

Printable Version of Topic

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

On Our Way Home > General CEC discussion > **New Charges Against The Patriarch Of The C E C**

Posted by: stlouismb Sep 27 2007, 03:13 PM

According to a very reliable source, new charges of sexual impropriety have been leveled against the Patriarch of the CEC.

Also an admission of sexual impropriety by the most prominent Archdeacon in the CEC.

It seems the unravelling of the CEC continues.

Please pray for them!!!

Posted by: jdshingl Sep 27 2007, 05:57 PM

It will be interesting to see where this goes. I pray that too many people will not get hurt. I will be watching, I'm not with the cec any more I'm with the ccr.

Posted by: stlouismb Sep 27 2007, 06:04 PM

QUOTE (jdshingl @ Sep 27 2007, 06:57 PM)

It will be interesting to see where this goes. I pray that too many people will not get hurt. I will be watching, I'm not with the cec any more I'm with the ccr.

As soon as I heard about this I checked with others to verify the information.

The ripples have begun to turn to waves. There is some talk of a coup. A prominent Bishop was quoted as saying something like: I've had enough or it's enough or I have heard enough.

Posted by: stlouismb Sep 27 2007, 06:17 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Sep 27 2007, 04:13 PM)

According to a very reliable source, new charges of sexual impropriety have been leveled against the Patriarch of the CEC.

Also an admission of sexual impropriety by the most prominent Archdeacon in the CEC.

It seems the unravelling of the CEC continues.

Please pray for them!!!

There was some confusion in my first post. I have been asked by phone and email if I was saying the Patriarch and his archdeacon committed some sexual impropriety with each other. **This was/is not the case.** These are two separate incidents.

As of my last contact with my "source", the Patriarch has not denied the allegation against himself.

The Archdeacon to the Patriarch has allegedly confessed to a two year adulterous affair with another man's **wife**.

Though I say these incidents are unrelated, one wonders if there is some connection in another realm.

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Sep 27 2007, 06:51 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Sep 27 2007, 03:13 PM)

According to a very reliable source, new charges of sexual impropriety have been leveled against the Patriarch of the CEC.

Also an admission of sexual impropriety by the most prominent Archdeacon in the CEC.

It seems the unravelling of the CEC continues.

Please pray for them!!!

Thanks Mike for posting this let us all pray that this truly will be the end for the CEC and that we can be available for all who will be affected by this who are still apart of the CEC. Blessing to us all of us

Tony aka Tigger 😊 😊 😊

Posted by: stlouismb Sep 28 2007, 06:36 AM

QUOTE (Tony aka: the Baloney Man @ Sep 27 2007, 07:51 PM)

Thanks Mike for posting this let us all pray that this truly will be the end for the CEC and that we can be available for all who will be affected by this who are still apart of the CEC. Blessing to us all of us

Tony aka Tigger 😊 😊 😊

By "End", I assume you mean the end of problems for the CEC. Though I have my issues with the CEC, it got many of us where we are today and has been, itself, both a destination and a part of many of our journeys.

I do pray for those who have chosen to remain the CEC that they will weather this storm by either taking shelter elsewhere or by rooting out the problems and making a better place for themselves.

My own church has had its share of scandal and has chosen sometimes to do "damage control--spin" and sometimes to be forthright. The latter is the better path. Then the people are informed to make the best decision about their own spiritual welfare.

IMHO

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Sep 28 2007, 08:13 AM

Mike thanks,

I couldn't agree with you more... 😊

Tony 😊

Posted by: stlouismb Sep 28 2007, 09:09 AM

David Z has opened a new thread for discussion at the Ancient Future Forum Site to discuss the current troubles in the CEC. Here is a post from this morning from over there:

QUOTE (Samwise @ Sep 28 2007, 08:59 AM)

Thanks, David.
Any news other than reported by Mike Baldwin?
In particular, which Bishop has indicated "enough is enough"?

Sam

Samwise, I am not at liberty to divulge that contact. However it will be evident soon.

As posted on the Where's Everyone thread and elsewhere:

QUOTE (Tony aka: the Baloney Man @ Sep 27 2007, 07:51 PM)

Thanks Mike for posting this let us all pray that this truly will be the end for the CEC and that we can be available for all who will be affected by this who are still apart of the CEC. Blessing to us all of us

Tony aka Tigger 😊 😊 😊

QUOTE (stlouismb Sep 27 2007 On our Way Home and here)

By "End", I assume you mean the end of problems for the CEC. Though I have my issues with the CEC, it got many of us where we are today and has been, itself, both a destination and a part of many of our journeys.

I do pray for those who have chosen to remain the CEC that they will weather this storm by either taking shelter elsewhere or by rooting out the problems and making a better place for themselves.

My own church has had its share of scandal and has chosen sometimes to do "damage control--spin" and sometimes to be forthright. The latter is the better path. Then the people are informed to make the best decision about their own spiritual welfare.

IMHO

Posted by: stlouismb Sep 28 2007, 06:12 PM

I strongly encourage everyone who posts on this topic or any topic to keep in mind the adage that **words can hurt**. There are some deeply wounded people out there looking for safe haven and a chance to vent.

I understand that there are several defections from St. Michael's cathedral parish in San Clemente already. I have also heard of three parishes in different parts of the US writing their Bishops to demand some accountability--and ultimately the resignation of the Patriarch and perhaps others who have stonewalled.

Please pray before you post. I do not want to see us wound the wounded on this forum.

Many of those who remained "loyal" throughout the last go around now feel duped and foolish. Rubbing salt in that wound will not help them. Others hope to bring back the CEC from the dust of the past scandals and the present one. They deserve to be heard as brothers and sisters in Christ.

No matter what their decisions...they all deserve our prayers.

Posted by: David Zampino Sep 28 2007, 06:41 PM

I want to state my agreement with Mike here.

Pray before posting. Remember, there is a whole new "crew" of wounded victims now.

Our duty is reconciliation and restoration.

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Sep 29 2007, 04:00 AM

QUOTE (David Zampino @ Sep 28 2007, 06:41 PM)

I want to state my agreement with Mike here.

Pray before posting. Remember, there is a whole new "crew" of wounded victims now.

Our duty is reconciliation and restoration.

David and Mike

I say Amen and agree with you all whole heartedly..... Both of you are to be commended for this past year for all of us who endured the last go around. I too will be praying and am available for anyone needing to vent and be a listening ear... Again David and Mike I love you both soooo much and I Praise God for the both of you for allowing all of to come here for healing and processing as we all moved on to safer place ie: the Roman Catholic, the Orthodox and other places with in the body of Christ. Bless you my dear friends and brothers in the Lord.....

Again Bless us on and all.

Lots of love to all Tony 😊🙏

Posted by: Royedw Sep 29 2007, 07:03 PM

I am saddened by this latest round of allegations, simply because I had hoped in my prayers that all those who were negatively impacted in some way by the improprieties of the leadership causing the schism may have been able to work towards the healing of the CEC. It now seems, based on these allegations, that may not be possible and if this is truth, this denomination may not truly survive.

please brethren let me say this to you faithful people. All of us here pray for you, we ask for your Divine guidance to be where Our Lord wants you to be!! 🙏

If you desire the Sacraments and the ritual, then I would say look at us in the Roman Church. If you are seeking a level of charismatic, that too can be found in the Catholic Church, although you may have to search your area to find it. Rest assured, if you Love Jesus Christ as much as I do, the Catholic Church may be worth looking into. I **would NOT** be here if this church didn't Love Jesus as much as I do!!!!

I know you have people around you who carry the gifts of The Spirit, many are probably ordained. There are many in this forum who have gone before you, ask us your questions, someone will answer!! Hopefully through our presence and that of Our Lord, we may be able to show you a way! God's Blessings for each of you with questions, you are NOT alone, and you have not entered into this by yourselves, we are here to help!! With the Love of Our Lord & Saviour, Jesus Christ, I am

Roy

Posted by: stlouismb Sep 30 2007, 04:47 PM

Somewhere I was asked who said what to me.

The source for my information did not ask for anonymity, I gave it to him. He did corroborate other items on this forum as well which have been questioned. He also indicated it was + Bates who said something *like*: I've heard enough!

I am afraid I will need to limit my involvement in this discussion to here or over there A/F forum, since keeping two dialogues open is difficult. I like this forum because for the time being, it is open to all to post.

However, there are more readers over there. Where are you all getting your information?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 07:19 AM

Here are my thoughts on the current issue of sexual impropriety in the CEC.

If I were still a parishioner in the CEC I am certain that I would expect the resignation of any church leader who has confessed to adultery or any sexual impropriety. I would also expect that those who have helped with covering up a scandal would resign as well. How can these church leaders, both those who have confessed to sin (or at least not denied it) and those who have helped cover it up expect to have my respect and support into the future? I have heard that in the San Clemente circle of power that some are saying "sin is sin", "it is time for forgiveness and love"..... Those statements to a limit, are true. Sin is sin and sinners are deserving of forgiveness and love--thank God!

However, in regards to church leaders who sin, particularly in a sexual way and hide it, there needs to be a higher standard, IMHO. In the RCC, this type of scandal left unchecked and covered up led to many victims. Not just those who were involved directly in the sexual sin of priests, but those who had their world "rocked" by the revelations--the people in the pew. In addition, the very reputation of Christ's Church was damaged. Many who though not directly involved in the sin, but who covered it up (or at least did not give full investigation to claims) and moved priests around--notably Bishops, are complicit in the sin.

In many church denominations, the discovery of sexual sin by church leaders is immediately followed by resignations both voluntary and forced. It is that type of damage control that leads to a restoration of confidence in the leaders who remain. The responsibility of the Shepherds who take their responsibilities seriously and prayerfully have few other options than to ask for the resignation of those involved or to offer their own. Any other response or form of "damage control" is whitewashing, IMHO.

I found an interesting piece by an Orthodox priest on the subject of "sin is sin" as it related at the time to the RCC priest sex scandals. I quote from the introduction to that piece:

QUOTE

Aren't we disgusted with the shocking number of high-profile cases of priests engaged in pedophilia, homosexual activity, and adultery? Some excuse this behavior with the platitudes "a sin is a sin" and "we are all sinners." Uh, excuse me?

Persons who say "a sin is a sin" don't live in the real world. My wife is more than forgiving when I snap at her for no reason. I don't think that she would be that charitable if I were to come home smelling of another woman's perfume.

I concede that we are all sinners, but clergy relinquish the right to even think of engaging in certain classes of sin. When a priest sins sexually he damages the Church the way that crooked judges, lawyers, and police officers damage the legal system. How can anyone not understand this?

<http://cantuar.blogspot.com/2007/09/orthodox-priest-on-clerical-immorality.html>

I think it is time to reexamine the "good ole boy" system that winks at this type of problem, and set the Church in order. If I were a parishioner having weathered last year's storms of controversy, some of which involved sexual sin, I would ask that my rector take a firm stand on behalf of his flock to demand a higher standard. I would expect my shepherd to demand resignations and apologies. I would expect my bishop to protect me from *wolves in shepherds clothing*--to turn a phrase. Expecting anything less would make both me and my shepherds complicit in this same sick system.

What do you think?

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 1 2007, 07:24 AM

One further thought/question.

Had I remained loyally in the CEC throughout the last year's tsunami, waiting for the promised reforms, and now confronted with this "replay"...I would be disgusted and feel a bit foolish or at least like I had been "played" for a fool.

My prayers are particularly with those of you who have remained loyal to the CEC! 😊

Posted by: **Tony aka: the Baloney Man** Oct 1 2007, 07:38 AM

Thanks Mike

I couldn't agree with you more....

Tony 😊 😊 😊

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 1 2007, 08:00 AM

In order to not cloud the current issue within the CEC by questions of my credibility or motive for posting the original news of Sexual Improprieties within the leadership of the CEC, I moved this post and others here from the A/F Forum. In addition, it was becoming difficult to respond to both forums and keep both forums in the "loop". I hope this helps.

QUOTE (Samwise @ Sep 28 2007, 08:59 AM)

Thanks, David.

Any news other than reported by Mike Baldwin?

In particular, which Bishop has indicated "enough is enough"?

Sam

Samwise, I am not at liberty to divulge that contact. However it will be evident soon.

As posted on the Where is Everyone???? thread and elsewhere:

QUOTE (Tony aka: the Baloney Man @ Sep 27 2007, 07:51 PM)

Thanks Mike for posting this let us all pray that this truly will be the end for the CEC and that we can be available for all who will be affected by this who are still apart of the CEC. Blessing to us all of us

Tony aka Tigger 😊 😊 😊

QUOTE (stlouismb Sep 27 2007 On our Way Home and here)

By "End", I assume you mean the end of problems for the CEC. Though I have my issues with the CEC, it got many of us where we are today and has been, itself, both a destination and a part of many of our journeys.

I do pray for those who have chosen to remain the CEC that they will weather this storm by either taking shelter elsewhere or by rooting out the problems and making a better place for themselves.

My own church has had its share of scandal and has chosen sometimes to do "damage control--spin" and sometimes to be forthright. The latter is the better path. Then the people are informed to make the best decision about their own spiritual welfare.

IMHO

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 08:04 AM

Moved from the A/F Forum:

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Sep 28 2007, 09:06 AM)

QUOTE (Samwise @ Sep 28 2007, 08:59 AM)

Thanks, David.

Any news other than reported by Mike Baldwin?

In particular, which Bishop has indicated "enough is enough"?

Sam

Samwise, I am not at liberty to divulge that contact. However it will be evident soon.

...Now the whistle blower who first spoke to me and gave me the "heads-up" about this latest scandal, who is himself a loyal CECer, has been attacked by others within the CEC for airing the dirty laundry.

He is himself tired of the secrecy and spin--and he is in the CEC!

I will leave the following response to Truthspeaker until midnight (or so) and then I will edit it away if it doesn't get deleted altogether to begin with:

Where are you, Truthspeaker, that you must hide?

I sign my name to all my posts--no need to refer to "stlouismb". Those who wish to address me privately, may freely do so by email: mbroute66@charter.net or phone: 314-974-7432 or PM via this forum. If you think I have been unfair or inaccurate...well, at least you know my name do we all know yours?

I would suggest to the Forum administrator that he/they not allow personal attacks on **credibility of the persons** relating their personal experiences without full disclosure from the attacker. This is what makes for an unsafe forum.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 08:06 AM

post moved from the A/F forum:

QUOTE (Dcn. Chic Harmon @ Sep 30 2007, 10:09 AM)

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Sep 30 2007, 08:59 AM)

....Now the whistle blower who first spoke to me and gave me the "heads-up" about this latest scandal, who is himself a loyal CECer, has been attacked by others within the CEC for airing the dirty laundry.

He is himself tired of the secrecy and spin--and he is in the CEC!

How is this any different than Truth Speaker using an alias?

My source did not ask me for anonymity, I gave it!

Sidebar to David, and Truthspeaker

QUOTE

BTW, If there were still freedom to edit past posts, I would proudly add my signature to each and every one. If you have any questions as to what posts I have written, please send them to me for verification. I was under the impression that changing my signature changed it on all posts, previous and future. That is why I did it!

Now, back on topic, which, BTW is not MY (Mike Baldwin's/stlouismb's) credibility. I have a forum thread devoted to that topic on the On Our Way Home Forum http://z6.invisionfree.com/On_Our_Way_Home/index.php?showtopic=23

Sincerely,

Mike Baldwin writing from Saint Louis, MO, a.k.a stlouismb, a moniker I use almost everywhere

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 08:07 AM

moved from the A/F forum:

QUOTE (Samwise @ Sep 28 2007, 08:59 AM)

Thanks, David.

Any news other than reported by Mike Baldwin?

In particular, which Bishop has indicated "enough is enough"?

Sam

+Bates.

BTW, "indicated" is the operative term. The use of quotation marks is intended to convey an *idea* of what was said, though imprecise, because I do not have the 3 witnesses required of ME 🙄 and therefore I cannot prove it is a direct, verbatim quote in those exact words. 🙄 However, it was something LIKE that.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 08:51 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 1 2007, 08:19 AM)

Here are my thoughts on the current issue of sexual impropriety in the CEC.

If I were still a parishioner in the CEC I am certain that I would expect the resignation of any church leader who has confessed to adultery or any sexual impropriety. I would also expect that those who have helped with covering up a scandal would resign as well. How can these church leaders, both those who have confessed to sin (or at least not denied it) and those who have helped cover it up expect to have my respect and support into the future? I have heard that in the San Clemente circle of power that some are saying "sin is sin", "it is time for forgiveness and love"..... Those statements to a limit, are true. Sin is sin and sinners are deserving of forgiveness and love--thank God!

here is an example from the RCC:

QUOTE

Pope Benedict XVI accepted the resignation of the Zimbabwean archbishop, who is facing **allegations** of adultery.

In a letter written by the archbishop and released by the Vatican press office Sept. 11, the archbishop wrote that he offered his resignation to Vatican officials to **spare sullyng the image of the church**

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 08:55 AM

And from Benedict XVI:

QUOTE

In a June 24 address delivered before praying the Angelus with thousands of pilgrims and tourists gathered in St. Peter's Square here, Pope Benedict pointed to St. John the Baptist on the feast of his birth as one "whose life was totally oriented toward Christ."

He called on the church to follow the lived example of St. John the Baptist to not fear denouncing "transgressions of God's commandments," even when those implicated are "people in power." "John the Baptist was the precursor, the 'voice' sent to announce the incarnate word," the holy father said. "For this reason, to commemorate the birth of John the Baptist in reality means to celebrate Christ, the fulfillment of the promises of all the prophets, of whom John was the greatest, called to 'prepare the way' before the messiah."

He noted that all of the gospels stress the importance of St. John the Baptist, noting that it is his baptism of Jesus in the Jordan River that began the Christ's public life.

"He is still the first 'witness' of Jesus," the pope said of St. John the Baptist, who "knew the full reality of Jesus of Nazareth and began 'to make it known to Israel,' naming him as son of God and redeemer of man."

"As an authentic prophet, John bore witness to the truth without compromise," Pope Benedict said.

"He denounced transgressions of God's commandments, even when the protagonists were people in power," he said, adding that his raising of his voice accusing Herod and Herodius of adultery led to his martyrdom in the "service of Christ, who is the truth in person."

The pontiff called upon the "church of our time" to pray for the intercession of St. John and the virgin Mary in order that it may "know how to be ever faithful to Christ and testify with courage to his truth and his love for all."

In remarks to English-speaking pilgrims, the pope prayed that the faithful receive the "gift of true conversion and growth in holiness, so that our lives will prepare a way for the Lord and hasten the coming of his kingdom."

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 09:04 AM

Regarding the importance of Trust and the Clergy:

QUOTE

The Catholic Register: Trust evaporating – Poll finds clergy trustworthiness slips precipitously
By Michael Swan
9/17/2007
The Catholic Register (www.catholicregister.org)

TORONTO, Canada (The Catholic Register) – It may well be a greater compliment to be trusted than to be loved. If so, is it a greater heartbreak to watch trust evaporate? For an answer, one might ask a parish priest. Canadian trust in clergy has been slipping at an alarming pace over the past five years.

Advertisement

The 2007 Leger Marketing "Profession Barometre" finds that 61 percent of Canadians say they trust church representatives — not even close to the 97 percent who trust firefighters or 94 percent who trust nurses, Canada's most trusted professions.

However, Canadians still rank clergy more trustworthy than pollsters at 59 percent, journalists at 48 percent or politicians, who garner the trust of just 15 percent of Canadians.

The trouble for clergy is that they appear to have lost the trust of 12 percent of Canadians since 2002. While trust levels for journalists, bankers and teachers have remained steady over the past five years, Canadians' trust in church representatives has fallen from almost three-quarters at 73 percent to less than two-thirds at 61 percent.

"We should not just look at these things and say, 'Oh well, it's just another survey.' It's what the people are talking about, what they're saying," said St. Clare of Assisi Church pastor Father John Borean from Woodbridge, Ont.

Trust is the essential ingredient in a pastoral relationship, Father Borean said.

"People come to you with their personal needs. They need healing. They need someone who will not put a Band-Aid over them but give them hope of true healing," he said. "If there's no trust there, how can that ever happen?"

"Trust is an important ingredient," said Father Brian Clough, pastor of St. Anselm Church here. "We have to do our best to ensure we deserve the trust that people give us."

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 09:27 AM

Food for thought:

Although religious denominations do not audit clerical infidelity (or divorce), outside sources do.

QUOTE

In 1993 The Journal of Pastoral Care reported a survey of Southern Baptist pastors in which 14 percent acknowledged that they had engaged in "sexual behavior inappropriate to a minister." More startling, 70 percent said that they had counseled at least one woman who had had intercourse with another minister. In 1988, a survey of nearly 1,000 Protestant clergy by Leadership magazine found that 12 percent admitted to sexual intercourse outside marriage. Seventeen percent of these affairs occurred with people they were counseling, and 52 percent involved members, ministers or other leaders of their own congregation. An additional 18 percent disclosed that they had kissed, fondled or masturbated with someone other than their spouse. When asked what consequences they had suffered—in their marriages or their careers—as a result of their sexual adventures, only 6 percent said that they had lost their jobs. And nearly a third reported no adverse consequences of any kind.

"In all walks of life, charismatic figures exude a powerful attraction to the opposite sex. Charismatic clergy have the added aura of representing God or channeling the Holy Spirit. That's why Billy Graham, for example, decided early in his ministry never to be alone with a woman other than his wife. Few others are so fastidious. A generation ago, philandering clergy usually lost their jobs. That still happens. But in an age when adultery is tolerated in political and other leaders, religious denominations are hesitant to set too high a standard for their own. What some Protestant denominations seem to believe is that sexual behavior is either too personal to legislate or too trivial to condemn."

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 09:37 AM

one more word on the topic:

QUOTE

John Cleary, general counsel of Church Mutual Insurance Company, one of the nation's leading insurers of religious organizations, said every week he learns of approximately five incidents of clergy sexual misconduct from among the 70,000 houses of worship his Wisconsin-based company covers. Not all such incidents lead to lawsuits, Cleary said, and insurers now offer help and counseling for victims as a means of heading off lawsuits like the one in Dallas.

According to Cleary, the first clergy misconduct suits appeared in 1984, and the numbers grew dramatically before

leveling off in the mid-1990s. No official compiles figures on a number of cases, but experts estimate they number in the thousands. Cleary noted that his company at one time considered dropping sexual misconduct insurance for churches but decided instead to cap the coverage at \$300,000. In cases of adultery, Cleary said, juries tend to be more sympathetic to employers, since the plaintiffs are consenting adults.

"The church has always been opposed to adultery and has to be," said Joan Brown Campbell, general secretary of the National Council of Churches. "It is disruptive of families and relationships, certainly of congregations." But she added that the "connection between power and sex" is changing in the church. "There is an assumption that a person of privilege and power is automatically the guilty party, and there is a new understanding of what sexual abuse is."

Church officials acknowledge that ministers placed in a position of trust can use that authority to take advantage of vulnerable members of their flock or church employees. **Even in a completely consensual situation, however, there is an issue of credibility. "If the adultery is a onetime violation of trust, and the pastor's wife is the only other person who knows and is willing to forgive, it's one thing," said Zane Buxton, manager of the judicial process for the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). "It's very different, though, if it's semi-common knowledge and the pastor is standing in the pulpit talking about faithfulness. That brings the ministry into disrepute. That needs to be dealt with."**

COPYRIGHT 1998 The Christian Century Foundation

COPYRIGHT 2000 Gale Group

emphasis mine.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 09:54 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Sep 27 2007, 04:13 PM)

According to a very reliable source, new charges of sexual impropriety have been leveled against the Patriarch of the CEC.

