for the chosen few
Who will judge the many when the game is through.
Ring them bells, for the time that flies,
For the child that cries
When innocence dies.

There's also this line:

Time is running backwards
And so is the bride.

Just heard a new version of it today (from the upcoming "I'm Not There" movie about his life story, starring 6 different people as Dylan himself, including Cate Blanchett!). ANYWAY, just heard a new version today and those lines just kind of grabbed me by the throat and squeezed real hard.

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 09:30 PM

+Myers,
What is your interpretation of the song? What does 'Ring them bells!' refer to, to you?

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 09:38 PM

Ring them bells St. Peter
Where the four winds blow,
Ring them bells with an iron hand
So the people will know.
Oh it's rush hour now
On the wheel and the plow
And the sun is going down
Upon the sacred cow.

Ring them bells Sweet Martha,
For the poor man's son,
Ring them bells so the world will know
That God is one.
Oh the shepherd is asleep
Where the willows weep
And the mountains are filled
With lost sheep.

Ring them bells St. Catherine
From the top of the room,
Ring them from the fortress
For the lilies that bloom.
Oh the lines are long
And the fighting is strong
And they're breaking down the distance
Between right and wrong.

(Dylan is officially a member of the Vineyard Church)

Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 09:41 PM

QUOTE

And they're breaking down the distance between right and wrong.



Posted by: Guest Oct 30 2007, 09:43 PM

Ring them bells, ye heathen
From the city that dreams,
Ring them bells from the sanctuaries
Cross the valleys and streams,
For they're deep and they're wide
And the world's on its side
And time is running backwards
And so is the bride.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 30 2007, 10:39 PM

QUOTE (Bishop Kenneth Myers @ Oct 30 2007, 10:17 PM)

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 30 2007, 12:56 PM)

I wonder what those without internet capability (Philippines, Africa, South America...) know? They may not even know their patriarch "retired" under pressure.

Wow, you need to read Thomas Freedman's "The World is Flat"; the "third world" is NOT internet and technology deprived. Kids in the Philippines can "thumb" on their cell phones FASTER than the average American can type on the computer. Fact.

Great recommendation! I have read the book and recommend it. However, Freedman though technology is available most anywhere there is still a digital divide both in the USA and around the world between people with resources and those without. MY wi-fi signal for instance is the only on line access some of the kids in my neighborhood have to the internet, on computers given to them by me and others.

I wrote Freedman to tell him my version: the world is becoming flat. We are not there yet until everyone has access and the resources (phone, computer, whatever gadget) to use the access.

There is someone on this forum who only gets internet access every few days due to where he is. Not quite flat yet! Fact. 😊

Posted by: alberta Oct 30 2007, 10:42 PM

QUOTE (Royedw @ Oct 30 2007, 05:31 PM)

QUOTE (Ken Follis @ Oct 30 2007, 05:08 PM)

Alberta,
We see you snooping. How are you? 🙄

Yes my friend Alberta,... how are you indeed??? And your better half as well??? Haven't heard from you in a long time, are you here?? Boy, J must have loved the Ok State score... 🙄 I do hope all is well, J and the "boys" remain in my prayers!!! Hi to him!

Roy

Hi Guys,

You caught me! I have been snooping around. 🙄 Still breaks my heart and boils my blood. Expect to see me snooping so I can keep J. informed as he prayfully seeks direction.

J is doing well and God continues to sustain him while he wonders in the desert. Please pray for him and the boys that God will continue to protect them and keep them safe.

Thank You so much for asking about him. It means the world to me.

Be blessed my friends.

A. 🙄

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 30 2007, 10:42 PM

QUOTE (Bishop Kenneth Myers @ Oct 30 2007, 10:23 PM)

Bob Dylan is a prophet. I don't care what ANYONE says. He's also the most important poet/songwriter in the 20th century. Period. But I'll refrain from a litany of praise to Robert Zimmerman, and instead give you a verse from his powerful song, "Ring Them Bells":

Ring them bells for the blind and the deaf,
Ring them bells for all of us who are left,

Ring them bells for the chosen few
Who will judge the many when the game is through.
Ring them bells, for the time that flies,
For the child that cries
When innocence dies.

There's also this line:

Time is running backwards
And so is the bride.

Just heard a new version of it today (from the upcoming "I'm Not There" movie about his life story, starring 6 different people as Dylan himself, including Cate Blanchett!). ANYWAY, just heard a new version today and those lines just kind of grabbed me by the throat and squeezed real hard.

My spouse and I just attended a Dylan concert on 10/22. He is still amazing! It was our 50th birthday gift to each other. We have birthdays 17 days apart. In fact, Sunday, we celebrated with over 100 of our closest friends (one for every year and a few to grow on 😊). Anyway, I digress. What brought Dylan into this topic? I need to catch up on my reading of this thread.

Posted by: Guest Oct 31 2007, 12:18 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 30 2007, 12:56 PM)

I wonder what those without internet capability (Philippines, Africa, South America...) know? They may not even know their patriarch "retired" under pressure.

well, we may be third world to you but internet access is something not foreign to us.

We knew of the so-called retirement of the patriarch a few hours after it was announced here and last sunday it was relayed to the congregation by our bishop.

we may be too far from the site of conflict but we certainly can see through the smokes of war.

from the philippines... 🇵🇭