Also an admission of sexual impropriety by the most prominent Archdeacon in the CEC.

It seems the unravelling of the CEC continues.

Please pray for them!!!

It should be noted that there are CHARGES/Allegations (against the Patriarch) only! These charges, as of the first posting of this information, had not been denied nor adjudicated by the CEC.

I understand there is to be a meeting (of at least some if not all) of the CEC Bishops very soon. Perhaps there will be some statement from that gathering.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 04:32 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 1 2007, 10:54 AM)

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Sep 27 2007, 04:13 PM)

According to a very reliable source, new charges of sexual impropriety have been leveled against the Patriarch of the CEC.

Also an admission of sexual impropriety by the most prominent Archdeacon in the CEC.

It seems the unravelling of the CEC continues.

Please pray for them!!!

It should be noted that there are CHARGES/Allegations (against the Patriarch) only! These charges, as of the first posting of this information, had not been denied nor adjudicated by the CEC.

I understand there is to be a meeting (of at least some if not all) of the CEC Bishops very soon. Perhaps there will be some statement from that gathering.

I have been told that not all the "facts" of this story are correct.

Here is what I have been told to clarify: There are new *Allegations* of a *Past Incident* of Sexual Impropriety having been committed by the Patriarch of the ICCEC.

Additionally, Fr. Daniel Sharp, Archdeacon to the Patriarch confessed to having had an "affair" (of indeterminate length) with woman (possibly married or unmarried) who is not his wife.

The comment that the CEC is unraveling is my opinion and one that is shared by others...not part of the comments from any of my sources.

Posted by: frequent reader, infrequent post Oct 1 2007, 05:00 PM

I don't find it at all surprising that "not all the "facts" of this story are correct".

Shall we post here for all to see everything you have confessed? I doubt you would consider that proper, and certainly not to be splashed about in large red bold font.

The word that comes to mind ... hypocrisy.

And for all the complaints from non-CEC and former-CEC people about being villified by current CEC people ... my analysis in reading all the blogs administered by you and the Davids shows that for every slander against non-CEC people (whether a poster or not) there are a couple dozen against a CEC person.

I am grateful that David Z. has come to a more respectful (if not quite balanced) view ... you can learn much from him, Michael. And we all have more to learn from the Lamb Who was led to slaughter, but did not open His mouth. A bruised reed He will not break ... but He will resist the proud. [Yes, I know those are two separate Scriptures.]

Beware of pride and self-justification -- on all sides.

A Father+ to some....

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 05:02 PM

Let us pray!

For redemption for all involved in these serious matters.

For all clergy and all who serve Christ's Church to have the grace to live honorably and honestly, according to our station and calling in life.

For Fr. Dan Sharp, the woman, her family and all of their loved ones.... That God may give them the grace they need in this time.

For Archbishop Adler, that he may have the necessary grace to make an appropriate response to this allegation. If innocent--vindicated, if guilty--humbled and redeemed.

For the CEC Church of St. Michael in San Clemente, for grace and peace and clarity of decision-making corporately and individually.

For the CEC in the United States and around the world, for a turn toward purity and devotion to what is good in the eyes of God.

For those leaders within the CEC to chart a course that will bring Honor and Glory to God from this situation. A course that will protect all of God's family from further harm.

For the Church universal, that we may all live in purity of devotion to our Lord, Jesus Christ. That we may all be able to clearly discern the direction of our Chief Shepherd in all that we decide to do or to say.

For those of us reading this news and commenting on it, that we may have the best intentions of Christ and His Church uppermost in our hearts and minds.

Lord, hear our prayer.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 05:22 PM

QUOTE (frequent reader @ infrequent post, Oct 1 2007, 06:00 PM)

I don't find it at all surprising that "not all the "facts" of this story are correct".

Shall we post here for all to see everything you have confessed? I doubt you would consider that proper, and certainly not to be splashed about in large red bold font.

The word that comes to mind ... hypocrisy.

And for all the complaints from non-CEC and former-CEC people about being villified by current CEC people ... my analysis in reading all the blogs administered by you and the Davids shows that for every slander against non-CEC people (whether a poster or not) there are a couple dozen against a CEC person.

I am grateful that David Z. has come to a more respectful (if not quite balanced) view ... you can learn much from him, Michael. And we all have more to learn from the Lamb Who was led to slaughter, but did not open His mouth. A bruised reed He will not break ... but He will resist the proud. [Yes, I know those are two separate Scriptures.]

Beware of pride and self-justification -- on all sides.

A Father+ to some....

Father to some,

Thank you for your admonishment. You may be one who told me not all the facts are correct. I think you will find, they are essentially correct.

However, I know there is more to this story as it is still unfolding. Every day and every evening, there are new facets. I am quite confident that I have the essence of the story correct.

Please feel free to contact me privately to hear my confession and feel free to post from that what you think would bring about a more holy and pure church.

I have left the names of both women out of my post, though I know their names.

I tried to leave all names out and refer only to titles, so as to confuse Google search. But, alas, the cat is out of the bag.

Do you know that you would have any of the story had I not posted it here? Is it not important to you and your flock? I beg to differ.

I was sent the story of a RCC priest under investigation for sexual impropriety in Maryland, by one emailer who claimed my facts are not all correct. I applaud the School in Baltimore for having him step down while the charges are being investigated.

The priest is a public figure, some are on his side and others are not. Should the persons involved not have lodged a complaint? Should the School not have taken action?

I lived through years of scandals within the RCC. Many personal acquaintances have never told their stories of abuse and illicit affairs with RCC priests. Most would not have known, had the news never reached the public eye. How many potential victims have been spared by the publicity of the RCC Priest Sex Scandals?

Admittedly, it is not perfect. The perfect would be that there be no sin to confess. Next to that would be confession of sin and voluntary removal from ministry. Unfortunately, that rarely happens.

You, Father, do not know which of my sins have already been on public display in the media. I offered no defense...only apology! Because I could not live with the hypocrisy. I received no glory, only forgiveness.

If I am wrong here, I am sorry!

Posted by: Oct 1 2007, 06:44 PM

I feel that both Father to some and Mike both have valid points.

First of all, lets give Father Sharp some credit here, he has confessed his sins and owned up to them! Isn't that what so many people have been asking for in their posts? Haven't you all wanted a little accountability from CEC officials? Well that is what Father Sharp has done. He has confessed his sins, hopefully with a repentant heart. So can we please give the man some credit? Yes he made a mistake, a huge mistake, but he stepped up and took accountability. He confessed his sins, and God, in his divine mercy, has forgiven him. So what good are we doing gossiping about this man whom has confessed and asked for forgiveness? None at all! He has owned up for his mistakes, now leave him alone!

On the other hand, dear ole Randy, he's a scumbag. He repeatedly has committed sins of sexual impropriety. He has lied about them and not owned up to them. And that is only the tip of the ice burg with all the messed up crap he has done, and then continuously denied and lied about it. So he deserves all that you have to throw at him until he can be a man and own up to his actions, which are indescribably unbecoming of a "Patriarch."

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 07:13 PM

QUOTE (..... @ Oct 1 2007, 07:44 PM)

I feel that both Father to some and Mike both have valid points.

First of all, lets give Father Sharp some credit here, he has confessed his sins and owned up to them! Isn't that what so many people have been asking for in their posts? Haven't you all wanted a little accountability from CEC officials? Well that is what Father Sharp has done. He has confessed his sins, hopefully with a repentant heart. So can we please give the man some credit? Yes he made a mistake, a huge mistake, but he stepped up and took accountability. He confessed his sins, and God, in his divine mercy, has forgiven him. So what good are we doing gossiping about this man whom has confessed and asked for forgiveness? None at all! He has owned up for his mistakes, now leave him alone!

I agree with you, Fr. Sharp has owned up. Lets pray for him, the other party and their families (and their church families)!!! PLEASE. You may have no idea how urgently those prayers are needed right now.

QUOTE

On the other hand, dear ole Randy, he's a scumbag. He repeatedly has committed sins of sexual impropriety. He has lied about them and not owned up to them. And that is only the tip of the ice burg with all the messed up crap he has done, and then continuously denied and lied about it. So he deserves all that you have to throw at him until he can be a man and own up to his actions, which are indescribably unbecoming of a "Patriarch."

As For ++Adler, let's also remember this is an allegation, so far, I have not heard of a denial or acceptance of the allegation. The parties involved have not, so far as I know, had any official adjudication of the claim.

I would like for us to focus not on the sin reported here, but on how to heal the church (and those involved) if it is determined there has been sin at such a level. That is why I posted several news items on how such things have been handled in other denominations. If the allegations are either *owned-up-to or proven* to be true, a course must be charted by the remaining leadership of the CEC to keep the parishioners from further harm.

What do you all think that course should be? How do you envision the future of the CEC if these allegations are true?

I, unlike many here, still have many beloved friends who have remained in the CEC throughout all of its stormy history. I wish them no harm. There are many fine men and women who have done as others have done...given their ALL to serve God and His

Church. They should be commended and prayed for as well.

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 1 2007, 07:20 PM

You are too quick to assume too much.
What is actually known, at this time, concerning these matters?

Did Sharp "step up" or "was he caught"? Big difference here.

"Give Sharp some credit"???????

How does anyone know the extent to which Sharp has dealt with this honestly?
How does anyone, with the facts known/unknown, take lightly a priest violating his office as principle, archdeacon, and one on the pastoral staff continuing to hear confessions, offer the Eucharist in the midst of such behavior? Can you only imagine the hurt of [his spouse], she being not only the wife of Daniel Sharp but the secretary to her boss, Randy Adler? How about the woman involved and her family and their trust?

Are priests who violate their office in the way in which this priest is accused of doing objects of God's redeeming grace? Yes, of course. But let us be much more careful here in pronouncing our absolution, for we are in no position to offer it and as for "giving some credit", ah.....

Grace is truly given to the truly penitent, but the consequences of violations of professional ethics cannot be merely avoided without serious consequences. No healthy organization anywhere allows for such conduct among those who are given a trust. People simply are escorted to the door.

Forgiveness? If truly repentant, yes, certainly.
Left in office? Absolutely not.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 1 2007, 07:25 PM

You make some excellent points. Perhaps that is why I have been told repeatedly that my "facts" aren't quite right.

Also why I am asking for prayer!

In the future, can we leave names of non-public figures out of the discussion?

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 1 2007, 07:33 PM

Deepest apologies. Please edit that.

Posted by: Guest Oct 1 2007, 09:40 PM

I appreciate your restrained response, Michael ... and no, it was not I who suggested you do not have your facts straight. The truth is, no facts have been determined.

I have a more appropriate question for the readers of this blog to ponder (to paraphrase your own words): **If the allegations are proven to be false, a course must be charted by the owners and posters of these hostile blogs to do penance for the injuries and assaults they have inflicted on the members of the CEC, and keep those same parishioners from further harm.**

What do you all think that course should be? How do you envision the future of this dialogue if these allegations against the CEC are FALSE?

If the allegations are true, then the Bishops of the CEC are obligated to deal with them, not "y'all". If the allegations are false, however, then you -- the leadership and commenters of this quick-to-condemn-without-two-or-more-independent-witnesses "forum" -- are obligated to deal with the consequences of your sin. And, in case you didn't know, "oops we were wrong" is nowhere near sufficient penance.

To ".....": ole Randy a scumbag? repeatedly committed? You can only say that if those sins have been publicly confessed or adjudicated. I suggest you lower your hand and drop "all that you have to throw at him" to the ground -- just as the Pharisees and teachers of the law did when Jesus instructed them, "He who is without sin among you, let him throw a stone at her first." If you do not, then you may come face to face with our Lord in a different context: "For I say to you, that unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven." The sin, IF true, admittedly would be more grievous for Abp. Adler as he has responsibility for more souls than just his own. However, you have been given neither the wisdom nor the authority to hold him accountable -- that task belongs to others. May God give them the strength and courage to exercise them wisely, faithfully, and justly ... whether you or I feel he is guilty or not!

And may God grant "**Just Watching**" the grace he refuses to give FATHER Dan Sharp.

A Father+ to some....

Posted by: frequent reader, infrequent post Oct 1 2007, 09:42 PM

The post immediately before this one, dated at 9:40 pm, belongs to me. I forgot to enter my "name", so it merely indicates "Guest".

Posted by: Guest Oct 1 2007, 10:50 PM

First, let me say that ALL of this is simply an echo of what transpired a year ago. Nothing is new. Even the sniping at the messengers and the ex-cec-ers, non-cec-ers and "those with an axe to grind" are all the same.

Not surprising.

QUOTE

So can we please give the man some credit? Yes he made a mistake, a huge mistake, but he stepped up and took accountability.

Since he has stepped up, he now needs to step down.

This is the core problem with what happened last year. The "patriarch" stayed right there in his seat of power and no one (in the hierarchy) demanded he step down. They all thought they could coddle him and everyone would soon forget what happened (as evidenced by the hushup following the dustup when the church split and lost nearly 50% of its US clergy/bishops and nearly the same percentage of laity), so everything eventually returned to normal and the Wiki article was sanitized constantly by CEC guardians.

The problem is that Adler never stepped down. Now others have been infected with the same sin as well. Lord knows if this is all that has happened. There may be much more that never makes it to the light of day nationally.

QUOTE

He confessed his sins, and God, in his divine mercy, has forgiven him. So what good are we doing gossiping about this man whom has confessed and asked for forgiveness? None at all! He has owned up for his mistakes, now leave him alone!

No one is gossiping here. Many of us are praying that the Lord cleanse His church. It is time to get rid of those in leadership who marr the image of Christ in public especially, but overall. It is time for a move of holiness to sweep the church. I'm not talking perfection here, simply the complete surrender to God of our lives in order to crucify the flesh and its desires so as to be the witness that God wants.

To date, this is a pathetic show. ECUSA has gone over the edge into heresy. Most of the other mainline denominations have also followed suit into the cultural cesspool while trying to stay relevant in the world. Christians suing Christians, and this before unbelievers. Ordaining homosexuals. Telling people that whatever they THINK is as valid as what the Doctors and fathers of the Church have taught.

Where will it end??

I go back to the beginning of this debacle over two years ago. If Adler had stepped down, if Bates hadn't made all sorts of excuses for Adler's behaviour, if the bishops took a stand about the cigars and scotch, if the youth in the Philipines had been disciplined when they were out of control and drunk, if the CEC had demanded accountability at all levels and TRULY sought God's holiness, none of this would have happened,

Instead they thought they could serve the two masters...and they were dead wrong.

Gossip about Dan Sharpe?? Not on your life. He should step down. No other comment is needed.

Gossip about Adler?? Not on your life. He should step down. No other comment is needed.

Now let's all enter into prayer for the poor souls still in the CEC and the trials they will face as they come out of the groupthink culture in the CEC and return to their first love.

Let's pray, fearfully (lest the same sins befall us) that those trapped in the sin that is being exposed come to true repentance and step down for an appropriate period of discipline and healing.

Let's keep watch so that we can rescue our brothers and sisters who may lose faith over the destructive behavior of those entrusted with their care.

Let us first and foremost return to our first love and seek to regain the zeal of pentecost and be able to say with Paul, "it is not I that live, but Christ in me."

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 1 2007, 10:56 PM

Sorry folks, I thought I was logged in when I sent the post immediately before this one.

The "Guest" is me.

Blessings+

Dcn. Chic Harmon

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 1 2007, 11:10 PM

QUOTE (A Father+ to some....)

I have a more appropriate question for the readers of this blog to ponder (to paraphrase your own words): **If the allegations are proven to be false, a course must be charted by the owners and posters of these hostile blogs to do penance for the injuries and assaults they have inflicted on the members of the CEC, and keep those same parishioners from further harm.**

What do you all think that course should be? How do you envision the future of this dialogue if these allegations against the CEC are FALSE?

I have an even better question for you AFTS,

What should have been done regarding the allegations that were proven TRUE over a year ago, for those of us that left the CEC and the damage those proven allegations already did to clergy and parishioners alike in the process??

What process has ever been put in place to protect the parishioners and clergy from further harm (as is apparently underway again) from those actions??

Let's go back further. When is the CEC going to exercise itself publicly of the consecration under the pagan Barker? When will the deliverance occur to free the CEC from recurring demonic sin and oppression?

Perhaps her very birth is partly responsible for the state of the CEC now. Many BROKE THEIR VOWS to join the CEC so as to be part of something new and shiny and exciting. The early ordinations were simply "ya wanna come along with us? We'll ordain you priest" which was said over scotch and cigars in a bar.

There is an inherent problem in the CEC that constant covering-over (white-wash) simply will not hide. Some of us had our blinders ripped off a year and a half ago. We can now see clearly. We are hoping that many more come back out into the light as well.

But please let me know your thoughts particularly on the question I asked at the beginning of this post. What is to be done about those of us that were spiritually injured in the first wave?

Posted by: Tony aka: the Baloney Man Oct 2 2007, 05:33 AM

Thank You Dn Chic Harmon.....

Nice posts last night. I am praying for all

Bless you all Tony 

Posted by: frequent reader, infrequent post Oct 2 2007, 07:18 AM

Dear Deacon,

What should have been done, which in many cases has been done, should still be ongoing:

Those of us with Dcn. or Fr. in front of our names should strip ourselves to the waist, gird up our loins, take up the towel and wash the wounds of those entrusted to our care. We should prayerfully probe deep into their hearts, allowing the Holy Spirit to release the poison of unforgiveness which remains and replace it with Christ's love. We should teach and minister forgiveness, for in this life there will always be those who disappoint, wound, and betray us. But we cannot teach what we do not know; we cannot minister out of our lack. Only as we live it in our own lives will those who are injured seek us out, so that they, too, may be healed.

We should humbly and honestly examine ourselves to see where our armor is weakest, for we can be certain the enemy will attack us there. We should remove the log from our own eye before trying to remove the speck from our brother's. And we should teach through word and example those same behaviors to the sheep entrusted to our care.

We should be quick to forgive, and quick to confess -- publicly! We should judge ourselves against Christ's standard before even thinking about judging another.

Is this what you have done, Deacon? Or have you harbored resentment and bitterness in your heart, and encouraged it in others? Are you gloating over others' failures, even before the truth of their actions is known? Are you demanding your pound of flesh, saying in your heart "I will not forgive until they come and beg me for forgiveness?" Are those who are injured seeking you out, not for healing but for justification of their anger?

If so, I recommend you lay aside that "deacon" thing until you have allowed Christ to wash the garbage away. Your ordination was not for your benefit; it was not a title of honor bestowed upon you. Ordination is dying -- death of self, death of my rights, death of my need to justify myself, death of my reputation. death of my wants and my needs.

Until you are dead, you cannot minister life to the precious lambs of Christ's flock.

A Father+ to some

QUOTE (frequent reader @ infrequent post, Oct 2 2007, 07:18 AM)

If so, I recommend you lay aside that "deacon" thing until you have allowed Christ to wash the garbage away. Your ordination was not for your benefit; it was not a title of honor bestowed upon you. Ordination is dying -- death of self, death of my rights, death of my need to justify myself, death of my reputation. death of my wants and my needs.

Wow. I think I know who you are. And it is not surprising to me.

As to my deacon "thing", you have missed the entire point of my posts. I do not hold it as an identity (as many of those I knew while in the CCE did). It is indeed a burden at times as I am a sinful man as well. (Lord have mercy on me!)

And I know full well (especially today) it is no honor in the eyes of the world to be ordained clergy. What most of the culture thinks when they see a collar is the sexual sins and abuse committed by priest's and bishop's in the RC church which the CEC hierarchy seems to reinforce over and over again with its own archdeacons and archbishops, or so it appears.

The difference though is that I am a sinful man who is repentent.

You need to remember the accounts of Jesus' earthly ministry here. He set a standard of observation and action for us. He was very merciful to all the poor and sick and those whose hearts were sorrowful and were truly seeking God. He was merciless though with those who had the appearance of religious, while darkness was the rule of their hearts. He saved his harshest and most vicious condemnation for those that led the Jews - the Pharisees and Scribes and those in **authority**. He overturned the tables of those in the temple that had corrupted and polluted its purpose.

A scoundrel always needs to be called out and yet you - and others like you - continually make excuses for the behaviour of the leadership as if they are simply poor souls in need of love! How dare you place the sheep at risk due to the voracious appetites of the hireling shepherd who simply sees them as a means to his ends. As pickin's for his personal taking.

I hold nothing back here for the leadership of the CEC. They killed and destroyed a large part of the flock in the last debacle, and here they are, and you as well, attempting to do it again!

The laity in the CEC need to rise up and DEMAND accountability from the clergy and bishops that remain. Many need to be removed, period.

And someone needs to come to their aid. Why is it not you?

I do not hold a grudge for any of the treatment I received. I see those who dealt with me for what they truly are. I did gain a lot of good while I was there as well.

I at least had the courtesy and courage to send a letter to my bishop.

He did not have the kahunas , nor heart of a shepherd to respond to me - AT ALL.

To this day, I have heard not a word from him even as to accepting my letter. I simply got the standard letter stripping me of my ordination (if that were even possible).

But I would challenge the fact of whether you are "**father to any**". From your actions - then as now - You do not defend, you rationalize and excuse. You use a wimpy attitude to appear pious while your core seethes at the fact that I am still a deacon. And that I have always been a deacon even before I was ordained. Do not presume that you know me or anything about me.

If indeed you were a "father" at all, you would not be here debating the merits of this blog or anyone on it as you are obviously not OUR father. You would be with your flock leading them to good water and healthful food and covering.

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 2 2007, 08:47 AM

A Father+ to some

Your posts remind us all of our call to extend grace and the remembrance of God's undeserved mercy toward us as previously sinful people ourselves. A heartfelt and very sincere thank you.

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 2 2007, 08:54 AM

A general observation:

I can understand the need for anonymity for those actually reporting what is happening in the CEC since the CEC hierarchy keeps (or attempts to keep) a closed and tight control of information from leaking out, but those who come here to attack others who post here are simply cowards in hiding behind their alias.

I have no use for them and shall refrain from responding to them. Only those who identify themselves deserve a response.

Posted by: Samwise Oct 2 2007, 09:32 AM

From my perspective:

1. I saw lots of deacons and laity, even some priests, disciplined and even inhibited and deposed for issues of "rebellion",

singular episodes of getting drunk, not paying creditors, internet porn, not tithing, not going to confession, not attended CEC affairs...

2. Yet isn't some of the righteous indignation based upon Archdeacons, Archbishops and a Patriarch who never receive such public discipline, who are not deposed, nor even inhibited? And for FAR FAR more egregious sins such as "adultery", chronic alcohol and controlled substance abuse, commission of felonies, making passes at other women, embarrassing behavior, abusing their clerical office, not giving due process to others beneath them.

I mean, has Archdeacon Sharp resigned his clerical office? Has he been inhibited or deposed? If so, when? Permanent, or temporary? Is Sharp's wife still Secretary to Adler? Is that wise, being in a position of local church spiritual leadership with her own personal crisis (not that she may be at fault, but many churches ask all those in crisis with church positions to take leaves of absence to deal with their personal matters). Has the Patriarch attempted to correct the wrongs inflicted by other Bishops on those who have left? Any letters of apology? Any phone calls? Did the Patriarch ever call Bp Weeks after HIS letter of resignation? (I remember a salient point of +Weeks' letter was that he hadn't heard a peep from the Patriarch in two years, even with crisis in his family).

The CEC talks about relationships: what relationships have existed between bishops and canons and archdeacons AFTER someone departs from the CEC? If there were true friendships and relationships, wouldn't there be?

The CEC talks about discipline but I've seen bishops bounce checks, not pay their credit cards, face foreclosure action, all a shoddy exercise of financial discipline and an embarrassment to the church and not the first one truly get called on the carpet and disciplined for such behavior by those over him.

Ok, enough righteous indignation for now. (And isn't that EXACTLY what some, like Dcn Chic, see?)

Any answers?

Posted by: **Tony aka: the Baloney Man** Oct 2 2007, 09:37 AM

QUOTE (Samwise @ Oct 2 2007, 09:32 AM)

From my perspective:

1. I saw lots of deacons and laity, even some priests, disciplined and even inhibited and deposed for issues of "rebellion", singular episodes of getting drunk, not paying creditors, internet porn, not tithing, not going to confession, not attended CEC affairs...

2. Yet isn't some of the righteous indignation based upon Archdeacons, Archbishops and a Patriarch who never receive such public discipline, who are not deposed, nor even inhibited? And for FAR FAR more egregious sins such as "adultery", chronic alcohol and controlled substance abuse, commission of felonies, making passes at other women, embarrassing behavior, abusing their clerical office, not giving due process to others beneath them.

I mean, has Archdeacon Sharp resigned his clerical office? Has he been inhibited or deposed? If so, when? Permanent, or temporary? Is Sharp's wife still Secretary to Adler? Is that wise, being in a position of local church spiritual leadership with her own personal crisis (not that she may be at fault, but many churches ask all those in crisis with church positions to take leaves of absence to deal with their personal matters). Has the Patriarch attempted to correct the wrongs inflicted by other Bishops on those who have left? Any letters of apology? Any phone calls? Did the Patriarch ever call Bp Weeks after HIS letter of resignation? (I remember a salient point of +Weeks' letter was that he hadn't heard a peep from the Patriarch in two years, even with crisis in his family).

The CEC talks about relationships: what relationships have existed between bishops and canons and archdeacons AFTER someone departs from the CEC? If there were true friendships and relationships, wouldn't there be?

The CEC talks about discipline but I've seen bishops bounce checks, not pay their credit cards, face foreclosure action, all a shoddy exercise of financial discipline and an embarrassment to the church and not the first one truly get called on the carpet and disciplined for such behavior by those over him.

Ok, enough righteous indignation for now. (And isn't that EXACTLY what some, like Dcn Chic, see?)

Any answers?

Thanks Samwise and Dcn Chic Harmon

You hit the nail on the head 😊

Posted by: **I See Dead Denominations** Oct 2 2007, 12:56 PM

Yawn,

Are we at this again.

Draw your shields, everyone to the ready, Grab your version of the scriptures, and let it rip.
Emotions will be shed and little reason used.

We must defend our self-love. We must defend our idea of the truth. We must call attention away from the actual facts and hide them among loose interpretations of what we think the scriptures might say.

Enough, Enough I digress

Quick question though

Has anyone seen financial accountability reports that include receipts and line item detail for monies spent, or have they seen reports with say courtesy cost or hospitality cost with no details? If I were you, I would like to know what counts as acceptable use of funds. What passes for income for that matter? I think many would be surprised at how pastors, bishops, arch bishops, and patriarch claim as there incomes as opposed to what they receive in actuality.

Sidebar

Sigh I wonder what modern Christians would do to Peter today, for daring to call down the Holy Spirit on poor lil ole Ananias and Saphira. Or for Paul in calling out Peter on doctrinal issues in Galatians. I guess the sons of Eli were not so wicked according to today's yard stick. They were misunderstood and they never meant any harm. And Eli was really a great dad to
Eli was a man of God but the people of God suffered at the hands of his sons.

All the cec people want to know is that their leaders will be like Peter and Paul and feed Christ's lambs at all costs instead of allowing their Son's like Eli to eat the faithful alive for the sake keeping their own closets closed.

All a Man of the Cloth needs is to be justified before his Lord and Father.
As a sheep before his ...

Stop with his reputation, slander ... stuff and read about the saints and or patriarchs over the centuries who have been removed wrongly and unjustly from office without ever defending themselves or taking down others. They went with the grace of the Lord.

Nevermind I'll say no more. Men loved darkness rather than light.

Posted by: mys_t_cal Oct 2 2007, 01:25 PM

I must say, the debate here has been very emotional and informing. I would like to address something Tony has mentioned a ways back. Something about "the end of the CEC". There may be some who have been terribly hurt by the CEC who want the dismiss of the whole denomination of the CEC. I don't count myself as one of them. After the last big scandal, my views of the CEC changed, and I saw the "whole picture", but still, I did not want the CEC to come to an end. If it weren't for the CEC, I would not have ever known about the liturgy and sacraments, and things catholic in general. I heard the call from our Blessed Mother to go home to the ancient faith. I can't imagine hearing that call from an independent charismatic church. I would not have been able to hear it. So, I believe that God has a purpose in the CEC. Even if some people don't go on to the RCC, at least they have liturgy and Eucharist, and a more genuine form of worship. But let's face it, this denomination is having a very rough start. Could it be that there was some cultish ingredients in the original mix? If that be the case, there must be a return to a basic foundation. This is my proposal. All guilty parties should step forward, confess, and step down. They should be forgiven and sent their way. Then the new patriarch (Bp Bates?) and the remaining bishops should just start over. Get cleansed of the cultic influence, get new blessings or ordinations, and draft a new set of vision, goals, canons, etc. But this time, they should make it clear from the beginning that they have no inclination or desire to be part of the RCC and that they are indeed a protestant denomination with a desire for worship that is sacramental, liturgical, and charismatic. Then, and I believe this is very important, there should be UNITY among all the parishes. Until the denomination has matured, maybe there shouldn't even be different dioceses. If all this sounds elementary and uneducated to some of you theologian, I'm sorry. I think also, that there is not enough accountability on the part of those Bishops over the dioceses. It seems they get together in their "good ole boy" club, pass the cigars and booze, say yea, yea, to the patriarch, and then go home and run things the way they see fit. Many parishes don't even believe the same way as others in the same dioceses. If this is not true, please correct me. Also, one more thing, who should the patriarch be accountable to? Who is Adler accountable to now? Just wondering. Thanks y'all for listening.

Mys_t_cal

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 2 2007, 01:42 PM

All of this just ticks me off.

I personally don't give a good gosh darn about what Adler drinks or smokes or who he makes passes at. And I don't care about Sharp either....on a personal level. I honestly could care less.

What I DO care about is the fact that these guys are going to stand up in the pulpit on Sunday mornings and tell other people how to live the Christian life AFTER they drink, smoke and do inappropriate sexual things. They are going to counsel others on how to work through financial difficulties or marital/family issues. AS IF!?!?!? What business do they have telling others how to live when they themselves can't get it together? It's disgusting!

Am I a sinner? Yup! And so are you.

The difference here is that I don't try for one minute preach the scriptures from the pulpit, nor do I stand with the body and blood of Jesus in my hands and act as the symbol of Christ.

Those who feel "called" to do this need to live lives that are above reproach.

I swear, I would SOOOO hate to be any of them or a number of other "religious leaders" when they have to stand before their maker and give an accounting of the spiritual destruction that they were responsible for. I can only imagine that God must weep for the pain and spiritual anihalation experienced by His children at the hands of these men who claim to be His apostles and prophets.

Matthew 18:6 but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in Me to stumble, it would be better for him to have a heavy millstone hung around his neck, and to be drowned in the depth of the sea.

(Yes, I See Dead Denominations...I grabbed my version of the scriptures and let it rip. Oops...my bad!)

Posted by: I See Dead Denominations Oct 2 2007, 01:57 PM

Don't mind me Bonnie I just want people to give the you are so wrong for talking about this crap a rest. Sharp was sent packing on a "sabbatical" for being over-stressed. And then proceded to "healing centers" across america and I hoped it worked.

Posted by: ISDD Oct 2 2007, 02:03 PM

sorry I hit the post instead of preview and I was not done.

The cover up is what kills me.

Sabbatical for being over stressed not the I ask for your forgiveness and I need time off to see if my wife will still stay in the same zipcode with me

There done.

PS
CEC PEOPLE ANYTIME YOU HERE THE WORD SABBATICAL SOME BODY IS IN SOME DEEP ATLEAST THE WAY THE CEC USES IT

Posted by: Samwise Oct 2 2007, 02:26 PM

"Sharp was sent packing on a "sabbatical" for being over-stressed. And then proceded to "healing centers" across america and I hoped it worked."

Was He officially immediately inhibited and/or deposed? Excommunicated?

None of the above?

Anybody know the answer?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 2 2007, 02:48 PM

QUOTE (Samwise @ Oct 2 2007, 03:26 PM)

Was He officially immediately inhibited and/or deposed? Excommunicated?

None of the above?

Anybody know the answer?

Yes, an official notice will soon be available--I am told.

However, I have it on good authority, that Dan Sharp was "deposed", *as it were*.

Was it immediate? It has happened since the story broke on the forums and blog sites.

...Sabbatical, Healing Centers and the such? I cannot confirm. Does the original poster know that to be the case? The reason being: "overstressed"... does the original poster of that information know that to be the reason? Or can anyone confirm these things?

Posted by: frequent reader, infrequent post Oct 2 2007, 04:17 PM

"Wow" is accurate, Deacon. Your response reveals that you do not know who I am ... much less know my heart. And it reveals much more as well....

You have missed, and misconstrued, the entire point of my posts. I do not defend, I do not make excuses, and I do not minimize the sin of, nor question the hurt caused by, those who were/are unfaithful to the vows they made to God -- whether their marriage vows or their ordination vows (both are sacraments, as you recall). I cannot change what they have done, but I am fully accountable for how I respond. The quality of that response is not measured by the heat of my moral outrage, but by my impact on the spiritual health, both current and future, of the sheep Christ has trusted to my care and nurture. Jesus has indeed set a standard, and we are to measure ourselves against it -- and we clergy above all others must be most honest and brutal with ourselves! That standard does not mark the difference between you and me; no, that difference lies elsewhere....

Jesus reserved his most harsh condemnation for those in authority who spoke lies to the people in the Name of God. Yet He had compassion on Peter, who proudly boasted before all the apostles that though the other wimps [my word] might fall away, he himself would never leave Jesus. Before the night was over he swore with an oath and called curses down upon himself as he falsely proclaimed, in public, that he did not even know Him!

Why did Jesus forgive? Because Peter was repentant. Jesus not only restored him to his previous position, but elevated him to be the first head of the Church. Should Andrew, James, or John have objected to Christ's action? Should they have sent scrolls to all believers who had ever talked to Peter, telling them in great detail about Peter's horrid betrayal? Should they have called for all the laity -- all non-apostles -- to rise up and demand that Christ depose him and choose someone else?

Our bishops (yours and mine) are not Jesus Christ, though. They are not perfect in their evaluation of a man. So they must test the truth of another man's repentance. Their responsibility is to listen to the Holy Spirit to determine how that is best done, and to act faithfully in monitoring for compliance. That is quite different than simply hushing it up and transferring the offender to a different diocese. (And by the way, "**I See Dead Denominations**", Peter did not dare "to call down the Holy Spirit on poor lil ole Ananias and Sapphira". He spoke the truth to Ananias -- "You have not lied to men but to God" -- and in response Ananias fell down and died. Peter then prophesied to Sapphira -- "they will carry you out also" -- and his prophecy came true. He never demanded or even recommended that God smite them dead.)

You accuse me of all sorts of hidden motives and secret hatred ... none of which are true. I do not resent the fact that you are still a deacon ... and my "core" does not seethe at you or anyone else. I will confess that my "cor" -- my heart -- does break when one who claims to be a servant of our Lord reserves omniscience to himself in knowing what's in the heart of all men who disagree with him.

We are not accountable for what others do; we are completely accountable for how we respond to it. If we sweep it under the rug, we are accountable for any further hurt that causes. If we judge others more harshly than God does, we risk final judgment. And if we call another "fool", we are in danger of the fires of hell.

I beg you in the love and power of the Holy Spirit to look at your posts as though they came from me and were accusing you. Recognize and confess the bitterness that still hides in the depths of your soul, which emerges when others simply ask a question. I plead with you not to let that bitterness be transferred to a single sheep ... for you, too, will be held just as accountable as those you identify by name here.

A Father+ to some

Posted by: norksquad Oct 2 2007, 06:53 PM

Man I sure wish some *healing centers* were available to me when I was *deposed* for doing nothing and left for dead by my church. I did contact one of these centers. When I vented my aggravation they told me that I needed a psychiatrist and then wrote me off.

I wonder if there is a *healing center* for me? Wait, I don't have any money or notoriety...oh I guess not...

I guess I'll just take the medicine from my *psychiatrist* and shut up.

Mentally Ill In New Mexico.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 2 2007, 08:28 PM

I am sorry for you, norksquad.

Funny(sad) how those with fame and (mis)fortune always find a way to rehab or healing centers. I pray the CEC opens healing center funds for the other parties involved as well as any parishioners and other clergy who have been adversely affected or "stressed out" over this situation.

Seriously, I think they should take some of the Foundation Day funds to help at least the other parties and their families. I would even donate to such a fund.

I would like to help you too, norksquad. I don't have that much money nor notoriety either. Hang in there! My prayers are with you.

Posted by: observing party Oct 2 2007, 08:55 PM

I think healing center means charismatic healing center. Many CEC people have been to inner healing weekends and such. Like the Lazarus ministry in Selma. That would be across the states and Arch. Bp. Jones is close to the Patriarch. This would actually make sense.

Whatever the case, seeking help in whatever form is good. I think ISDD was upset that things look as though they may have been covered up. Most Christians would have been charitable and supportive of a marriage being healed if told of the affair upfront instead of bogus stress get out of town tactics.

Assuming every thing posted was 100% accurate which I doubt. Not that I think harm is meant by the post just an obviously frustrated person. I see no personal attack just an attack on standard operational procedures in the CEC.

If I assume wrong ISDD let me know.

Posted by: Me Oct 2 2007, 09:01 PM

I know what you all need..... a good cigar and some scotch. Walking over to my humidor right now....
Keep the faith, God is not mocked....our faith is in Him. Glory be...

Feeling lonely in the CEC
Bad vibes and all to see
Must walk in faith
And count the cost
Was is that much that I lost?
Take heart my son
but you have gained
Much love and treasures
in Heaven yet unexplained.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 2 2007, 09:33 PM

QUOTE (Me @ Oct 2 2007, 10:01 PM)

I know what you all need..... a good cigar and some scotch. Walking over to my humidor right now....
Keep the faith, God is not mocked....our faith is in Him. Glory be...

Feeling lonely in the CEC
Bad vibes and all to see
Must walk in faith
And count the cost
Was is that much that I lost?
Take heart my son
but you have gained
Much love and treasures
in Heaven yet unexplained.

Hi Me,

What is the tune? I am waiting for my cigar and scotch, or is this a private party?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 3 2007, 09:18 AM

As found on cechealing blog regarding news on cechome:

QUOTE

Not that this comes as a huge surprise, but no news has been posted on the CEChome.com site about the latest developments out of San Clemente....

see the rest of the story here: <http://cechealing.wordpress.com/2007/10/01/no-news-on-cechomecom/>

Posted by: Samwise Oct 3 2007, 10:44 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 1 2007, 07:24 AM)

One further thought/question.

Had I remained loyally in the CEC throughout the last year's tsunami, waiting for the promised reforms, and now confronted with this "replay"...I would be disgusted and feel a bit foolish or at least like I had been "played" for a fool.

My prayers are particularly with those of you who have remained loyal to the CEC! 😊

Ok, several days after first posting the Archdeacon Sharp matter, Mike now reveals that he (Sharp) was deposed.

Isn't that as it should be? I mean, you could argue that there is an issue of poor leadership regarding this scandal/sin/disclosure--and that would be true--but sin still exist--even in the church--and wasn't this (deposition) the correct way to deal with it?

So isn't there now one issue-- involving Adler? Which I've read here is an old issue that has now surfaced, which I've yet to hear anything about. Is it on the level of carrying another married woman's picture in his wallet, or more serious like Texas/Bp Myers issue? Anyone know?

Posted by: wonder Oct 3 2007, 10:56 AM

mabe samwise things have been dealt with in the right way.

but 2 to 3 years from now and after things have died down don't be surprised to see the deposed reinstated. It has happened before in the cec with those who where close to head bishops. Similiar cases as well. He will have taken his discipline and followed the steps set before him.

Was or is the deposed a financial guy or cpa. Could he know where the financial bodies may be buried? I only ask because I

have heard that he has advised some clergy on how to structure income.

Discussion purposes only. I am not alleging any wrongdoing of any party. Things always should be taken with grain of salt. There should be nothing wrong with healthy questions.

Posted by: wonder Oct 3 2007, 11:18 AM

Let me explain why I am asking the above question.

All of this is assumed on the iffe material provided so far

1 accused confess affair

2 accused not deposed but sent for counseling at "healing center" on sabbatical.

3 events are leaked.

4 bishop or bishops are up in arms

5 accused is deposed.

It looks as if point 5 happened because of point 3 and not because of point 1. Why?

Probably will never know.

I doubt any further info on the head bishop will trickle any further than it has now. Mabe there is no news at all but a power play to get the accused deposed. Who knows what if anything is to be believed until a formal record of deposition is released. To be sure if a record is produced and relatively soon it will be a much faster response from the higher ups than was seen last year when no response was issued for several months after everything had blown up. PR and damage control seem better this time around.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 3 2007, 01:28 PM

((So it's long but I tried to make it fun to read.))

Fr Dan is now Dan. Of course this was done privately. He is moving to HI to his new house he bought ((or someone bought??)) with his wife and son. ((Mmm... I would love a house in HI.)) Word is he was looking while there with the SM's youth a month back. ((A month back?? - Where does a priest get the dough to buy a house in HI without selling his house in 'the OC' ??))

By the way, no ONE on St. Mike's pastoral team has offered a call to Dan's victims, not one. That's very sad. "Cover ourselves and leave the sheep for the wolves!" Maybe this "healing mass" tonight will make it all better. How about a "coming out mass"? No... too ECUSA... How about a "name it and claim it mass"? No... too protestant... Mmmm... how about no mass and just the truth? There's a thought. Why have a healing mass? Seems to put them in total control of the forum. We don't really even know what we are infected with yet, right. Or do we? Maybe it will be a "Dan the Scapegoat" sacrificial mass? ((OR)) The "pay no attention to that man behind the altar" mass?? Go figure...

I am glad to see that some have fled the gewy love for a more sobering view. The danger here is a sick view of love. Right? "Are yah with me?" One that destroys. You can't just repent when you get caught; then claim "amendment of life" and expect no consequences for your actions. Scripture says that God is a good Father that has no problem dealing out a little rod action to help our souls.

As they used to say a few years back, "What does the Word say about it brother?"

Saint Paul states it this way in 1Tim 5:20 - "Those who sin are to be rebuked publicly, so that the others may take warning." ((Oh no, we LOVE ya man... God's not mad at yah brother... can do that. Paul must have had a bad day there.)) ((This is what I see from where I am at)): 1Corn 5:2-5 - "**And you are proud!** ((hello)) Shouldn't you rather have been filled with grief and have put out of your fellowship the man who did this? Even though I am not physically present, I am with you in spirit. And I have already passed judgment on the one who did this, just as if I were present. When you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus and I am with you in spirit, and the power of our Lord Jesus is present, hand this man over to Satan, so that the sinful nature may be destroyed and his spirit saved on the day of the Lord."



PS Understand that most of this harshness is just plain hurt. I love Dan and his family very much. He was once a great man of God and I hope he will be again. I am in prayer for them. I do want God's best but sometimes y'all, God's best in a situation doesn't seem loving to the carnal eye of love.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 3 2007, 01:36 PM

Sorry for the typos, typing too fast! ((I claim amendment of type!)) Hopefully you still get the gist of it all. -NSV

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 3 2007, 02:13 PM

NS,

Your narrative is great! LOL I feel like I am right there in the OC. (🕶️ I wish I could tint these sunglasses blue for me and rose for others.)

Of course, you know what you need to do to get a house in HI, now. Is this move to HI to take place *after visiting the healing center for a sabbatical*? Or is this a permanent "sabbatical"? Doesn't sabbatical infer a return to ministry? Is the reason for Fr. Dan now being-- just Dan--that he is "stressed out" as reported here?

And where will the victim(s) be living? 😞

What of the man behind the altar, a.k.a ++Adler? And the allegations posted here and elsewhere? Will we have an HOB "Healing Mass" later this month for that?

Thanks for your insights and reflection...now back in out of the sun!

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 3 2007, 02:15 PM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 3 2007, 02:36 PM)

Sorry for the typos, typing too fast! ((I claim amendment of type!)) Hopefully you still get the gist of it all. -NSV

"offer it up", brother!

Where can I get acopy of the NSV?

Posted by: Just Watching Oct 3 2007, 02:17 PM

Totally apart from this situation in particular, but regarding clergy sexual misconduct policies in general, some reflection upon this matter is in order.

The question of a clergyman having an affair is not particularly a new story, as dreadful in consequences as it is. A larger concern here would be; if a clergyman had an affair, what did his superiors and/or rector's council know about it, when did they know about, what did they do about it and what processes within the policies and government of that church displayed either healthy or unhealthy responses to the clergyman, his family, the victims, the victim's family and to the church as a whole?

There exists abundant expert guidance on this subject. Many times insurance companies require there be adequate training and strong policies within the staffing and governmental structures of a church before granting liability coverage.

These matters need to be taken very seriously within all denominations and by all churches. Anything else to have one's head buried deeply in either the sand of arrogance or innocence and neither approach is acceptable.

[!][B][B][!]

Posted by: Lurker Oct 3 2007, 03:54 PM

Here's a copy of a revalent document we clergy of our Diocese had to sign back in late 2003 (identifying diocese name removed).

The Charismatic Episcopal Church
Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct
For Clergy

This policy statement is adapted from the policy received from the U.S. House of Bishops, March 2003, and commended to the CEC Provinces/Dioceses in the U.S.

The Charismatic Episcopal Church and the _____ Province/Diocese are committed to the highest biblical moral standards. All CEC members, guests, employees, and volunteers have the right to pursue their activities free from all forms of discrimination and conduct which can be considered harassing, coercive, or disruptive, including sexual harassment and sexual misconduct.

The Charismatic Episcopal Church holds that the Canon Law of the Church, both international and national, supercedes all Civil Law. The Church does not function as an extension or arm of the State, and though the Church submits to the authority of civil government where it does not conflict with God's Holy Law, it must always adhere to Canon Law. The _____ Province/Diocese and its member churches will adhere to all federal and state laws prohibiting sexual harassment and sexual misconduct.

This statement establishes the policy of the Charismatic Episcopal Church and the _____ Province/Diocese on sexual harassment and sexual misconduct and the CEC's expectations for appropriate and moral behavior by its clergy: archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons. It is the responsibility and duty of any member, guest, employee, or volunteer, who believes he or she has been harassed, to report such behavior so that it can be investigated and appropriate action taken.

Persons in charge of or activities sponsored by the _____ Province/Diocese, or any of its churches, have a responsibility and duty to report immediately to the bishop any complaint of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct which is brought to their attention. If the accused is the bishop of the diocese, such activity should be reported to the provincial archbishop; if the accused is an archbishop, then to the Primate.

The _____ Province/Diocese and its churches shall use any means necessary to maintain an environment for members, guests, employees, and volunteers that is free from sexual harassment, intimidation, or misconduct. The CEC recognizes sexual harassment and sexual misconduct as immoral and contrary to the Gospel and God's Holy Law. These activities undermine morale and interfere with the work of God's people in His Church, and will not be tolerated. Guidelines and procedures for reporting and investigating any misconduct are outlined in the following instructions.

Sexual harassment includes all unwelcome sexual advances and other unwanted touching, requests for sexual favors, sexually motivated physical conduct, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

- Submission to such conduct is made, either explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of an individual's involvement in an activity or employment; or
- Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for affecting involvement in an activity or employment of such an individual; or
- Such conduct is intended to or does create an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Sexual misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Sexual abuse or sexual molestation of any person including any sexual involvement or sexual contact with a person who is a minor.
- Sexual exploitation including the development of, or attempt to develop, a sexual relationship between a pastor, employee, guest, volunteer, or a person with whom he has a pastoral relationship, whether or not there is apparent consent from the individual.
- Submission to such conduct, as set forth above, being made, either implicitly or explicitly, as a condition of an individual's pastoral care or counseling.
- Such conduct, as set forth above, which has the purpose or effect of interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, exploitative, or offensive working environment.
- Submission to such conduct, as set forth above, being made, either explicitly or implicitly, a condition of employment.
- Submission to, or rejection of, such conduct, as set forth above, by an individual being used as a basis for employment decisions affecting the individual.
- Coercing or attempting to coerce a person into a sexual and/or dating relationship.
- Conduct between a child and adult in which the child is being used for sexual stimulation of the adult or a third person. For the purpose of this policy a person is considered to be a child until the age of 18.
- Conduct of a sexual nature between a married person and a person not his or her spouse.
- Any homosexual activity.
- Any sexual activity prohibited by federal law or state law of the states within the Province/Diocese.

The following are examples of actions that may be considered sexual misconduct or harassment:

- Using inappropriate, sexually intimate comments not consistent with professional conduct in pastoral care, counseling, or work relationships.
- Engaging in inappropriate, sexually intimate activity not consistent with professional conduct in pastoral care, counseling, or work relationships.
- Touching, bumping, gesturing, patting, or demanding sexual favors and promises pertaining to employment.
- Displaying or encouraging use of sexual materials for sexual stimulation.
- Using obscene or sexually suggestive language.
- Threatening to deny or limit employment or volunteer opportunities if sexual advances are rejected.

Based on government statistics, women are most often the victims of sexual misconduct and harassment, however, men and children can also be victims. Sexual misconduct and harassment is not dependent upon the sex of either the offender or the victim.

The church is deeply concerned for the welfare of the persons who have been victimized by sexual misconduct, and for safeguarding the church's members and staff from abuse. The effectiveness of determining the truth and protecting the innocent, as well as dealing appropriately with those who victimize others, are also concerns. The church's ministry is one of healing for all parties involved.

The Charismatic Episcopal Church and the _____ Province/Diocese believes the only appropriate and moral sexual behavior is that which is between a man and a woman within the context of marriage. Any bishop, priest, or deacon who forms a sexual relationship outside of the context of a sacramental marriage involves himself in sexual immorality and is subject to discipline.

Persons who believe they have been harassed, have witnessed harassment, or have had incidents of harassment reported to them should properly report these matters to the bishop. If the accused is a member of the episcopate, then the report is made to the archbishop at the next higher level.

The bishop or archbishop will inform the Bishop's Council of the allegations, and together they will determine if the incident warrants further investigation. If further investigation is warranted, the bishop will appoint a priest of the diocese, hereinafter entitled the 'investigator', to conduct the investigation and to seek the facts. If the accused is a bishop, then another bishop will be sought to serve as the investigator.

The supervising bishop, through the office of the archdeacon or other person appointed by the bishop, hereinafter entitled the 'bishop's emissary', will inform the victim, the person making the complaint, and the alleged abuser of the policy of the _____ Province/Diocese regarding sexual harassment, abuse, or misconduct. He will also assist the victim and the alleged abuser in finding resources for counseling and spiritual guidance, and will, if necessary, with the approval of the bishop, make immediate contact with civil authorities when required. Immediate involvement of the civil authorities should be given

special consideration if such abuse or misconduct involves a child under the age of 18.

The bishop's emissary and the investigator should not advocate for any party involved, act as legal counsel for any party, replace the function of the bishop or the Bishop's Council, determine guilt or innocence of the accused, or enforce a special remedy or disciplinary action.

If the complainant decides not to file a written statement of alleged offense, the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council must determine whether there is sufficient cause to take action. The complainant shall be advised not to speak further of the alleged offenses except in the course of professional and/or pastoral counseling or with legal authorities.

The supervising bishop will speak with the accused person regarding the exhortation to live a Christ-like life and his vow of obedience to his bishop which were made at his ordination. It is the bishop's expectation that the accused will remain silent so as not to further disrupt the peace and unity of the church. The matter should not be discussed with members of the local congregation, the officers of the congregation, or with other priests (unless directed by the bishop for the purpose of counsel and spiritual guidance) until such time as disciplinary action is concluded. If thereafter he is found to be speaking with anyone other than the supervising bishop or the person appointed by the bishop, there is cause for filing a separate complaint.

The bishop's emissary and the investigator shall report to the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council as expeditiously as possible. The supervising bishop and the Bishop's Council shall insure that the accused is given sufficient time to prepare and make a reasoned defense.

The supervising bishop shall arrange for attorneys who are competent in the field to consult on actual or potential cases of sexual misconduct, harassment, or abuse.

If the allegations are not sustained by the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council, a report will be made of the investigation and the findings. The report will be maintained within the patriarchal, provincial, or diocesan office, as appropriate.

If there is probable cause to believe an offense was committed, the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council shall proceed to file ecclesial charges and take necessary disciplinary actions.

If there is probable cause to believe that the accused has committed an act of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct against a minor, he shall be immediately suspended from the ordained ministry.

If there is probable cause to believe that the accused has committed an act of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct, he shall be granted a temporary leave of absence or removal from his ministry for counseling and spiritual guidance, and shall be inhibited from functioning as a bishop, priest, or deacon. Return to ministry or position, and removal of the inhibition, will be dependent upon consultation between the counselor, spiritual director, the Bishop's Council, and the bishop. The supervising bishop has the sole responsibility for making the final determination.

It is the responsibility of the supervising bishop, with the advice of his Bishop's Council, to determine if, and when, the individual is once again competent to engage in any ministry, lay or ordained. The supervising bishop, under Catholic discipline and practice, has the authority to deny any ordained person the right to return to ministry or the right to transfer to another ministry or jurisdiction. The supervising bishop reserves the right to impose a sentence of deposition from the ministry.

Appeals may be made to the next immediate level of authority within the Church in accordance with Canon 6.IV of the Canon Law of the Charismatic Episcopal Church.

When pastors of a congregation are involved in violations of professional ethics and biblical morality, the congregation is also a victim. Particular thought and concern should be given to the pastoral care of the congregation.

If the pastor or other clerical member of the pastoral staff is the subject of complaints or formal charges, the bishop and the Bishop's Council must determine how and to what extent the matter is known among other clergy, employees, and the members of the congregation. If the matter is known, the bishop, after consultation with the Bishop's Council and the local Rector's Council, the investigator, the bishop's emissary, and other selected priests or bishops, shall determine what action, if any, should be taken.

It is important that nothing be done that would prejudice the integrity of the Christian Church, or prejudice the integrity of the investigative, disciplinary, or judicial process of the Church, or adversely affect the legitimate interests of any complainant, witness, or accused.

The sacredness of the sacrament of confession shall under no circumstances be violated. If sexual harassment or sexual misconduct is confessed under the vow of the sacrament, it is the responsibility of the priest to encourage the penitent to report such inappropriate or immoral behavior to the bishop of the province/diocese. If the confessor is a bishop, he shall encourage the penitent to report the behavior to the next higher episcopal level. Under no circumstances shall the bishop or priest confessor inform or take part in the investigative, judicial or disciplinary process, nor shall he be required to provide any information toward such a process. If a bishop or priest breaks the vow of the confession, he shall be brought for immediate disciplinary action, removal of his faculties, and excommunication.

All clergy are challenged to take responsibility for their own spiritual growth and health, to remain accountable for their spiritual growth and health to the bishop of the province/diocese, who is their spiritual father, and to make regular use of sacramental confession for their own spiritual growth and health. May our God who calls us to true love for persons, which is holiness, grant us the grace to live out a life of sexual and moral purity.

I, _____, certify by my signature that I have received a copy of the Charismatic Episcopal Church's Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct as published by the _____ Diocese and that I will adhere to this policy.

(Signature of bishop priest/deacon/ordinand) / Date

Name of Bishop

Bishop

_____ Province/Diocese

Posted by: Lurker Oct 3 2007, 06:04 PM

Excuse me, that should be relevant, not revalent.

Posted by: Visitor Oct 3 2007, 07:02 PM

QUOTE (Lurker @ Oct 3 2007, 06:04 PM)

Excuse me, that should be relevant, not revalent.

The sexual misconduct policy outlines that the Bishop's Archdeacon is responsible for investigating allegations of misconduct.

Who investigates the Bishop's Archdeacon when it's the Bishop's Archdeacon responsible for the misconduct?

Posted by: Royedw Oct 3 2007, 08:36 PM

Folks,

What bothers me most about these latest transgressions is this: why is the "alleged" Patriarch of the CEC once again being dragged into the midst of a sexual scandal??? Randy Adler cannot seem to stay clear of the SIN, who does anyone, within or without seem to have a problem with this????

And under him we now find more transgressions!!! It **surely appears to be a failure of leadership** with those whom the congregation have placed a mantle of TRUST 😞

Jim Baker (and Tammy) lost an empire die to his sinfulness, why should this be any different?? 😞 What level of protectionism is afforded to this man??? And those in the HOB seriously need to question their allegiance to God, His Holy Word and the truth.

There is a repetitive pattern here and it is one that "should" destroy the CEC as it now stands; however, the people loyal to Jesus Christ should rise up and rebuild their congregations, wherever they may fall. That is what Our Lord would want you to do, seek His truth, His justice, and His Word, **NOTHING LESS!!!!**

Posted by: Joe Friday Oct 3 2007, 10:10 PM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 3 2007, 01:36 PM)

Sorry for the typos, typing too fast! ((I claim amendment of type!)) Hopefully you still get the gist of it all. -NSV

Hey Nat - does the NSV stand for the Nat Sherman Version"

I was told that the conregation at St Michaels has been getting smaller of late. Defecions to the Orthodox Church and other points of interest.

Also, the congregation at SM seems to finally be demanding accountability. Imagine that!

It finally hit home I guess.

JF

My name is Friday—I'm a cop
(Just the fact's Ma'am.)

Posted by: Joe Friday Oct 3 2007, 10:17 PM

QUOTE (Lurker @ Oct 3 2007, 03:54 PM)

Here's a copy of a revalent document we clergy of our Diocese had to sign back in late 2003 (identifying diocese name removed).

The Charismatic Episcopal Church
Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct
For Clergy

This policy statement is adapted from the policy received from the U.S. House of Bishops, March 2003, and commended to the CEC Provinces/Dioceses in the U.S.

The Charismatic Episcopal Church and the _____ Province/Diocese are committed to the highest biblical

moral standards. All CEC members, guests, employees, and volunteers have the right to pursue their activities free from all forms of discrimination and conduct which can be considered harassing, coercive, or disruptive, including sexual harassment and sexual misconduct.

The Charismatic Episcopal Church holds that the Canon Law of the Church, both international and national, supercedes all Civil Law. The Church does not function as an extension or arm of the State, and though the Church submits to the authority of civil government where it does not conflict with God's Holy Law, it must always adhere to Canon Law. The _____ Province/Diocese and its member churches will adhere to all federal and state laws prohibiting sexual harassment and sexual misconduct.

This statement establishes the policy of the Charismatic Episcopal Church and the _____ Province/Diocese on sexual harassment and sexual misconduct and the CEC's expectations for appropriate and moral behavior by its clergy: archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons. It is the responsibility and duty of any member, guest, employee, or volunteer, who believes he or she has been harassed, to report such behavior so that it can be investigated and appropriate action taken. Persons in charge of programs or activities sponsored by the _____ Province/Diocese, or any of its churches, have a responsibility and duty to report immediately to the bishop any complaint of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct which is brought to their attention. If the accused is the bishop of the diocese, such activity should be reported to the provincial archbishop; if the accused is an archbishop, then to the Primate.

The _____ Province/Diocese and its churches shall use any means necessary to maintain an environment for members, guests, employees, and volunteers that is free from sexual harassment, intimidation, or misconduct. The CEC recognizes sexual harassment and sexual misconduct as immoral and contrary to the Gospel and God's Holy Law. These activities undermine morale and interfere with the work of God's people in His Church, and will not be tolerated. Guidelines and procedures for reporting and investigating any misconduct are outlined in the following instructions.

Sexual harassment includes all unwelcome sexual advances and other unwanted touching, requests for sexual favors, sexually motivated physical conduct, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

- Submission to such conduct is made, either explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of an individual's involvement in an activity or employment; or
- Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for affecting involvement in an activity or employment of such an individual; or
- Such conduct is intended to or does create an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Sexual misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Sexual abuse or sexual molestation of any person including any sexual involvement or sexual contact with a person who is a minor.
- Sexual exploitation including the development of, or attempt to develop, a sexual relationship between a pastor, employee, guest, volunteer, or a person with whom he has a pastoral relationship, whether or not there is apparent consent from the individual.
- Submission to such conduct, as set forth above, being made, either implicitly or explicitly, as a condition of an individual's pastoral care or counseling.
- Such conduct, as set forth above, which has the purpose or effect of interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, exploitative, or offensive working environment.
- Submission to such conduct, as set forth above, being made, either explicitly or implicitly, a condition of employment.
- Submission to, or rejection of, such conduct, as set forth above, by an individual being used as a basis for employment decisions affecting the individual.
- Coercing or attempting to coerce a person into a sexual and/or dating relationship.
- Conduct between a child and adult in which the child is being used for sexual stimulation of the adult or a third person. For the purpose of this policy a person is considered to be a child until the age of 18.
- Conduct of a sexual nature between a married person and a person not his or her spouse.
- Any homosexual activity.
- Any sexual activity prohibited by federal law or state law of the states within the Province/Diocese.

The following are examples of actions that may be considered sexual misconduct or harassment:

- Using inappropriate, sexually intimate comments not consistent with professional conduct in pastoral care, counseling, or work relationships.
- Engaging in inappropriate, sexually intimate activity not consistent with professional conduct in pastoral care, counseling, or work relationships.
- Touching, bumping, gesturing, patting, or demanding sexual favors and promises pertaining to employment.
- Displaying or encouraging use of sexual materials for sexual stimulation.
- Using obscene or sexually suggestive language.
- Threatening to deny or limit employment or volunteer opportunities if sexual advances are rejected.

Based on government statistics, women are most often the victims of sexual misconduct and harassment, however, men and children can also be victims. Sexual misconduct and harassment is not dependent upon the sex of either the offender or the victim.

The church is deeply concerned for the welfare of the persons who have been victimized by sexual misconduct, and for safeguarding the church's members and staff from abuse. The effectiveness of determining the truth and protecting the innocent, as well as dealing appropriately with those who victimize others, are also concerns. The church's ministry is one of healing for all parties involved.

The Charismatic Episcopal Church and the _____ Province/Diocese believes the only appropriate and moral sexual behavior is that which is between a man and a woman within the context of marriage. Any bishop, priest, or deacon who forms a sexual relationship outside of the context of a sacramental marriage involves himself in sexual immorality and is subject to discipline.

Persons who believe they have been harassed, have witnessed harassment, or have had incidents of harassment reported to them should properly report these matters to the bishop. If the accused is a member of the episcopate, then the report is made to the archbishop at the next higher level.

The bishop or archbishop will inform the Bishop's Council of the allegations, and together they will determine if the incident warrants further investigation. If further investigation is warranted, the bishop will appoint a priest of the diocese, hereinafter entitled the 'investigator', to conduct the investigation and to seek the facts. If the accused is a bishop, then another bishop will be sought to serve as the investigator.

The supervising bishop, through the office of the archdeacon or other person appointed by the bishop, hereinafter entitled the 'bishop's emissary', will inform the victim, the person making the complaint, and the alleged abuser of the policy of the _____ Province/Diocese regarding sexual harassment, abuse, or misconduct. He will also assist the victim and the alleged abuser in finding resources for counseling and spiritual guidance, and will, if necessary, with the approval of the bishop, make immediate contact with civil authorities when required. Immediate involvement of the civil authorities should be given special consideration if such abuse or misconduct involves a child under the age of 18.

The bishop's emissary and the investigator should not advocate for any party involved, act as legal counsel for any party, replace the function of the bishop or the Bishop's Council, determine guilt or innocence of the accused, or enforce a special remedy or disciplinary action.

If the complainant decides not to file a written statement of alleged offense, the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council must determine whether there is sufficient cause to take action. The complainant shall be advised not to speak further of the alleged offenses except in the course of professional and/or pastoral counseling or with legal authorities.

The supervising bishop will speak with the accused person regarding the exhortation to live a Christ-like life and his vow of obedience to his bishop which were made at his ordination. It is the bishop's expectation that the accused will remain silent so as not to further disrupt the peace and unity of the church. The matter should not be discussed with members of the local congregation, the officers of the congregation, or with other priests (unless directed by the bishop for the purpose of counsel and spiritual guidance) until such time as disciplinary action is concluded. If thereafter he is found to be speaking with anyone other than the supervising bishop or the person appointed by the bishop, there is cause for filing a separate complaint.

The bishop's emissary and the investigator shall report to the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council as expeditiously as possible. The supervising bishop and the Bishop's Council shall insure that the accused is given sufficient time to prepare and make a reasoned defense.

The supervising bishop shall arrange for attorneys who are competent in the field to consult on actual or potential cases of sexual misconduct, harassment, or abuse.

If the allegations are not sustained by the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council, a report will be made of the investigation and the findings. The report will be maintained within the patriarchal, provincial, or diocesan office, as appropriate.

If there is probable cause to believe an offense was committed, the supervising bishop and his Bishop's Council shall proceed to file ecclesial charges and take necessary disciplinary actions.

If there is probable cause to believe that the accused has committed an act of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct against a minor, he shall be immediately suspended from the ordained ministry.

If there is probable cause to believe that the accused has committed an act of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct, he shall be granted a temporary leave of absence or removal from his ministry for counseling and spiritual guidance, and shall be inhibited from functioning as a bishop, priest, or deacon. Return to ministry or position, and removal of the inhibition, will be dependent upon consultation between the counselor, spiritual director, the Bishop's Council, and the bishop. The supervising bishop has the sole responsibility for making the final determination.

It is the responsibility of the supervising bishop, with the advice of his Bishop's Council, to determine if, and when, the individual is once again competent to engage in any ministry, lay or ordained. The supervising bishop, under Catholic discipline and practice, has the authority to deny any ordained person the right to return to ministry or the right to transfer to another ministry or jurisdiction. The supervising bishop reserves the right to impose a sentence of deposition from the ministry.

Appeals may be made to the next immediate level of authority within the Church in accordance with Canon 6.IV of the Canon Law of the Charismatic Episcopal Church.

When pastors of a congregation are involved in violations of professional ethics and biblical morality, the congregation is also a victim. Particular thought and concern should be given to the pastoral care of the congregation.

If the pastor or other clerical member of the pastoral staff is the subject of complaints or formal charges, the bishop and the Bishop's Council must determine how and to what extent the matter is known among other clergy, employees, and the members of the congregation. If the matter is known, the bishop, after consultation with the Bishop's Council and the local Rector's Council, the investigator, the bishop's emissary, and other selected priests or bishops, shall determine what action, if any, should be taken.

It is important that nothing be done that would prejudice the integrity of the Christian Church, or prejudice the integrity of the investigative, disciplinary, or judicial process of the Church, or adversely affect the legitimate interests of any complainant, witness, or accused.

The sacredness of the sacrament of confession shall under no circumstances be violated. If sexual harassment or sexual misconduct is confessed under the vow of the sacrament, it is the responsibility of the priest to encourage the penitent to report such inappropriate or immoral behavior to the bishop of the province/diocese. If the confessor is a bishop, he shall encourage the penitent to report the behavior to the next higher episcopal level. Under no circumstances shall the bishop

or priest confessor inform or take part in the investigative, judicial or disciplinary process, nor shall he be required to provide any information toward such a process. If a bishop or priest breaks the vow of the confession, he shall be brought for immediate disciplinary action, removal of his faculties, and excommunication.

All clergy are challenged to take responsibility for their own spiritual growth and health, to remain accountable for their spiritual growth and health to the bishop of the province/diocese, who is their spiritual father, and to make regular use of sacramental confession for their own spiritual growth and health. May our God who calls us to true love for persons, which is holiness, grant us the grace to live out a life of sexual and moral purity.

I, _____, certify by my signature that I have received a copy of the Charismatic Episcopal Church's Policy Statement on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct as published by the _____ Diocese and that I will adhere to this policy.

(Signature of bishop priest/deacon/ordinand) / Date

Name of Bishop

Bishop

Province/Diocese

Hey Lurker, How are things in the NE diocese these days? Is Bates on a plane yet to take over as patriarch (his hearts desire)?

If I'm not mistaken, I think the NE is the only diocese that actually had a policy on sexual misconduct.

Too bad it didn't take.

JF

My name is Friday—I'm a cop
(Just the fact's Ma'am.)

Posted by: Thoughtful Traveler Oct 3 2007, 11:18 PM

QUOTE (BonnieZ @ Oct 2 2007, 01:42 PM)

All of this just ticks me off.

I personally don't give a good gosh darn about what Adler drinks or smokes or who he makes passes at. And I don't care about Sharp either....on a personal level. I honestly could care less.

What I DO care about is the fact that these guys are going to stand up in the pulpit on Sunday mornings and tell other people how to live the Christian life AFTER they drink, smoke and do inappropriate sexual things. They are going to counsel others on how to work through financial difficulties or marital/family issues. AS IF!?!?!? What business do they have telling others how to live when they themselves can't get it together? It's disgusting!

Am I a sinner? Yup! And so are you.

The difference here is that I don't try for one minute preach the scriptures from the pulpit, nor do I stand with the body and blood of Jesus in my hands and act as the symbol of Christ.

Those who feel "called" to do this need to live lives that are above reproach.

I swear, I would SOOOO hate to be any of them or a number of other "religious leaders" when they have to stand before their maker and give an accounting of the spiritual destruction that they were responsible for. I can only imagine that God must weep for the pain and spiritual anihalation experienced by His children at the hands of these men who claim to be His apostles and prophets.

Matthew 18:6 but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in Me to stumble, it would be better for him to have a heavy millstone hung around his neck, and to be drowned in the depth of the sea.

(Yes, I See Dead Denominations...I grabbed my version of the scriptures and let it rip. Oops...my bad!)

Bonnie, I couldn't agree with you more! Great Post!!!!

Posted by: Samwise Oct 4 2007, 05:07 AM

Is Daniel Sharp still administrator/principal of St. Michael's academy?
http://www.gotosma.com/main_sublinks.asp?id=1&sid=2

Posted by: Nemo Oct 4 2007, 07:27 AM

QUOTE (Joe Friday @ Oct 3 2007, 10:17 PM)

If I'm not mistaken, I think the NE is the only diocese that actually had a policy on sexual misconduct.

JF

The Diocese of Maryland had one, back when it existed.

Posted by: ALSO Oct 4 2007, 10:32 AM

I believe the SE did as well.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 4 2007, 01:59 PM

QUOTE (Samwise @ Oct 4 2007, 06:07 AM)

Is Daniel Sharp still administrator/principal of St. Michael's academy?
http://www.gotosma.com/main_sublinks.asp?id=1&sid=2

I am not sure about that. However, didn't Bishop Weeks report he was to forward all of the CEC Missions stuff to Daniel Sharp?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 4 2007, 02:07 PM

David Z Posted on the A/F Forum: <http://forum.ancient-future.net/index.php?showtopic=248>

QUOTE

David Zampino Posted: Oct 4 2007, 09:33 AM

I am advised that the senior bishops in the CEC are meeting in emergency session to see how this latest crisis can best be dealt with.

My guess is, that Sharp will be made the scapegoat for everything which has happened in San Clemente, and that any other consideration will be swept under the rug.

I hope I'm wrong.

David Zampino

God is the Lord, of angels, and of men -- and of elves.
Legend and History have met and fused.

On Fairy Stories -- J. R. R. Tolkien

Posted by: Amazing Grace.. Oct 5 2007, 07:55 AM

The Diocese of Maryland had one, back when it existed.[QUOTE]

Yes , from what I know, the CEC diocese of Maryland (before Zampino destroyed it) did in fact have a policy in place BECAUSE While Zampino was RECTOR of Saint Timothy's Episcopal Church, His assistant priest who also was the Headmaster of the school K-8, UNDER ZAMPINO'S watch was sexually ABUSING, RAPING, and PHOTOGRAPING naked young boys. 100's and 100's maybe THOUSANDS of them. [edited by administrator as irrelevant to this discussion]
For as "prophetic" as Zampino claimed to be, he never saw or "sensed" it in the spirit. Zampino was named in several lawsuits, and had to go to the trials, because a lot of the abuses occurred on HIS WATCH!!!

[edited by administrator as irrelevant to this discussion]

So, What were you saying about causing little ones to STUMBLE and MILLSTONES around necks, BONNIE????[FONT=Arial]

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 5 2007, 08:45 AM

I won't offer comment on the merits of your post, Amazing Grace, except to say that it is very strongly worded...perhaps too strong.

One comment I have, regards your point about the Prophetic and "Sensing" by church leaders...I don't believe the hype! OK? That is one of the things that brought me back to Rome. I was tired of the Charismaniac Hype! Many on this forum and others can point to hype by their church leaders both in and out of the CEC whenever the "prophetic" begins to dominate. "the Lord has given us the land.", "the Lord is telling us to give sacrificially." The Lord is telling me this and telling me that for you and you and you...."

In that toxic environment of idolized "prophetic" leaders and "good ole boys", it is difficult to challenge and difficult to resist.

I think you are also right to say that sometimes the toxicity of power and authority (my words)... can cause one to ignore the obvious, yet mundane tasks of pastoral housekeeping and management. Our absolute loyalty will sometimes blind us to the task of seeking audits, overviews, reviews, second opinions and general accountability etc....

Posted by: Guest Oct 5 2007, 10:18 AM

QUOTE

The Diocese of Maryland had one, back when it existed.

Yes , from what I know, the CEC diocese of Maryland (before Zampino destroyed it) did in fact have a policy in place BECAUSE While Zampino was RECTOR of Saint Timothy's Episcopal Church, His assistant priest who also was the Headmaster of the school K-8, UNDER ZAMPINO'S watch was sexually ABUSING, RAPING, and PHOTOGRAPING naked young boys. 100's and 100's maybe THOUSANDS of them. We will never know how many.

For as "prophetic" as Zampino claimed to be, he never saw or "sensed" it in the spirit.

So, What were you saying about causing little ones to STUMBLE and MILLSTONES around necks, BONNIE????

Amazing Grace..,

First of all, this little tirade you had about Bishop Zampino is incredibly misleading. Yes, his assistant priest was abusing many children. No, he did not turn a "blind eye" to these abuses. He had no idea what was going on and neither did anyone else because the man doing these absolutely horrible things was sneaky and covered up what he was doing very well, for a very long time. If he or anyone else did know, he would have been stopped and brought to justice much sooner.

As for Bishop Zampino not being able to "sense it in the spirit," the man is not omniscient, nor does he claim to be.

Also, you say that the reason that Bishop Zampino didn't "see what was going on" (I'm sure that all the molestation quite apparent to you) was because he was trying to be an "evangelist celebrity." Tell me, if Zampino was so concerned with being a celebrity, why would he leave his huge congregation for a tiny congregation that started with only 40 people? Also Bishop Zampino made a pledge that the second his radio program started to go under he would just let it go and not try to raise money to save it. If he was so concerned with continuing on with his big celebrity profile, why would he have stuck to this pledge and left the radio business the moment it started to go under?

You called Bishop Zampino a coward. I'm assuming that you say this because he left TEC and the CEC. So are you saying that all the people that have left TEC are cowards? Because thousands and thousands have done so. And how could you blame them? TEC is ignoring scripture and committing down right heresy? As for the CEC many in that communion committed this (as you would say) "cowardly act" to join the CEC. And now in the middle of the recent scandals in the CEC the people are again acting (as you would say) "cowardly" and leaving the communion. Was Martin Luther also a coward? If you call everyone that leaves a corrupt church a coward, you will have a lot of enemies. Bishop Zampino simply will not stand for corruption in the church and I do not blame him. He stands up for what he believes, he is not a coward!

Finally, this is not a thread for bashing Bishop Zampino, it is one for discussing the current situation in the CEC and for attempting a little bit of healing. So you can take your lies elsewhere. In fact I know an excellent place for you to shove it.....

Posted by: Oct 5 2007, 10:19 AM

that last post was dot guy

Posted by: Joe Friday Oct 5 2007, 11:07 AM

[QUOTE=Amazing Grace..,Oct 5 2007, 07:55 AM] The Diocese of Maryland had one, back when it existed.[/QUOTE]

Yes , from what I know, the CEC diocese of Maryland (before Zampino destroyed it) did in fact have a policy in place BECAUSE While Zampino was RECTOR of Saint Timothy's Episcopal Church, His assistant priest who also was the Headmaster of the school K-8, UNDER ZAMPINO'S watch was sexually ABUSING, RAPING, and PHOTOGRAPING naked young boys. 100's and 100's maybe THOUSANDS of them. We will never know how many.

For as "prophetic" as Zampino claimed to be, he never saw or "sensed" it in the spirit.

So, What were you saying about causing little ones to STUMBLE and MILLSTONES around necks, BONNIE????[FONT=Arial]
[/QUOTE]
AG,

All I can assume is that perhaps you are one of the boys that you describe in your diatribe who were allegedly abused in that debacle (of which I know absolutely nothing and it has NEVER come up in the forums one way or the other.) At least it seems to be possible considering the extreme venom and hatred you spew in your posting.

Further, that had to be what, fifteen or twenty years ago? Give me a break!

Personally I am offended you would choose such a repentant and beautiful song title as a moniker as it is evident you know nothing about Amazing Grace.

Note to Mike - if this type of attack which is unwarranted and unprovoked is allowed to continue (it serves no useful purpose whatsoever), perhaps this is not the forum in which to discuss the issues.

At the very least, this individual should be censored and warned.

JF

Posted by: Oct 5 2007, 11:21 AM

QUOTE

Note to Mike - if this type of attack which is unwarranted and unprovoked is allowed to continue (it serves no useful purpose whatsoever), perhaps this is not the forum in which to discuss the issues.

At the very least, this individual should be censored and warned.

JF

Amen!!!!

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 5 2007, 11:23 AM

[QUOTE=Amazing Grace..,Oct 5 2007, 07:55 AM] The Diocese of Maryland had one, back when it existed.[/QUOTE]

Yes , from what I know, the CEC diocese of Maryland (before Zampino destroyed it) did in fact have a policy in place BECAUSE While Zampino was RECTOR of Saint Timothy's Episcopal Church, His assistant priest who also was the Headmaster of the school K-8, UNDER ZAMPINO'S watch was sexually ABUSING, RAPING, and PHOTOGRAPING naked young boys. 100's and 100's maybe THOUSANDS of them. We will never know how many.

For as "prophetic" as Zampino claimed to be, he never saw or "sensed" it in the spirit.

So, What were you saying about causing little ones to STUMBLE and MILLSTONES around necks, BONNIE????[FONT=Arial]

[/QUOTE]
Okay Amazing Grace, I'm calling you out.

Prove your accusations! This is not even on the radar of discussion (concerning Bp Zampino pre CEC).

If you cannot prove them, you need to be called on the carpet as a liar.

The challenge is there. I have thrown down the glove.

Now you need to verify and substantiate your claim. OR was it simply something that you "heard" once upon a time??

You are a wolf in sheep's clothing - if in fact you claim to know Christ at all - seeking to stir up something not even related to the discussion at hand other than a secondary and general comment about a sexual abuse policy in the CEC.

We are waiting to hear your case...

Posted by: Guest Oct 5 2007, 01:24 PM

QUOTE (Amazing Grace.. @ Oct 5 2007, 07:55 AM)

Okay Amazing Grace, I'm calling you out.

Prove your accusations!

If you cannot prove them, you need to be called on the carpet as a liar.

The challenge is there. I have thrown down the glove.

Now you need to verify and substantiate your claim. OR was it simply something that you "heard" once upon a time??

You are a wolf in sheep's clothing - if in fact you claim to know Christ at all - seeking to stir up something not even related to the discussion at hand other than a secondary and general comment about a sexual abuse policy in the CEC.

We are waiting to hear your case...

Oh please, spare me! So it's okay for you to make all kinds of accusations and pronounce judgements on those in the CEC based merely on rumors, but for someone else to make a similar comment against your new bishop, you "demand" (whatever that means) that they "prove it"?! Can you say hypocrit?. Please apply your demands to your own participation here, and perhaps your requests would be taken more seriously. Oh, and heresay evidence (the rumor mill of phone calls and emails that go on behind the scenes) doesn't count as proof.

While I'm not a big Zampino fan, I didn't post that message. But I can see the rationale behind it. Here David Zampino and Bonnie appear to be jumping down the Archbishop's throat for failing to know about and deal with Dan Sharp, and yet they have some close-to-home similarities in their own family that make it hard to take their indignation seriously as well.

He who is without sin, mate . . .

And you actually are inferring that this person isn't saved? Do you realize that every time you post, it validates at least one of the accusations against the CEC, that they really needed to have higher standards for whom they ordained. If one compares the tone and maturity of "Father to some's" posts to yours, it's like night and day, grace versus unveiled rage. I realize you've got some pain, but based on what you've demonstrated here and in the past on these forums, I have to wonder how much of it is self-inflicted.

Posted by: Oct 5 2007, 02:04 PM

QUOTE

Oh please, spare me! So it's okay for you to make all kinds of accusations and pronounce judgements on those in the CEC based merely on rumors, but for someone else to make a similar comment against your new bishop, you "demand" (whatever that means) that they "prove it"?!? Can you say hypocrit?. Please apply your demands to your own participation here, and perhaps your requests would be taken more seriously. Oh, and heresay evidence (the rumor mill of phone calls and emails that go on behind the scenes) doesn't count as proof.

While I'm not a big Zampino fan, I didn't post that message. But I can see the rationale behind it. Here David Zampino and Bonnie appear to be jumping down the Archbishop's throat for failing to know about and deal with Dan Sharp, and yet they have some close-to-home similarities in their own family that make it hard to take their indignation seriously as well.

He who is without sin, mate . . .

And you actually are inferring that this person isn't saved? Do you realize that every time you post, it validates at least one of the accusations against the CEC, that they really needed to have higher standards for whom they ordained. If one compares the tone and maturity of "Father to some's" posts to yours, it's like night and day, grace versus unveiled rage. I realize you've got some pain, but based on what you've demonstrated here and in the past on these forums, I have to wonder how much of it is self-inflicted.

I believe that it has already been established here that in order to make personal attacks against other posters you cant hide behind alias'.

And as far as I know all the substantiation needed against Adler is there. He did it himself by trying to hush up accusations by persecuting those who questioned him.

Oh yeah, and again, if you are going to insult other posters, identify yourself and don't hide behind alias'.

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 5 2007, 02:13 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 5 2007, 01:24 PM)

Oh please, spare me! So it's okay for you to make all kinds of accusations and pronounce judgements on those in the CEC based merely on rumors, but for someone else to make a similar comment against your new bishop, you "demand" (whatever that means) that they "prove it"?!? Can you say hypocrit?. Please apply your demands to your own participation here, and perhaps your requests would be taken more seriously. Oh, and heresay evidence (the rumor mill of phone calls and emails that go on behind the scenes) doesn't count as proof.

While I'm not a big Zampino fan, I didn't post that message. But I can see the rationale behind it. Here David Zampino and Bonnie appear to be jumping down the Archbishop's throat for failing to know about and deal with Dan Sharp, and yet they have some close-to-home similarities in their own family that make it hard to take their indignation seriously as well.

He who is without sin, mate . . .

And you actually are inferring that this person isn't saved? Do you realize that every time you post, it validates at least one of the accusations against the CEC, that they really needed to have higher standards for whom they ordained. If one compares the tone and maturity of "Father to some's" posts to yours, it's like night and day, grace versus unveiled rage. I realize you've got some pain, but based on what you've demonstrated here and in the past on these forums, I have to wonder how much of it is self-inflicted.

You must have no ability to think or understand critical data. I cannot believe you to be so ignorant and foolish ads to think that YOU could be right in anythgin here.

You are a coward as is AG and all others that simply hide behind an anonymous moniker and shoot at individuals who happen to be engaged in the forums.

You prove your utter ignorance with your post.

There is no comparison between Bp. Zampino and Adler or anything AG has to say or think.

Some archbishop your Adler! AG talked about the charismania issue?? Adler and his Tsunami is one of the biggest jokes there was! And he thinking God was telling him to marry another priest's wife?? Give ME a break!!

How about the time he was doing the Ambien and all the alcohol on the junket with Bates on the cruise ship and wandered into the main lobby of one of the levels in his underwear all confused and lost??? Some patriarch he!

And you defend this man????

Now as to your idiocy concerning the "suposed" allegations of AG: #1 - they had NOTHING to do with Zampino and actually

predated his tenure; #2 it was over 20 years ago; and #3 - I wish you were close enough to pop in the nose right now from my righteous indignation!!!! (I am ACTUALLY restraining myself right now believe it or not.)

YOU are a perfect example of the lunacy I could not stand in the CEC!

There is no pain on my side now. Simply anger at those, probably like yourself, who place trusting and unsuspecting believers in a vise and trap from which they eventually are squeezed dry of money, time, spirit and effort, without so much as a "thank you" or "to H**I with you" and off you go to the next target.

Yes anger. You and your ilk along with AG polute the body and lead many astray.

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 5 2007, 02:17 PM

Guest,

Oh, and BTW, I'm not even angry yet!

Posted by: Oct 5 2007, 02:21 PM

QUOTE

You must have no ability to think or understand critical data. I cannot believe you to be so ignorant and foolish ads to think that YOU could be right in anythgin here.

You are a coward as is AG and all others that simply hide behind an anonymous moniker and shoot at individuals who happen to be engaged in the forums.

You prove your utter ignorance with your post.

There is no comparison between Bp. Zampino and Adler or anything AG has to say or think.

Some archbishop your Adler! AG talked about the charisma issue?? Adler and his Tsunami is one of the biggest jokes there was! And he thinking God was telling him to marry another priest's wife?? Give ME a break!!

How about the time he was doing the Ambien and all the alcohol on the junket with Bates on the cruise ship and wandered into the main lobby of one of the levels in his underwear all confused and lost??? Some patriarch he!

And you defend this man????

Now as to your idiocy concerning the "suposed" allegations of AG: #1 - they had NOTHING to do with Zampino and actually predated his tenure; #2 it was over 20 years ago; and #3 - I wish you were close enough to pop in the nose right now from my righteous indignation!!!! (I am ACTUALLY restraining myself right now believe it or not.)

YOU are a perfect example of the lunacy I could not stand in the CEC!

There is no pain on my side now. Simply anger at those, probably like yourself, who place trusting and unsuspecting believers in a vise and trap from which they eventually are squeezed dry of money, time, spirit and effort, without so much as a "thank you" or "to H**I with you" and off you go to the next target.

Yes anger. You and your ilk along with AG polute the body and lead many astray.

Blessings+

Dn. Chic

That was harsh, but I completely agree! You have no idea how angry AG's and Guest's posts made me as well! "Patriarch" Adler isn't half the man that Bishop Zampino is! There is no comparison.

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 5 2007, 02:22 PM

Wow...

I think that AG is right. I do recall history about the Rector of St. Tims who was molesting boys...I think including his own son. His wife found the pictures. Of course, she found them after this had been going on for years. But, hey, my Dad should have known what the guys own wife didn't know. Right?

I don't have a lot of memory of the event. It surfaced after we were gone from St. Tim's. But I think my Dad had a lot of pain in knowing that people were hurt by this man. I think anyone who knew that children had been damaged by someone in authority, particularly spiritual authority, would feel pain for those victims. My Dad has a very tender heart and would have defended those victims if he had known what was happening.

But AG, the parallel that you draw is incorrect. I wasn't bashing Adler for not knowing what Sharp was doing and I wasn't bashing Adler for failing to hold him accountable. I just said that Adler has issues and he should be very careful about attempting to represent Christ to the Church while he is in active/unrepentant sin.

I'm sorry that you are so angry. It sounds like you've been very hurt. I'll say a prayer for you.

B

Posted by: Guest Oct 5 2007, 02:24 PM

See how that mirror works? Hold it up and let others see how they look and it just makes even angrier. 😏

Thanks for playing the game and proving the point.

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 5 2007, 02:38 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 5 2007, 02:24 PM)

See how that mirror works? Hold it up and let others see how they look and it just makes even angrier. 😏

Thanks for playing the game and proving the point.

And you, mine.

That IS all this is to people like you...a game.

Glad to have entertained you.

Posted by: Dcn. Chic Harmon Oct 5 2007, 02:44 PM

And with that ladies and gents (and anonymous neutered cowards...),

I bid you farewell. I doubt I'll be back (or if I do, at least not until Mike cleans the feces from the cage).

This is no longer a place to discuss the serious issues of Adler's betrayal of the faithful (and how to deal with it) but has digressed to mud and filth.

Enjoy!

Posted by: Guest Oct 5 2007, 03:02 PM

At least we agree on that much . . . remember the mirror.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 5 2007, 03:20 PM

OK let's all cool down and remember why we are here. Stay on-topic. Refrain from offensive and inflammatory rhetoric. Keep relevant to the topic.

Please note there was no PLEASE in any of the above directives. We know we are discussing sensitive issues here. Emotions run high. Threats of heating up even further need to be checked at the door.

I posted this near the beginning of this topic thread:

QUOTE

I strongly encourage everyone who posts on this topic or any topic to keep in mind the adage that **words can hurt**. There are some deeply wounded people out there looking for safe haven and a chance to vent.

Please pray before you post. I do not want to see us wound the wounded on this forum.

Many of those who remained "loyal" throughout the last go around now feel duped and foolish. Rubbing salt in that wound will not help them. Others hope to bring back the CEC from the dust of the past scandals and the present one. They deserve to be heard as brothers and sisters in Christ.

No matter what their decisions...they all deserve our prayers.

I will edit and/or delete entire posts, if need be in order to keep the thread on-topic and civil.

Also, if you are going to complain about a post but continue to quote the entire post which you find offensive, it makes my job that much harder. Please police your own responses by not quoting from someone you are later asking me to censor or remove. If need be I will remove the offending post and all who repeat (quote) it!!!

FYI I have made several edits to preceding posts.

Posted by: J.F. Bouck Oct 5 2007, 03:32 PM

QUOTE

Quoting Nat Sherman: "Fr Dan is now Dan. Of course this was done privately. He is moving to HI to his new house he bought ((or someone bought??)) with his wife and son.

By the way, no ONE on St. Mike's pastoral team has offered a call to Dan's victims, not one.'

I think I remember Dan & [his spouse] had a daughter in college, but didn't they have two sons? Is one staying on the mainland?

"victims' was there more than one?

I do not inquire for reasons of gossip, but only because this has hit me like a ton of bricks. My heart is so heavy for Dan, [his spouse], and their family, as well as the victim(s).

I take it that [Dan's spouse] is moving with Dan to Hawaii and they will be working on their marriage. Will they be attending the CEC church there?

Please know that my prayers are with them, and with those reading and participating in this forum. "And the peace of God, which transcends all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus.' Phil 4:7

Posted by: frequent reader, infrequent post Oct 5 2007, 04:11 PM

The pot is getting ugly ... thank you for trying to calm it down, Mike.

Dcn. Chic,

There is one reason, and one reason only, that I use an alias, and it is this:

Too much of my time is spent ministering to people who get derogatory or even flaming e-mails every time some bad news (real or invented) is rumored -- it seems preferable to waiting for the truth. I do not need my inbox filled with comments like those that have lately been appearing in this blog.

Perhaps if you would sign your e-mail address up on a protestant Romo-phobic web-site, after a few weeks you might begin to understand my reasoning.

I know that doesn't fit your misconceptions, but nevertheless it is the truth. If you prefer, you may convict me as a coward.

I defer to the only One Who can plead my defense.

A Father+ to some

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 5 2007, 04:14 PM

No more name calling! PERIOD!

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 5 2007, 04:40 PM

It would seem to me that the reference to "victims" regarding Dan Sharp is not about multiple women, rather the family members of the woman with whom he had the affair. She has a husband and children, parents and in-laws ... surely they are also hurting.

And, regarding the "son" instead of "sons" ... maybe it was an oversight. The Sharps do indeed have a beautiful and wonderful college aged daughter.

It grieves me to think of the young people who have put so many of their eggs in the CEC basket. So many have submitted their lives, their choices of marriage partners, their child-bearing choices, their every decision on the line. And now this.

It's tragic.

What a mess.

God help us all.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 5 2007, 06:10 PM

The above post was in response to J.F. Bouck's earlier queries.

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 6 2007, 06:28 PM

From Wikipedia.com:

TROLL

An Internet troll, or simply troll in Internet slang, is someone who intentionally posts controversial or contrary messages in an on-line community such as an on-line discussion forum with the intention of baiting users into an argumentative response.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet_troll

FLAMER

Flaming is the hostile and insulting interaction between Internet users. Flaming usually occurs in the social context of a discussion board, Internet Relay Chat (IRC) or even through e-mail. An Internet user typically generates a flame response to other posts or users posting on a site, and is usually not constructive, does not clarify a discussion, and does not persuade others. Sometimes, flammers attempt to assert their authority, or establish a position of superiority over other users. Other times, a flamer is simply an individual who believes he or she carries the only valid opinion. This leads him or her to personally attack those who disagree. Occasionally, flammers wish to upset and offend other members of the forum, in which case they are trolls. Most often however, flames are angry or insulting messages transmitted by people who have strong feelings about a subject.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flaming_%28Internet%29

The best way to deal with trolls and flammers is to ignore them.

DON'T FEED THE TROLLS

There is nothing a troll hates more than being ignored.

But if you feel you MUST respond, here is a links with some further ideas on the subject:

http://geekblog.oneandoneis2.org/index.php/2006/04/12/how_to_deal_with_a_troll

Never Respond in Anger

Simple rule: If a troll upsets you, he's won. If you let him know he's upset you, he'll know he's won.

Be unfailingly courteous

Partly this is an extension of the first rule: It's almost impossible to be rude to a troll without him taking it as a sign that you're angry.

Don't argue

Never fight a war you can't win. Trolls aren't interested in facts. There is no way to refute the argument "It sucks!" So don't try.

Never give the troll any significance

Even if you obey all the above rules, you can still make a troll happy if you seem to consider he's important: If you respond to every one-line troll with a 50-line rebuttal, then the troll is clearly getting to you, no matter how you word the replies.

Short & sweet is the way to go. If you obey the "Don't argue" rule, it should be fairly easy.

A great message from another online forum...still working on learning this myself 🙄

Posted by: Me Oct 6 2007, 07:11 PM

Thanks Bonnie!

I propose we call the AF The Troll Hole and this forum Troll Haven.

Shall we call Cec Healing Troll Hell or Flamers Reunited??

Ha just some levity, but of course we have to be careful in pointing our fingers towards the hosts - they are never wrong and always pure in heart!

What is good for the goose is good for the gander!

Food for thought.....talk amongst yourself....

peace out

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 6 2007, 11:04 PM



Posted by: Jim Oct 7 2007, 10:20 AM

Well, this is certainly a fine mess.

I would like to thank those of you who have come forward and shared what you know. As an "outsider" in the church, (a mere member), this site has provided answers to many of the questions which were going unanswered at SM.

One question in particular was why on earth AB Adler stood up and told about his wives alcohol problem and his transgression with a female. It was all so very odd, clearly rehearsed and after Fr Dans admission seemed really out of place and incincere. The transgression was blamed on mixing sleeping pills with alcohol, a plausible excuse I suppose, however I do not know many people who pop a sleeping pill when they are out amongst friends.

I have heard over and over on this forum that this is nothing new, and that there was a (similar?) incident last year? I would like to know what happened, I am very new to the church and would like to know what I have gotten myself into.

Thanks.

J

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 7 2007, 03:36 PM

Thanks Jim, for posting. Similar to last year, many "mere members" only heard about the various controversies brewing within the CEC on forums and blogs. Most notably, perhaps, was Per Christum and the follow-up forum: Ancient Future Catholics. I am glad you posted the "admission" by ++Adler. I had heard about it also.

As for prior incident(s) you should go see the Ancient Future Forum for a lengthy discussion of the "pain killer addiction" and "sexual improprieties" of the Patriarch. These have not been fully discussed here as this forum started in February of this year.

Here is a good place to start on the A/F forum click on this link: <http://forum.ancient-future.net/index.php?showtopic=145> but, brace yourself, people are quite frank in their discussions over there as you have no doubt seen from here.

My prayers are with all "mere members", clergy and loved ones who remain in the CEC. As David Zampino recommended, I shall say a rosary for those who hurt me and for those who have been hurt (either by me or others).

Posted by: Me Oct 7 2007, 05:15 PM

Hi Jim,

yes also a word of caution is in place: You will find plenty of information, but not necessarily truth.

Motivations, like posters' identification, are often not known and frequently questionable.

Guard your heart and keep the faith!

Peace out

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 7 2007, 06:15 PM

For those of you who have now heard or had previously heard the admission of the Patriarch...are you satisfied? Do you feel like you know all you need to know? Do you think there is more to this story? Do you care?

What will you do? What would you like your leaders to do?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 7 2007, 06:39 PM

BTW, "Me", where do you get information you deem to be "true" about the CEC?

I assume you know the identification of your sources. But, do you know their motivations?

I was told that the speedy treatment of these issues was directly related to the existence of the "blogs and internet forums". Would we have heard any of the truth? Have we heard the whole truth?

Also, can you explain the "ranking system" you proposed? JK 😊

Seriously, thanks for chiming in. Your comments to Jim are sort of what I was alluding to in regards to the discussions. 🙏

Posted by: misunderstood Oct 7 2007, 07:36 PM

QUOTE (Jim @ Oct 7 2007, 10:20 AM)

Well, this is certainly a fine mess.

I would like to thank those of you who have come forward and shared what you know. As an "outsider" in the church, (a mere member), this site has provided answers to many of the questions which were going unanswered at SM.

One question in particular was why on earth AB Adler stood up and told about his wives alcohol problem and his transgression with a female. It was all so very odd, clearly rehearsed and after Fr Dans admission seemed really out of place and incincere. The transgression was blamed on mixing sleeping pills with alcohol, a plausible excuse I suppose, however I do not know many people who pop a sleeping pill when they are out amongst friends.

I have heard over and over on this forum that this is nothing new, and that there was a (similar?) incident last year? I would like to know what happened, I am very new to the church and would like to know what I have gotten myself into.

Thanks.

J

Did I miss something?

Could somebody point me to this admission.....

Thanks mis.....

Posted by: Me Oct 7 2007, 07:58 PM

Mike: ultimately only God knows what is man's heart. For me, being just a bit less knowledgeable, I base my judgment on relationships, having known some of my sources nearly a quarter century. Thus affording a tad more credibility to my sources than what is found on the net. The point (I think) you make - that people's motivation regardless of the source should always be taken into account - is quite valid in my opinion.

Still the net can be a great source of information (thank you Al Gore) -- if taken in context and with a grain of salt especially when it comes to grave spiritual matters.

Mis: stay tuned.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 7 2007, 09:22 PM

Misunderstood, Jlm and other forum readers and posters,

Let me re-cap from what I know via reports to me.

Archdeacon Dan Sharp admitted to having had improper sexual relations, ie adultery. He was dismissed from his position and then defrocked. According to "Nat Sherman" he is on his way with wife and family to live in HI.

Near the same time as that issue became apparent, further allegations of sexual improprieties have been lodged against the Patriarch. Let me be perfectly clear about this point. These are new allegations, not ones stemming from the alleged incident with Bp. Myers' wife.

At the Sunday night Bishop's council meeting in San Clemente, ++Adler was "pressed" to answer about these OTHER allegations. A priest asked ++Adler which of these other allegations are NOT TRUE. To which, ++Adler responded: "they are ALL TRUE."

Then comes the "healing Mass" of Wednesday night where the St. Michael's Cathedral congregation hears about Dan Sharp being defrocked the night before and that he is on his way to HI. They also hear ++Adler say that he had committed some form of improper sexual conduct several 3 or 4 years ago, with a friend's (Bishop Myers) wife, while under the influence of prescription medications and maybe alcohol. His words were: "I was Gone!" Then he immediately moved to the topic of his wife's abuse of alcohol...thus deflecting the spotlight from what he had just said about himself...to her!

Being from Kansas originally, I am familiar with the OZ story wherein the Great OZ says to Dorothy and her companions: Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain. This is the same ploy being used by ++Adler, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others. He has used Dan Sharp's situation and his own wife's situation to deflect from what is most important...in this story>>himself.

I agree with Bonnie in that what ++Adler does is of no direct consequence to me, except that he is the Patriarch!!! He has now admitted (during the healing Mass) to being in charge of the ICCEC while under the influence of drugs and that while doing so he committed an offensive act of sexual impropriety. Either of those things should have been enough a year ago for the Bishops who remained at that time to "retire" him for "medical reasons", at the very least. But what is more astounding is that his own Bishop's council has heard him say that the CURRENT allegations, which may be the tip of the iceberg, are all TRUE.

So, though ++Adler has now admitted to having done something he regrets several years ago while under the influence of drugs, he has not answered the latest charges, except to say they are true.

whew!

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 7 2007, 09:28 PM

QUOTE (Me @ Oct 7 2007, 08:58 PM)

Mike: ultimately only God knows what is man's heart. For me, being just a bit less knowledgeable, I base my judgment on relationships, having known some of my sources nearly a quarter century. Thus affording a tad more credibility to my sources than what is found on the net. The point (I think) you make - that people's motivation regardless of the source should always be taken into account - is quite valid in my opinion.

Great point. And well stated. I agree 100%. However, with the CEC being only 15 years old, some of the folks I keep in touch with there, I have known for 15 years or less.

QUOTE

Still the net can be a great source of information (thank you Al Gore) -- if taken in context and with a grain of salt especially when it comes to grave spiritual matters.

I keep a large salt shaker handy every time I get on the net. I also keep a packet in my pocket for when I am on the phone even with folks I've known for a long while. I hope you all do the same thing. 😊

QUOTE

Mis: stay tuned.

Indeed, particularly to what happens at the HOB(and to the "man behind the curtain").

Posted by: me Oct 7 2007, 11:24 PM

the following is a flamer

Nat sherman says hello

end flamer statement

pleaz edit in morning tx mikke

QUOTE



no need to edit except to add this emoticom by stlouismb

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 09:02 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 7 2007, 09:22 PM)

Misunderstood, JIm and other forum readers and posters,

Let me re-cap from what I know via reports to me.

Archdeacon Dan Sharp admitted to having had improper sexual relations, ie adultery. He was dismissed from his position and then defrocked. According to "Nat Sherman" he is on his way with wife and family to live in HI.

Near the same time as that issue became apparent, further allegations of sexual improprieties have been lodged against the Patriarch. Let me be perfectly clear about this point. These are new allegations, not ones stemming from the alleged incident with Bp. Myers' wife.

At the Sunday night Bishop's council meeting in San Clemente, ++Adler was "pressed" to answer about these OTHER allegations. A priest asked ++Adler which of these other allegations are NOT TRUE. To which, ++Adler responded: "they are ALL TRUE."

Then comes the "healing Mass" of Wednesday night where the St. Michael's Cathedral congregation hears about Dan Sharp being defrocked the night before and that he is on his way to HI. They also hear ++Adler say that he had committed some form of improper sexual conduct several 3 or 4 years ago, with a friend's (Bishop Myers) wife, while under the influence of prescription medications and maybe alcohol. His words were: "I was Gone!" Then he immediately moved to the topic of his wife's abuse of alcohol...thus deflecting the spotlight from what he had just said about himself...to her!

Being from Kansas originally, I am familiar with the OZ story wherein the Great OZ says to Dorothy and her companions: Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain. This is the same ploy being used by ++Adler, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others. He has used Dan Sharp's situation and his own wife's situation to deflect from what is most important...in this story>>himself.

I agree with Bonnie in that what ++Adler does is of no direct consequence to me, except that he is the Patriarch!!! He has now admitted (during the healing Mass) to being in charge of the ICCEC while under the influence of drugs and that while doing so he committed an offensive act of sexual impropriety. Either of those things should have been enough a year ago for the Bishops who remained at that time to "retire" him for "medical reasons", at the very least. But what is more astounding is that his own Bishop's council has heard him say that the CURRENT allegations, which may be the tip of the iceberg, are all TRUE.

So, though ++Adler has now admitted to having done something he regrets several years ago while under the influence of drugs, he has not answered the latest charges, except to say they are true.

whew!

Admitting that the accusations of a few years ago were true is a far cry from addressing them in a Biblical sense.

My sincere hope is that, now that he has admitted his guilt, he will be rerquired to ADDRESS the situation(s) with the other parties and their families. My sincere hope is that he will be released from his post for the sake of the health of the church, and that he receive the help that he needs.

By the way, I never intended to be a troll. (As it appeared that post was directed toward me.) I am in no way trying to stir up dissension. I am the wife of a former CEC clergyman, and my husband and I still deeply loves the people whose lives we are discussing.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 8 2007, 09:39 AM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 8 2007, 10:02 AM)

Admitting that the accusations of a few years ago were true is a far cry from addressing them in a Biblical sense.

True, both those charges and the current ones. However, I am now being accused of not "loving" and "forgiving" enough since I

have both brought up the past charge and the current charges. So, I am guessing that type of "goey love" is how the CEC folks prefer to deal with things in a Biblical sense. Plus there seems to be no mechanism in place for a forced retirement of the patriarch, or a removal from his post. Anyone know differently?

QUOTE

My sincere hope is that, now that he has admitted his guilt, he will be required to ADDRESS the situation(s) with the other parties and their families. My sincere hope is that he will be released from his post for the sake of the health of the church, and that he receive the help that he needs.

Unfortunately, as I said, he has only admitted to being "under the influence" and offending someones wife a few years ago. I think that is all we will ever hear about that. As for admitting anything else...he hasn't >> to the public, only to his own council of hand-picked men. Perhaps it was their advice to pretend it was all related to an incident a few years back and then deflect attention from it by throwing his spouse in front of the spotlight.

QUOTE

By the way, I never intended to be a troll. (As it appeared that post was directed toward me.) I am in no way trying to stir up dissension. I am the wife of a former CEC clergyman, and my husband and I still deeply loves the people whose lives we are discussing.

I wouldn't worry about being singled out as a troll. I think it was a general comment and probably more related to another post which has since been edited by me...though not to the satisfaction of many. Oh well! 

BTW, when does the HOB convene?

Posted by: misunderstood Oct 8 2007, 10:38 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 8 2007, 09:39 AM)

BTW, when does the HOB convene?

My information says this Tuesday (tomorrow) the HOB will be meeting.

It is my prayer that the issues that have been mentioned concerning ++Adler, if with merit, will be addressed and handled in such a way that will bring healing and restoration, not just to the people involved (both victims and offenders) but to the entire denomination that has been through much and has paid a dear price while remaining faithful.

Recently, a man that I admire greatly and I believe God is using mightily, said that "Confidentiality is one thing; secrecy is another. I am all for the one; I am all against the other. "

I believe God wants to remove the secrecy once and for all and have the leaders of the ICCEC be transparent as it relates to these matters. It can be done with true Godly love and under confidentiality without having to be cloaked in secrecy which then opens the door for untruth to come and confuse, divide and bring mistrust.

May God be with us all at this time of revealing ALL truth, for His Glory and the advancing of His Kingdom.

mis.....

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 8 2007, 10:42 AM

Dear Firewheel,

My post about Trolls was in NO WAY related to you at all!

I'm sorry for the placement of my post. If I were in your shoes, I would have thought that it was directed at me too. But it was not, I promise.

It was more generalized and had more to do with some earlier postings.

My apologies to you. Keep on posting...you're doing great!

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 11:17 AM

Thanks, Bonnie. I get it now.

Let's see ... once upon a time, there were a group of clergy men who truly believed they were acting with integrity by using discretion in regard to what was and wasn't discussed. Confidentiality, if you will.

Confidentiality seemed to serve them well and, sadly, seems to have covered a multitude of sins. Which led to secrecy. Even some men of integrity succumbed to the secrecy in the interest of protecting their families and their flocks and in the hopes that these matters could and would be dealt with privately and without our name being besmirched in the eyes of the watching world.

Now, it's gone way beyond secrecy. Secrecy led to out and out cover-ups.

As much flack as the blogs have gotten, and as much as they have probably been misused, I say thank God for the actions that they have forced among the leadership. My personal thanks to you all for drawing attention to the nakedness of the emperor.

May our children inherit from us a church who is a little humbler and a lot wiser, with hands to the plow and eyes on Jesus.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 11:52 AM

In regard to whether or not there is a system in place for the removal of a patriarch ... I don't know how things are now, but when we were part of the CEC, the big buzz word was consensus. Had there been consensus among the leadership that the patriarch should step down, he presumably would have done so. Sadly, although there WAS most definitely consensus among those in leadership that the patriarch "had some serious issues" ... there was not consensus among them that the appropriate action was to require him to step down.

A glass half full interpretation of that might be that they honestly intended to take serious action to ensure his receiving help in private...and that they truly were trying to keep people from being hurt, therefore wanted to use utmost discretion.

A glass half empty interpretation of that might be that they were blinded by pride and ambition and were not willing to pay the price for doing the right thing, therefore allowing the victims to go down as flakes and fools. I know some of the victims, and they are neither.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 8 2007, 12:30 PM

QUOTE

A glass half full interpretation of that might be that they honestly intended to take serious action to ensure his receiving help in private...and that they truly were trying to keep people from being hurt, therefore wanted to use utmost discretion.

A glass half empty interpretation of that might be that they were blinded by pride and ambition and were not willing to pay the price for doing the right thing, therefore allowing the victims to go down as flakes and fools. I know some of the victims, and they are neither.

Based on the CEC's history, if I were a betting man, I would put my money on the half empty interpretation.

Posted by: Me Oct 8 2007, 01:23 PM

Never wise to place bets on spiritual matters.

Based on the history of virgin births, Jesus' wasn't supposed to be.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 8 2007, 01:39 PM

QUOTE

Never wise to place bets on spiritual matters.

Based on the history of virgin births, Jesus' wasn't supposed to be.

Oh boy, well in that case let me rephrase.

Based on the two interpretations presented by Firewheel in his/her last post, I find the one that implicates selfish motives to be far more likely.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 01:39 PM

The bet statement's hardly about "spiritual matters". It's about the actions of a group of fallible men (as we all are). It's about betting on what happened based on having observed their track record. Nothin' wrong with that.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 01:59 PM

" So are you confirming that there are multiple counts and multiple victims? That is what I said, but no further confirmation has been posted."

There were a number of accounts of situations that would most definitely fall under the category of inappropriate behavior. Yes. But at the time that Bp. Meyers and his wife came forward, others chose to remain anonymous.

Posted by: Me Oct 8 2007, 02:06 PM

Firewheel I agree with your post about the betting statement. I merely wanted to point out that things aren't always what they appear to be. That said, I completely understand where Dot Guy is coming from. It all does *look* bad, half full or half empty.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 8 2007, 04:34 PM

A special message to our sponsors: The dutchy who called me a flamer can suckinz (a word I learned in the CEC – pray for the interp).

All joking aside, I am excited to see what comes out of this HOB NOB (höb'nöb for those of you trying to spell it out). The oblation of smoke rising above the Floridian skies tonight will be very telling.

Black Smoke: still without a clue
White Smoke: successful ejection

We may of course see mixed signals of black and white smoke if they are indecisive. Time will tell. -NSV (a brother to most)



Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 08:21 PM

Earthy grey smoke ... Cohibas.

Posted by: Jim Oct 8 2007, 08:23 PM

This discussion of "confidentiality" and "secrecy" is interesting to me.

Can anyone out there provide me with a concise difference and how they should be applied in a church setting?

For instance , if one priest tells another he is having an affair and asks him not to tell, is that confidentiality or is it secrecy?

I may be showing my ignorance here, but it would seem to be a game of semantics, left up to the persons involed where if it is something deeply troubling or a cause for outrage by the congregation, the first answer is almost certainly going to be invoked without further thought.

I eagerly await your enlightenment. 😊

J

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 08:54 PM

Farbeit from me to presume to enlighten anyone ... and I'm sure there will be many more posts in response to this which will be more enlightening than mine ... but ...

If one priest tells another priest that he is having an affair, hopefully the priest confided in would first of all minister to that priest who was owning up to his sin. But, secondly, I would hope that priest would begin to call the one having the affair to accountability.

Hopefully it would be required that he cut off the affair and seek help. Hopefully great measures would be taken to ensure that everyone affected by this affair would receive help and healing.

Hopefully it would be made known that if he did not, there would be consequences. For the sake of everyone involved.

And hopefully it would be handled biblically, lovingly and with great mercy all around.
With a heart toward reconciliation. Not bloodshed.

If we're talking the sacrament of confession, violation of "confidentiality" could mean the priest would be defrocked.

In short (I know ... too late for that) confidentiality seems to come down to "an ethical principle" that one in authority will hold private those matters which are disclosed to him by another. And secrecy is more hiding ... concealing a matter ... and not necessarily for a noble cause.

Posted by: Popeye ("and this is too mu Oct 8 2007, 10:27 PM

Someone should ask some of the young couples in San Clemente about the odd tradition of Adler encouraging them to have sex in his bed so the conception would be blessed. Is that SICK or what?

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 8 2007, 10:47 PM

Enough is enough, and this is too much? Is that what your by-line is supposed to read?
(It got cut off.)

Posted by: misunderstood Oct 9 2007, 03:03 AM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 8 2007, 08:54 PM)

If we're talking the sacrament of confession, violation of "confidentiality" could mean the priest would be defrocked.

In short (I know ... too late for that) confidentiality seems to come down to "an ethical principle" that one in authority will hold private those matters which are disclosed to him by another. And secrecy is more hiding ... concealing a matter ... and not necessarily for a noble cause.

Fire Wheel

I believe this is a good working definition. I would add that secrecy lends itself to deception for someone else's/something's benefit.

Confidentiality would be totally motivated by a desire to not expose another without any personal benefit.

Just my thoughts

mis.....

Posted by: Jim Oct 9 2007, 07:36 AM

Thank you both for your input. While I understand the definitions you have given, and the reasoning behind them, the only word that comes to mind is "subjective".

Being that the application of either of these terms is clearly subjective, it appears to me that this whole mess is entrenched in "circular logic" if you will.

For instance, in the example I gave, if the priest confesses his affair to another priest, the other priest holds it in confidentiality and counsels the offending priest that "should" be sufficient under your definition. However, when members of the congregation find out months later, and ask why he did not come forward, that counseling and confidentiality is then considered to be a coverup and smacks of secrecy.

I ask you; How then are we to expect full transparency of fallable men, when they know disclosure will result in the call for a "pound of flesh" and the dishonoring of their family amongst their church family? How do we expect priests to uphold their vow of confidentiality AND full disclosure?

'Round and 'Round we go....

Please know, I am not trying to make excuses here for the events of late. Quite the contrary. I am deeply perplexed and hope to gain insight, perhaps if I understand the "rules" I might understand how and where to place my trust.

Thanks,

J

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 9 2007, 08:35 AM

You're right, Jim. It is subjective.

Some key elements in handling these situations well (if that's even possible) are discernment and integrity.

Maybe the situations I've been aware of are unique, but in my experience, most often the person in an affair is more likely to be caught than to confess. More likely to be confronted than to suddenly come to his senses. So, I don't have much input on a situation such as you describe.

Which would suggest that perhaps it's been handled beautifully and with utmost discretion and I was completely unaware. Let's hope.

As for trust, that's a tough one, isn't it? So painful when it's broken. And difficult to regain. Thank God for His strength in my weakness where that's concerned.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 9 2007, 08:44 AM

By the way ... in the summary of the last HOB meetings which can be found at http://www.iccec.org/hob/Summary_Patriarchs_Council_Spring_2007.pdf, it states that "The next meeting of the Patriarch's Council will be held in Orlando, Florida at the Cathedral Church of St. Dismas, October 15-18, 2007." Did the dates get changed?

Posted by: seraph, yes that one! Oct 9 2007, 08:48 AM

Hi:

It is puzzling with regards to this situation ...I am not quite sure I understand the dynamics of what happened.

If Fr Dan or any other clergy or lay person were to go to the sacrament of reconciliation to confess...presumably any mortal sin...in this case an affair. How is it we are reading about it in the internet????

If he or anyone else went to confession to keep that in confidence is not "secrecy" , it what is expected of the priest...otherwise the "seal of the confessional" is a joke. Might as well confess it on your blog!

blessings

seraph

Posted by: **Dot Guy** Oct 9 2007, 08:58 AM

QUOTE

Being that the application of either of these terms is is clearly subjective, it appears to me that this whole mess is entrenched in "circular logic" if you will.

Jim,

Here are my thoughts.....

If one "Patriarch" goes to confession and confesses his sins which include highly questionable sexual behavior and drug/alcohol abuse the priest is expected to keep the confession he just heard confidential and that would not be considered a cover up. But the priest should counsel the "patriarch" and the "patriarch" should most definitely be advised to step down a) because he cannot effectively run an entire denomination while influenced by drugs and alcohol. ☹️ he cannot counsel and help the people of his congregation who may also be sinning in this way. and c) with the burden of adultery over your head and possible drug/alcohol misuse he should not be representing Christ as the head of the church.

This all turns from confidentiality to cover-ups when people, other than the priest who heard the confession, start to ask questions and they get lied to. If they dont get lied to they are just hushed up and pushed aside. And if they are say, a bishop, "patriarch" Adler will attempt to demote them and try to discredit their integrity, when infact, it only makes him look worse. So I wouldnt say that there is not a lot of "circular logic" going on here, because what may have once been simple confidentiality (though I doubt it) has turned to lies, decite, and cover-ups.

QUOTE

Someone should ask some of the young couples in San Clemente about the odd tradition of Adler encouraging them to have sex in his bed so the conception would be blessed. Is that SICK or what?

Is this true??? Or do we have another troll lurking around? That is awful if it is true!

Posted by: **Dot Guy** Oct 9 2007, 09:03 AM

BTW there isnt supposed to be that smilie face thingy in my las post, its supposed to be a B with a) after it. But I guess it didnt turn out that way.

Lol I dont want people thinking that I think running a church while under the influence is cool!

Posted by: **Popeye** Oct 9 2007, 09:04 AM

Yes this IS true. Check it out with young couples in SC. Not a troll here (nor an orc).

Posted by: **Me** Oct 9 2007, 09:11 AM

When conflicting interests are to be considered (in your example the priest's/victims need for restoration and the people's need to know) and deemed to be sufficiently important (by church law - not subjectively) then an obligation exists for disclosure. Failure to do so implicates the 2nd priest, in your example.

We must abide by the rule of law.

Posted by: **Jim** Oct 9 2007, 09:22 AM

QUOTE

This all turns from confidentiality to cover-ups when people, other than the priest who heard the confession, start to ask questions and they get lied to. If they dont get lied to they are just hushed up and pushed aside.... So I wouldnt say that there is not a lot of "circular logic" going on here, because what may have once been simple confidentiality (though I doubt it) has turned to lies, decite, and cover-ups.

Wouldn't that be expected though? If the preist is sword to confidentiality, wouldn't he HAVE to lie or tell people to hush to avoid breaking his confidentiality? Thus bringing sin upon that preist, which he would confess to another...and on and on- ad nauseum.

What I see here is a very fine line which is not clearly defined.

The other thing that keeps rolling through my mind is the accountability which is supposed to go along with the confidentiality. If for instance, the one who has transgressed does not repent as he is told and provide disclosure, is there some point at which the priest who heard the confession and advised him is release of his obligation to protect the information and the one confessing it? If not, we are once again looking at the fallable man who may be sorry but does not want to come forward or in some cases not change his way.

What then? Does his confession become a "get out of jail(accountability) free" card?

Please excuse my ramblings, this is the first time I have encountered this type of thing "head on" , I have heard rumors and rumblings before, but never delved in to the "hows and whys". My only hope is to find a greater understanding.

Posted by: Dear Seraph Oct 9 2007, 09:26 AM

Confession in the CEC has always been a joke.

I believe the cover that was always used was "this is under the stole" even though clergy wives and "trusted" laity weres usually there.

In those celctic evening songs many a poor souls secrets were spread wide and far in the form of prayer requests.

The HOB was especially bad, where minions would gather under the clouds of cigar and whiskey to discuss political strategies or course jokes. Many a bishop were going to be damned if this or that bishop was going to try and pull this or that. If that bishop dared to go forward with their proposal then this or that nice piece of info was going to have to be answered for.

Why do you think so few people actually go to confession in the CEC. They know their sins will be posted not on a forum for a few to see, but relayed down prayer chain after prayer chain.

Seraph why the mock outrage?

Posted by: Jim Oct 9 2007, 09:29 AM

ME:

You quote "church law"...is there a site you can point me to where I could read more on this?

Thanks in advance.

J

Posted by: Me Oct 9 2007, 09:33 AM

JIM: See my previous post in response to your questions.

Confidentiality does not trump other obligations in certain predefined situations.

The rule of law is the great equalizer. If broken or ignored all collapses.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 9 2007, 09:42 AM

Having been a social worker for many years and effectively "hearing confessions" for which I was not ordained to offer absolution, I was often under the obligation to counsel the party to disclose themselves after receiving absolution from an appropriate minister.

In some states there are laws pressuring not only secular workers but religious as well to disclose issues of child abuse, harm to self or others to the proper authorities. I actually consider that there was always harm to others and self in these situations, but was only under reporting obligation in certain situations.

In the case of ministers and adult "victims", for a one time offense, I did not require them to disclose, but suggested it be held in confidence with their spouse (certainly one of the victims) and proper amends to the offended parties along with long-term counseling. I usually counseled them to take a sabbatical to work on their issues. However, if there was a pattern, I told them I would no longer see them for counseling until they had disclosed to others who could hold them accountable in their own denomination as well as the above requirement. This usually led to the decision by "elders" to remove the person from active ministry for awhile, and sometimes permanently depending on their particular view of the offenses and/or severity of the offense.

It is always more difficult (for me, at least) when a person of high profile is "caught" in a sin. Then you are never quite sure if they are seeking treatment and absolution out of repentance and remorse or for other reasons. In other words, in some cases it is difficult to determine if a person is "confessing" in the sacramental (please help me deal with this) sense or if they are "admitting" or agreeing with or at least not contesting the charge(s) of wrongdoing.

I believe each of these requires different treatment by those who know of the offense(s).

An example I gave in an earlier post reported how one archbishop in the RCC in Africa, has stepped down to give him time to refute charges against him, which he reports are part of a Mugabe government conspiracy to discredit him. The Vatican agreed with his decision and is supporting him in the refutation as well. This very well could have been the advice and support offered by the Patriarch's Council, or the HOB, or the SM/SC Bishop's councils. IMHO

Posted by: Guest Oct 9 2007, 09:46 AM

QUOTE (Dear Seraph @ Oct 9 2007, 09:26 AM)

Confession in the CEC has always been a joke....

True....but then again many people came to CEC from ev/protestant backgrounds and not too comfortable with that kind of stuff. We do have general confession..! I have been present at sermons by bishops and the like encouraging the practice of individual confession to a priest, but in the parishes I am familiar with, it never did take off....with minor exceptions.

QUOTE

In those celctic evening songs many a poor souls secrets were spread wide and far in the form of prayer requests. ..The HOB was especially bad, where minions would gather

This is an awful image...at least in my mind. I have never been party to these gathering of the minions under clouds of smoke so would not be able to comment. It would be awful if true. There is a real lack of integrity or judgement when people's private problems and struggles become the subject of conversation in any sort of gathering. There are HIPAA civil laws to protect confidence in certain fields such as counseling and medicine! Technically the church's standarts to protect penitents should be as strictly observed.

QUOTE

Why do you think so few people actually go to confession in the CEC.

Most are evangelical and see no need, others do not like or trust their confessors, others are embarrassed of their problems, others have been burned.

QUOTE

Seraph why the mock outrage?

It is not mock at all friend, and I am not outraged just a bit confused that is all...

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 9 2007, 09:57 AM

Popeye,

I agree, that is SICK! Kind of cult-like too. I find that very disturbing.

Jim,

No the priest does not have to lie at all! If he were be questioned about it, it would be fine if he were to say that he's not going to comment. Yes, then he would probably be accused of some sort of cover up, but we are not that priests judge, there is only one who will know the truth (well 2 if you count the "patriarch"). And shame on us if we attack a man for keeping a confession confidential! Also, I would say that yes, at some point the priest is no longer required to keep the "patriarch's" confession confidential if the "patriarch's" sins begin to hurt others and the church.

Posted by: seraph Oct 9 2007, 10:06 AM

QUOTE

Confession in the CEC has always been a joke....

I remember an open meeting at a convocation for the SE province in the 1990's, +Howard and maybe Woodall, presiding, where the subject of confession and mandatory reporting was mentioned!

The force of the statements made by bishops and the great majority of clergy who spoke and asked questions was that the confessional was "inviolable". That priests were under no circumstance, even under pain of civil punishment, break the confidentiality of the penitent. There was a couple of clergy and some lay people involved in counseling who dissented making exceptions for child abuse and physical harm...but not well received. Certainly at least at this meeting it was not treated as a joke.

Few lay people I know in my parish have been to confession. Like in many other churches. Long communion lines, short confession ones. Perhaps, that is a good thing if , despite assurances otherwise, confidentiality is not really kept.

blessings

seraph

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 9 2007, 10:18 AM

QUOTE (Dot Guy @ Oct 9 2007, 10:57 AM)

....

And shame on us if we attack a man for keeping a confession confidential! Also, I would say that yes, at some point the priest is no longer required to keep the "patriarch's" confession confidential if the "patriarch's" sins begin to hurt others and the church.

I am on the side of inviolate confessions. I am also on the side of counselling the penitent to disclose to the proper authorities (legal or Church governors) and others if the matter confessed is against the law, against a minor, or against a victim even if not a minor who is incapable of defending themselves for some reason against the perpetrator.

I would say that the patriarch's sins (which to my understanding have now been "confessed" publicly, though not widely), if true, have already hurt many, including the Church. Now it is up to the Church which he serves to determine the best course of action to be taken. IMHO

Posted by: observer Oct 9 2007, 10:22 AM

QUOTE (Dear Seraph @ Oct 9 2007, 10:26 AM)

Why do you think so few people actually go to confession in the CEC. They know their sins will be posted not on a forum for a few to see, but relayed down prayer chain after prayer chain.

Not true at all. I've never heard of the confessional being violated in the CEC, so no one I know has such a fear. The reason it's not used as much is likely due to our backgrounds. I view confession with a twofold purpose, to reconcile to God those who've committed serious sin (e.g., adultery) and as a tool for spiritual direction/counseling as a way to advance holiness and maintain accountability. We know from scripture that sins are forgiven us when we confess them to God and ask for His forgiveness. We do that also by the general confession at Mass each week and even through the Eucharist. So unless we've sinned a whopper or we're in a season where we want to focus on overcoming some habitual sin and are seeking direction/counsel from a priest, then confession is not something we need. Afterall, we're not the Catholic Church that added a mile long list of sins they've deemed mortal (like not believing that Mary was sinless, or missing church on Sunday, or eating meat on a fast day). The early church kept it simple - mortal sins were limited to such things as apostasy, murder, adultery, fornication, homosexuality. If I had to live under the Catholic rules, then I'd have to say confession would have to be a more regular thing, but thankfully I don't have such binding rules.

Posted by: Guest Oct 9 2007, 11:09 AM

Observer,

Your personal view of the sacrament of confession is much more legalistic than the true Roman Catholic position. The sacrament is about relationship.

And I don't think you're REALLY like to do it the old fashioned way. Read on:

CCC 1447: Over the centuries the concrete form in which the Church has exercised this power received from the Lord has varied considerably. During the first centuries the reconciliation of Christians who had committed particularly grave sins after their Baptism (for example, idolatry, murder, or adultery) was tied to a very rigorous discipline, according to which penitents had to do public penance for their sins, often for years, before receiving reconciliation. To this "order of penitents" (which concerned only certain grave sins), one was only rarely admitted and in certain regions only once in a lifetime. During the seventh century Irish missionaries, inspired by the Eastern monastic tradition, took to continental Europe the "private" practice of penance, which does not require public and prolonged completion of penitential works before reconciliation with the Church. From that time on, the sacrament has been performed in secret between penitent and priest. This new practice envisioned the possibility of repetition and so opened the way to a regular frequenting of this sacrament. It allowed the forgiveness of grave sins and venial sins to be integrated into one sacramental celebration. In its main lines this is the form of penance that the Church has practiced down to our day.

God's peace be with you.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 9 2007, 11:16 AM

Popeye:

I've heard about that practice in SC too. Very disturbing. And yes, very cult-like. But then so are a lot of other practices there.

Regarding confession ... I can say that in my experience, as a former CEC priest's wife, I was NEVER aware of anything that was spoken in confession to my husband. I wouldn't have asked. But if I had, he certainly wouldn't have told me.

I was never aware of anyone breaking the confessional. Not saying it never happened. But it certainly wouldn't have been tolerated in our diocese.

I think asking the offender to disclose his or her self in some cases is very wise.

In the case of Adler, it wasn't about his making confession. It was a case of multiple offenses observed by or imposed upon

others who confronted him multiple times. Some charges he denied. Others he danced around. Others were supposedly dealt with privately by those closest to him.

Now that he has admitted guilt to things he once denied, I wonder ... will he go to those offended? I hope so.

Now that the statement about there not having been any sexual harrassment charges seems a mere technicality ... will there be a statement saying there could have been if the women offended had chosen to file them? I doubt it. But I hope so. It would be the right thing.

Posted by: Me Oct 9 2007, 11:20 AM

MIKE: you said:

QUOTE

I am on the side of inviolate confessions

Do you mean this is in the absolute sense? Please clarify.

I believe in free speech, however this is not an absolute right.

JIM: for starters go to

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canon_law

Posted by: Me Oct 9 2007, 11:32 AM

In the case of the current events at the CEC things are a bit more complicated as is depicted in the last few posts here.

Failures on multiple levels have ocured.

However, I am very hopeful that our leaders will rise up and do what is right.

Posted by: Me Oct 9 2007, 11:35 AM

FYI, I think you Trolls are very amusing, I needed a good laugh, thank you!!

Also, Bonnie thanks again about your last few posts, very helpful in this situation!

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 9 2007, 11:40 AM

QUOTE

Now that he has admitted guilt to things he once denied, I wonder ... will he go to those offended? I hope so.

Hopefully he will do that immediatly after he resigns! I do not see any way that the HOB can allow him to stay as "patriarch" after he admitted what he has been being accused of for so long, and lying about it. If the HOB does not force him out then the entire denomonation will have truely become a mockery. Also, if they do get Adler out of there, I wonder if they will try to reach out to and apologize to the churches, clergy, and bishops that left the CEC. Not to try to convince them to come back, but to just try to gain some kind of reconciliation. It would a mature move on the CEC's part.

QUOTE

Popeye:

I've heard about that practice in SC too. Very disturbing. And yes, very cult-like. But then so are a lot of other practices there.

I dont know, maybe its just me, but hearing about this infuriates me beyond belief!

Posted by: Me Oct 9 2007, 12:19 PM

QUOTE

I dont know, maybe its just me, but hearing about this infuriates me beyond belief!

Ahhh Dot Guy you are a Troll's true reward! Keep feeding and they will grow!

Be careful though, I have heard there is Someone watching. You don't want to be on the wrong side of Him.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 9 2007, 12:26 PM

Me,

So are you saying that these reports from SC, that I find so agravating, are false?

Posted by: Me Oct 9 2007, 12:39 PM

I am sorry you are aggravated. You must be very hungry, however, not everything shiny is worth swallowing! (be careful you may get caught!)

Peace out!

Posted by: Popeye Oct 9 2007, 12:51 PM

Me: I'm not sure what you're implying - perhaps that I'm making this stuff up. I'm telling you, I have been in the past an insider, and this stuff is only the tip of the iceberg.

Posted by: Dear Seraph Oct 9 2007, 12:53 PM

QUOTE (observer @ Oct 9 2007, 10:22 AM)

Not true at all. I've never heard of the confessional being violated in the CEC...

You are lucky,

I have seen folks even shy away from discussing perceived problems with the church lambasted in such meetings. Hines was subjected to all kinds of rumors concerning his sexual preference from American Bishops after a guy claimed Hines had confessed such to him. Howard would never have been deposed if he had not misused a certain Late Bishop's monies. There has been blatant use of shepharding tactics with confessions in the CEC.

I know many Priest who would never dare to do such but that does not mean that a lot of this stuff has not and is not happening. I have been witnessed to it to many times. Sorry it does happen. Yes SM seminary taught us differently as the rule, but rules were meant to be bent right. Bent happened a good bit it seems.

Among clergy it is like a medical conference was the reasoning. In larger parishes and Cathedrals you could always find that inner circle. The inner circle could always be trusted right? Clergy, their wives, their youth even sometimes, and any out of towners of distinction that really did not know the situation so it was safe there too right?

Did not seem wrong at the time because being part of relationships (inner circles) was what it was about. How else could you get that esoteric knowledge of the Spirit that the rest of the parish was not ready for? How else could you truly know where the Spirit was moving? Where else could you find out if 2 hrs of tongues a day was enough? This was our link with God's representative on earth. If he thought we should know about this or that situation why should we shy away from that.

This was the Church of the early days. A great place to drink cut loose and fellowship (gossip) about how God was moving. The struggles of the parishoners could be discussed with pity and prayer.

The HOB was a time to lock and load baby.

Seraph and observer, If you have not seen this than God be praised.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 9 2007, 01:02 PM

QUOTE

I am sorry you are aggravated. You must be very hungry, however, not everything shiny is worth swallowing! (be careful you may get caught!)

Peace out!

I certainly do not swallow everything shiny. But 2 people have said that this is true, and you seem to tip toe around the question. If you could answer the question (its not a complicated one) that would be nice.

Posted by: Popeye Oct 9 2007, 01:02 PM

Seraph: I know entire dioceses where the sacrament of confession has been nothing but honored and held sacred, with no breaking of the bond, even in the context of Celtic Evensong, or anywhere or anytime else. Please be careful about lumping the entire CEC (including bishops, clergy, dioceses, congregations which have left) with the San Clemente sickness. There are places where the San Clemente disease spread to other areas, there are also places it did not corrupt.

Posted by: Guest Oct 9 2007, 01:15 PM

Seraph: I know entire dioceses where the sacrament of confession has been nothing but honored and held sacred, with no breaking of the bond....

careful there are two here "seraph": (yes that one) and Seraph (Dear Seraph)..

I have made no comments about Celtic smokeouts because I have never been to one and do not know what has been said

there...! The thought that it could happen and may have is disturbing.

thanks

seraph-1

Posted by: seraph Oct 9 2007, 01:40 PM

QUOTE

Hines was subjected to all kinds of rumors concerning his sexual preference from American Bishops after a guy claimed Hines had confessed such to him.

Whattttt...???? surely you jest????

QUOTE

There has been blatant use of shepharding tactics with confessions in the CEC

I have not been aware of any specific instances ...are you ...?How, Where?

QUOTE

have been witnessed to it to many times. Sorry it does happen. Yes SM seminary taught us differently ...

are u a priest in the CEC?

QUOTE

Did not seem wrong at the time because being part of relationships (inner circles) was what it was about

I see where this can be very plausible...

seraph

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 9 2007, 01:57 PM

Ummm...just to clarify, I'm finding the discussion very interesting and I think that people, for the most part, have been behaving really well. There are obvious differences of opinion but I feel that people are having respectful discourse. I'm enjoying the read...so, thanks!

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 9 2007, 02:10 PM

Yes and I agree with "Me" that the Trolls are at it again!.

Good work "Me" !

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 9 2007, 03:20 PM

Bishop Adler's bed? Whoa! I wonder what happens with the sheet in the morning? Just a muse. My mind seems to wonder on these things a bit.

How about being told who you are going to marry? Ahhh... many of us have had that thrust upon us at SM. If you didn't heed the 'word' you were shunned and belittled. An of course everyone must start a children's farm once they're married. Maybe even hold the Guinness Book of World Records for the most C-sections. You can do it too!

This happened to me personally. I could have been in the royal family. She only had one tooth with a buckeye and black boy (she was white). (Now I have no issues with this in families but I had zero interest in taking that on.) I was compelled by many to marry this ugly little darl'n. But NO! I wouldn't have it. Members of the royal family would call me (friends no doubt) and tell it was the Lord. I would rather have joined the Franciscans then be tied to that noose.

BTW: Anybody remeber the movie Soylent Green? -NSV (a brother to most)



Posted by: stlouismb Oct 9 2007, 03:24 PM

QUOTE (BonnieZ @ Oct 9 2007, 02:57 PM)

Ummm...just to clarify, I'm finding the discussion very interesting and I think that people, for the most part, have been behaving really well. There are obvious differences of opinion but I feel that people are having respectful discourse. I'm enjoying the read...so, thanks!

Yes. I agree. Thank you. I must be away at times during the day and evening and thus you have made my "job" much easier and ther reading much more interesting. I had hoped it could cool down and be rational.

Any word(s) yet from the HOB?

Beware of trolls is good advice.

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 9 2007, 03:29 PM

QUOTE (Me @ Oct 9 2007, 12:20 PM)

MIKE: you said:

QUOTE

I am on the side of inviolate confessions

Do you mean this is in the absolute sense? Please clarify.

I believe in free speech, however this is not an absolute right.

JIM: for starters go to
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canon_law

Me,

No, not in an absolute sense. Speaking from a professional, non-ministerial standpoint I have had to disclose when my client absolutely would not. However that only happened once in 11 years.

I primarily counseled those affected by sexual abuse. Those abused and those who abused. In that line of work, it was incumbent upon me to "report" per State law. My preference was to get the offender to "report" themselves. I remained with them as their counselor even if they went to prison, which some certainly did.

Not being a priest myself, I still imagine I would have felt just the same.

How about you, Me? 🙄

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 9 2007, 03:32 PM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 9 2007, 03:20 PM)

BTW: Anybody remember the movie Soylent Green? -NSV (a brother to most)



"...Soylent Green is people..."

blessings

seraph

Posted by: **Unregistered One** Oct 9 2007, 03:33 PM

Last year, before half of the bishops resigned, they made a very concerted effort to get Adler to step down. But, alas, he managed to stay in office, seemingly unscathed by it all, forcing many to leave with their principles intact.

Here we are again, about a year later, with even more allegations, and even more widespread shenanigans. What is it going to take for everyone out there to wake up? The man is flawed, his doctrine is flawed, his lifestyle is flawed, and yet there are so many who are standing at the ready to prop him up and enable all of his flaws.

I will be amazed if he is actually removed from office - he and everyone else at SM who knew of the multiple abuses - and new leadership is put in power. SM is in need of a great time of healing. I hope they are afforded the opportunity, and are not kept in the CEC spotlight.

My expectation, however, is that Adler will worm his way out of this one as well, and everything will go on as before. The spin machine is well-oiled and at the ready.

Posted by: **J. FreeMan** Oct 9 2007, 04:17 PM

[QUOTE=observer,Oct 9 2007, 10:22 AM] [/QUOTE]

Not true at all. I've never heard of the confessional being violated in the CEC, so no one I know has such a fear. [/QUOTE]

I wish this were so in my old province. My Archbishop would regale the boys on the golf course with tales from my confessions. He would tell all who would listen that "Fr. J---- will never be able to pastor a church because....." It did not matter that I was more educated and experienced than his son who was the Dean of the Cathedral. My sins outweighed all of that. Also there were the forced confessions. If he perceived that my attitude was not what he thought it should be then I was "set aside" for a while and

when I had been "set aside" long enough, I could once again minister after I had confessed my sin. Once I had to make a 120 mile round trip (240 miles total) to go to a neighboring priest to make my confession even though there were 4 priests at the cathedral that could've heard my forced confession.

Posted by: seraph Oct 9 2007, 04:25 PM

QUOTE (J. FreeMan @ Oct 9 2007, 04:17 PM)

Once I had to make a 120 mile round trip (240 miles total) to go to a neighboring priest to make my confession even though there were 4 priests at the cathedral that could've heard my forced confession.

You actually did this?

wow....

seraph

Posted by: J. FreeMan Oct 9 2007, 04:33 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 9 2007, 04:25 PM)

QUOTE (J. FreeMan @ Oct 9 2007, 04:17 PM)

Once I had to make a 120 mile round trip (240 miles total) to go to a neighboring priest to make my confession even though there were 4 priests at the cathedral that could've heard my forced confession.

You actually did this?

wow....

seraph

Every mile of it!

The confessional was used to manipulate and browbeat us in that province.

Posted by: Me Oct 9 2007, 04:40 PM

MIKE:

QUOTE

Not being a priest myself, I still imagine I would have felt just the same.

How about you, Me?

Yes I would have too, it appears to me you did the right thing!

So let's switch gears a bit. How does one reconcile "inviolable confession" in light of the recent pedophilia cases in the Catholic church? The Catholic Canon seems to be awfully quiet about how to handle such a confession. No specifics anyways. No specific directive as to the type of penance the confessor is to prescribe to the confessing party.

What do you think?

Posted by: BonnieZ Oct 9 2007, 04:41 PM

QUOTE (NOT BY BonnieZ @ Oct 9 2007, 02:10 PM)

Yes and I agree with "Me" that the Trolls are at it again!.

Good work "Me" !

Hey...I don't know if you were trying to be funny, but it is totally uncool to sign in under someone else's name. I realize that in my first post, I forgot to technically log in, but that does not give you the right to say something and pass it off as something I said.

I DID NOT post the above quote. Please, be a pal and don't do that again, OK?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 9 2007, 04:57 PM

QUOTE (BonnieZ @ Oct 9 2007, 05:41 PM)

Please, be a pal and don't do that again, OK?

I have not had to check IP addresses until this incident, Bonnie. Indeed it was not you, Bonnie, it was another poster.

Please follow basic forum etiquette or I will be forced to require registration for posting. I really don't want to do that.

Thanks.

[Back to the discussion.](#)

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 9 2007, 05:58 PM

It would be really helpful for those who wish not to register, to choose one moniker and stick with it. It helps all of us identify to whom we are responding. Try something unique. Not just Guest, or some variation on Seraph.... Thanks.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 9 2007, 06:43 PM

[Back to confessions and violations thereof...](#)

Violations of confessions, violations of all sorts of things, can be expected and pretty much guaranteed when there is abuse of drugs and alcohol.

Drinking excessively is not only modeled but encouraged. I myself was told I was really a "lightweight" because I limited my alcohol consumption at a SC gathering of leadership.

Inappropriate conversation ... inappropriate touching ... inappropriate everything ... it's to be expected when people are not in control of their faculties.

And yes, I concur and know firsthand that there has been a very controlling mentality toward the choosing of marriage partners for young people, their employment choices and their childbearing in SC. Not in the CEC in general, but I think the mentality probably spread somewhat. People in SC have been rebuked for going against who was chosen to be their mate. And many who do choose to use any form of birth control hide the fact to avoid the hassle of that being known. I have heard this from the mouths of the people involved. It's not gossip or guessing.

This can't go on forever. I pray that these brainwashed young people will "wake up and smell the incense" as someone so brilliantly put it and that they will be able to see through the fog and see who Jesus really is and who the Church really is, what we can and should be.

We can't sit idly by and watch this happen to the next generation. It would be a sin.

Posted by: seraph Oct 9 2007, 07:24 PM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 9 2007, 06:43 PM)

....We can't sit idly by and watch this happen to the next generation. It would be a sin.

If all you write here is true.....how does that church still exist? In our very liberal society and in California of all places people allow that kind of control?

I do not doubt your comments..I have been in the CEC for a loooooong time and never heard of such a thing. To all appearances...see the Live Journal on the web, the church seems well attended and growing.

Is this a new thing or an old set of secrets?

curious

seraph

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 9 2007, 07:48 PM

I was in the CEC a LOOOOONNNNNG time too ... and, sadly, this is not new.

It took a while for us to wake up, but thank God, we did. There were a lot of us thinking "This just isn't right". But we had felt so called by God into this move of God ... and I don't doubt that God brought a bunch of like-minded folk together ... I don't think it was all for naught.

That's the thing ... the SC church looks so alive and appeared to be thriving ... but there have been so many really disturbing things taking place among the people. The Brother's House. The Sister's House. Really disturbing things. More than has been touched on here, for sure. Much more.

And it doesn't please me at all to be the bearer of this kind of news. But it's better than letting it all go by and by my silence inferring it's all been okay. It's certainly not okay. It's not what God intends for the church to be. Not by a long shot.

I'm not saying priests and bishops should be perfect. I'm not saying they should be infallible. But I am saying they should own up to it when they fail. And they should make every effort to right the wrongs they have caused.

Isn't there something somewhere about it being better for there to be a millstone hung around your neck than to offend one of

God's little ones?

Posted by: Centurion Oct 9 2007, 08:09 PM

Firewheel you said that

QUOTE

We can't sit idly by and watch this happen to the next generation.

What are you suggesting we do?

and

QUOTE

I was in the CEC a LOOOOONNNNG time too ...

when did you leave and why?

and where do you attend now? Is it any better? No secrets there?

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 9 2007, 08:20 PM

I'm suggesting we don't pretend things are okay when they aren't. If the emperor has no clothes on ... say so.

Many from our diocese left in the great exodus of a couple years ago. My husband and I remain active in ministry. We're part of the Communion of Christ the Redeemer now.

I sure hope there are no secrets in our congregation and in our communion! It's all of our desire to steer as far away from that as possible! And we've done everything we can to remain accountable to one another and to walk in integrity. That will be a lifelong effort. As it should be.

I can assure you that, now that I've been through this with the CEC, I'll speak up much sooner if there is any evidence of inappropriate behavior within the ranks of any congregation of which I am a part. And I hope you'll do the same. Not in a haughty spirit, but to preserve the integrity of the Church as best we can. And not for the sake of harming people who are in the wrong, but so that they can be steered in the right direction and get back on track.

My husband's been hurt. I've been hurt. But, worst of all, my children have been hurt. Thank God they are still serving Him!!!!!! I'm so very grateful for that. Because they've seen so much stuff.... in the name of the church.

Now, they've seen people take a stand. Now they've seen people say 'ENOUGH'. And now, let's get on with the business of the Kingdom and do the right thing!

Posted by: Centurion Oct 9 2007, 08:28 PM

QUOTE

I'm suggesting we don't pretend things are okay when they aren't.

I have to say, with all my experience in the forums the past 18 months or so, I haven't heard too many people say "everything is OK!"

I assume you are saying that leaving (as you did) is the best way to go, and you may be right.

Just don't think that any of us in the CEC think everything is OK. Because of our commitment to one another and our communion, we are hanging in there. It is a tough road, and no doubt many will throw stones at us for having remained. Well I have to say, we need your prayer now more than ever.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 9 2007, 08:54 PM

You have my prayers. And I mean that. I'm not throwing any stones at you for remaining. I just pray you can (and will seek to) effect change. We tried repeatedly to no avail.

God be with you.

Posted by: Centurion Oct 9 2007, 08:59 PM

Thank you Firewheel!

Yes we need it very much. I would also ask any participant seeking to stir up rumors, dissension and the like - to refrain for our sake. I know it is alot to ask, but we all need the truth here.

Posted by: **Popeye (the real one)** Oct 9 2007, 10:07 PM

Bonnie: the post saying "It was me", from 5.19, WASN'T from me either. Someone is being nasty here.

Posted by: **BonnieZ** Oct 10 2007, 05:19 AM

Hi, real sailor man! I knew that it wasn't you...no worries 😊

Firewheel...what is the brother house and the sister house that you mention? I haven't heard of those.

Posted by: **misunderstood** Oct 10 2007, 06:09 AM

QUOTE (Centurion @ Oct 9 2007, 08:28 PM)

QUOTE

I'm suggesting we don't pretend things are okay when they aren't.

I have to say, with all my experience in the forums the past 18 months or so, I haven't heard too many people say "everything is OK!"

I assume you are saying that leaving (as you did) is the best way to go, and you may be right.

Just don't think that any of us in the CEC think everything is OK. Because of our commitment to one another and our communion, we are hanging in there. It is a tough road, and no doubt many will throw stones at us for having remained. Well I have to say, we need your prayer now more than ever.

Well said Centurion, well said!

I would like to remind those that have left that there are those of us that have stayed for reasons other than having blinders on or just not caring or worse yet excusing improper behavior.

I do not judge any who have left nor their motives or reasons. I would like to feel that same sense of respect because I and others choose to stay.

For me it is simply staying true to the vision that I believed was God over 11 years ago. Last time I prayed about leaving (which BTW was not too long ago) I still could not get a release about it. For me, I know I would be in personal rebellion for God's call on my life. So staying and standing for truth and honesty is the course God has called me to at this time. I am not alone for I know many others.

Perhaps with God's grace we will see the healing of this denomination once and for all.

mis.....

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 10 2007, 06:42 AM

Hi mis.....,Centurion, and others who have stayed:

I agree you deserve respect. I personally don't understand how you have stayed, but many have said the same thing about me in regards to the RCC.

I pray you are right...that we will see healing!

I have written all the remaining/current Bishops of the ICCEC last night and this morning for whom I have email addresses and have asked them to take a courageous stand for healing and reconciliation within their own ranks and within the ICCEC.

[let me add: I know the Church is not a democracy, but I think it is important for our leaders to at least know how we feel. I have very little sway in my church and obviously less to none, in matters of the ICCEC. I just wanted to let them know how a "once insider, now outsider" sees things] [this forum was set-up to bring reconciliation, not further division. I realize there is much "venting" that must occur first. Let us all do that respectfully!]

As Nat Sherman indicated: we will be watching the skies over Florida.

Posted by: **Firewheel** Oct 10 2007, 07:57 AM

Bravo, stlouismb, for writing a letter to the Bishops! There should be a lot more of that.

BonnieZ, the Brothers House and Sisters House in San Clemente are houses where single men and single women live together in a sort of community. There are disciplines that they are to observe while there which are good ... work, prayer, etc. It is overseen by leaders of St. Michael's.

However, having spoken to a number of young men and women who have spent time in these places, their lives are really not their own, and there is way too much control over what they do, who they see, who they should marry, and even whether or not they are meant to leave. They are not prohibited from leaving physically, but there are a lot of mind games that go on. Talk of "submission" and "authority" that goes beyond what is healthy.

Having spoken with parents of those who have been part of these programs, some children came away having acquired bad habits rather than having developed more discipline. Sadly.

Mis, and others who have not left, I respect your decision and understand. And I do and will continue to pray for you and for the CEC.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 10 2007, 09:04 AM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 8 2007, 09:21 PM)

Earthy grey smoke ... Cohibas.



Sorry, I just read this today!

Posted by: Nemo Oct 10 2007, 09:17 AM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 9 2007, 06:43 PM)

And yes, I concur and know firsthand that there has been a very controlling mentality toward the choosing of marriage partners for young people, their employment choices and their childbearing in SC. Not in the CEC in general, but I think the mentality probably spread somewhat.

In peoples' experience, is this characteristic of most Cathedral congregations? I've heard this more than once from San Clemente folks, and it also seems to have crept into the Kansas City congregation. What about Malverne or Selma?

To mis and Centurion: You are not alone, although there are those who are starting to lose hope. Please keep posting to encourage us to keep up our side of the struggle.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 10 2007, 09:23 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 10 2007, 10:04 AM)

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 8 2007, 09:21 PM)

Earthy grey smoke ... Cohibas.



Sorry, I just read this today!

Regarding smoke signals:

The only "news" I have heard from Florida, this morning was the nomination of a new bishop to be consecrated in November. I have no word as to any other deliberations thus far.

Posted by: Nemo Oct 10 2007, 09:35 AM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 10 2007, 09:23 AM)

The only "news" I have heard from Florida, this morning was the nomination of a new bishop to be consecrated in November. I have no word as to any other deliberations thus far.

Do tell! Who is it?

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 10 2007, 09:54 AM

They haven't started meetings yet, have they? I thought the meetings were going to be next week.

Posted by: Just Readin' Oct 10 2007, 10:01 AM

Epps. He sent out an announcement.

Posted by: Just Readin' Oct 10 2007, 10:11 AM

Sorry, that would be Fr. David Epps of Peachtree GA. He sent out an email announcement but I deleted it after having read it so I really can't prove it actually ever existed. 🙄

Posted by: Grace Abounds Oct 10 2007, 11:36 AM

QUOTE (Nemo @ Oct 10 2007, 09:17 AM)

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 9 2007, 06:43 PM)

And yes, I concur and know firsthand that there has been a very controlling mentality toward the choosing of marriage partners for young people, their employment choices and their childbearing in SC. Not in the CEC in general, but I think the mentality probably spread somewhat.

In peoples' experience, is this characteristic of most Cathedral congregations? I've heard this more than once from San Clemente folks, and it also seems to have crept into the Kansas City congregation. What about Malverne or Selma?

To mis and Centurion: You are not alone, although there are those who are starting to lose hope. Please keep posting to encourage us to keep up our side of the struggle.

nothing like that in NY that I know of, and I do a lot of volunteering there.

Posted by: hald Oct 10 2007, 12:18 PM

QUOTE (Nemo @ Oct 10 2007, 10:17 AM)

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 9 2007, 06:43 PM)

And yes, I concur and know firsthand that there has been a very controlling mentality toward the choosing of marriage partners for young people, their employment choices and their childbearing in SC. Not in the CEC in general, but I think the mentality probably spread somewhat.

In peoples' experience, is this characteristic of most Cathedral congregations? I've heard this more than once from San Clemente folks, and it also seems to have crept into the Kansas City congregation.

I have not noticed this mentality in the Kansas City congregation either, so I am sceptical. I arrived at the shores of the CEC in 2004, and burned my boats on the beach, so I am not completely knowledgeable of what was on before that time.

Posted by: 1spirit Oct 10 2007, 12:38 PM

I was a member of Intercessor for 20 years (10 before CEC, 10 after) and that mentality is unique to the community at San Clemente. If that's how they want to raise their kids, fine--they can--- but push their community's more unusual ways on other smaller parishes would be a grave disservice.

I am now in a small church in the diocese of San Clemente and it always disturbs me when I see some of those "traits" migrating into my community. We have a brothers house, but it's small. I'm not worried about control issues, but watchful.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 10 2007, 12:53 PM

QUOTE

Just don't think that any of us in the CEC think everything is OK. Because of our commitment to one another and our communion, we are hanging in there. It is a tough road, and no doubt many will throw stones at us for having remained. Well I have to say, we need your prayer now more than ever.

My prayers are completely with you!

Posted by: Centurion Oct 10 2007, 01:25 PM

DotGuy, Firewheel, Mike, and others offering support. Thank you so much, it means a lot. It is very tough for us right now. The auto-reflex (anger??) is to leave, but haven't gotten much peace about that. However if after the HOB nothing of essence has changed, then we will have to take another hard look.

Epps is becoming a bishop. I thought it was Fr. Heniser from Advent in Carlsbad, CA.

Do we need more bishops? What could be a legitimate reason for this? More authority?

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 10 2007, 01:35 PM

You are very welcome!

QUOTE

Epps is becoming a bishop. I thought it was Fr. Heniser from Advent in Carlsbad, CA.

Do we need more bishops? What could be a legitimate reason for this? More authority?

Hey, maybe its because they've gotten rid of Randy and they need Epps to take the place of whomever is becoming the new "patriarch"!!!! 😞

That is probably a little optimistic though 😞

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 10 2007, 01:55 PM

QUOTE (Centurion @ Oct 10 2007, 02:25 PM)

DotGuy, Firewheel, Mike, and others offering support. Thank you so much, it means alot. It is very tough for us right now. The auto-reflex (anger??) is to leave, but haven't gotten much peace about that. However if after the HOB nothing of essence has changed, than we will have to take another hard look.

I mean it. As do the others who have offered prayers. Thanks for your comment. A current CEC priest told me "don't bother, we don't need your prayers."

QUOTE

Epps is becoming a bishop. I thought it was Fr. Heniser from Advent in Carlsbad, CA.

I actually heard both. The other news flash came by email a few moments ago. Anyone else know more about either?

QUOTE

Do we need more bishops? What could be a legitimate reason for this? More authority?

More votes? 😞

Take care.

Posted by: Centurion Oct 10 2007, 01:57 PM

Yes you may be right. I am hopeful.

I believe +Hines is next in line for Patriarchal succession.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 10 2007, 01:58 PM

QUOTE (Centurion @ Oct 10 2007, 02:57 PM)

Yes you may be right. I am hopeful.

I believe +Hines is next in line for Patriarchal succession.

Is there a succession protocol?

Posted by: Centurion Oct 10 2007, 02:00 PM

Nemo:

QUOTE

You are not alone, although there are those who are starting to lose hope. Please keep posting to encourage us to keep up our side of the struggle.

Don't lose hope, the HOB is what is important now. If they can do the right thing, all may pan out just fine.

Posted by: Centurion Oct 10 2007, 02:01 PM

QUOTE

Is there a succession protocol?

I am not sure. It just seems to be logical. Howard is out, so is Sly, so we got...Hines.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 10 2007, 02:07 PM

QUOTE

A current CEC priest told me "don't bother, we don't need your prayers."

That is horrible. A man that would make a comment like that is not fit for the priesthood.

QUOTE

I am not sure. It just seems to be logical. Howard is out, so is Sly, so we got...Hines.

I wasn't really a big fan of Sly anyways, and as you said, Howard is out. I don't know much about Hines. Might someone enlighten me?

Posted by: xcec Oct 10 2007, 02:49 PM

QUOTE (Centurion @ Oct 10 2007, 01:25 PM)

Epps is becoming a bishop. I thought it was Fr. Heniser from Advent in Carlsbad, CA.

Do we need more bishops? What could be a legitimate reason for this? More authority?

Epps is Canon to the Ordinary under John Holloway who had a pretty severe stroke and is on a long term recover path.

It makes sense that they need a bishop for the diocese that is able to perform the duties of a bishop and Epps is available.

Perhaps Holloway is going to retire for medical reasons.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 10 2007, 02:57 PM

YES! They need a good Hines BBQ here in the CEC (USA). That guy is no-nonsense! Very Orthodox, at least with his vestments. He wears a crown some times. ((Pretty cool.))

++He hasn't allowed ++Adler in since the Convocation in '04. BUT it looks like ++Adler has been invited by ++Hines after the upcoming Men's Retreat for the Diocese of San Clemente (which should be a real blast). No telling what's in store for ++him once ++he arrives??

Our prayers should be for ++Adler. He was once such a great man of God. I remember his compassion for the people of the Philippines. Once he visited them when they were forcible being held in their building (which someone was trying to take from the church). He gave them Communion through the barbed-wire. Sheep first, shepherd last. Ahh.. those were the days....



Smoke'nz Fatty-Natty - +++++NSV ((an Archbrother to the world man))

**The following has been a paid announcement by Nat Sherman and does not necessarily reflect the views of the CEC, ICCEC, ++Adler, Mike Baldwin or President Bush, but I think they are funny as hell! If the reader considers this post to cause offence, then s/he should smoke'nz FAT one, Nat Sherman that is!

Posted by: Ancient Neophyte Oct 10 2007, 03:10 PM

Curious as to who I am, eh Mike! Perhaps the Lord will reveal it to you in a dream!

Nat, giving this discussion a nice bit of comic relief! Pass that fatty natty to the left hand side!

Posted by: seraph Oct 10 2007, 03:15 PM

It appears Natty the Fatty has been drinking again!

Scotch and Cigars anyone?

Mr Sherman u seem to know a lot, perhaps u r too close to have a proper perspective on SC??

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 10 2007, 03:16 PM

Now to a more serious message:

I think that many of the people in the CEC are hoping and trusting that the Lord will not abandon them. They want a miracle because they still believe in the original vision of the Church. By faith, they believe that judgment begins in the household of God!

It is so easy to be skeptical about all these things. To ask, "Why did they stay?" Or, "Don't they see?" Or, "Why should we stay?" Now, I know of many who are drones, blind followers, ones gripped by the spell of those with inflated personality disorders. However, there are others who stay because they believe God called them. It is not about making a choice per se, but rather about hearing and believing and trusting God. It is so easy to rationalize these matters. BUT, maybe that is being too charismatic. Hearing from God, imagine that. -NSV



Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 10 2007, 03:20 PM

Twat was that seraph? I am not too close but once was...

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 10 2007, 03:27 PM

QUOTE (Ancient Neophyte @ Oct 10 2007, 04:10 PM)

Curious as to who I am, eh Mike! Perhaps the Lord will reveal it to you in a dream!

Nat, giving this discussion a nice bit of comic relief! Pass that fatty natty to the left hand side!

AN,

Listening in on my phone conversation with Mr. Sherman, the archbrother?

Thanks to both of you for injecting a little levity. You make me LOL.

As to the commercial endorsement of Nat Sherman's posts...well, I am happy to have my name listed as concurring with the views of my archbrother, Nat. You may now move my name out of it's current juxtaposition btwn ++him and "he (hah)"

Pass the fatty.

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 10 2007, 03:36 PM

ah Mr Sherman you are not that close now. And when did you leave? How are those still in the CEC to 'hear from God' as you propose? A flash from the skies??

And what if nothing changes at the CEC, then how will they hear?

It sounds like you are backtracking to me.

Posted by: **Crowded House** Oct 10 2007, 04:15 PM

Seraph I get what Nat Sherman is trying to say (-- Nat Sherman if that is your real name - dude you can change name, I know someone who has done that!).

Nat is making a good point, although it does appear he is making an exit strategy of some sort - if nothing changes he will still stay!

Interesting to see how that will pan out.

Posted by: **Popeye** Oct 10 2007, 04:26 PM

Regarding the notion of a succession protocol for the office of Patriarch:

(1) there is no "heir apparent"

(2) there IS a canonical procedure, which is seen by many as antiquated

(3) Bates has stated in the past that the establishment of the office was a mistake and ought not be continued after the current holder is no longer in office (whether he still believes that, I don't know, but that has been his stated position).

Regarding the election of Epps: He's going to replace Bishop John Holloway.

I am what I am.

Posted by: **stlouismb** Oct 10 2007, 04:28 PM

QUOTE (Crowded House @ Oct 10 2007, 05:15 PM)

Seraph I get what Nat Sherman is trying to say (-- Nat Sherman if that is your real name - dude you can change name, I know someone who has done that!).



Just don't use someone else's (name)...please.

QUOTE

Nat is making a good point, although it does appear he is making an exit strategy of some sort - if nothing changes he will still stay!

Did you mean to say he will leave?

QUOTE

Interesting to see how that will pan out.

Indeed!

Posted by: Crowded House Oct 10 2007, 04:35 PM

QUOTE

"Nat is making a good point, although it does appear he is making an exit strategy of some sort - if nothing changes he will still stay!"

Did you mean to say he will leave?

No it appears that Nat Sherman is saying he will stay, regardless of what happens at the HOB. Remember, the charismatic "hearing from God" always goes before reason, common sense etc.

He says "the people in the CEC are hoping and trusting that the Lord will not abandon them." and "they want a miracle". So if that miracle doesn't happen, he falls back to "hearing from God" abandoned or not.

Soylent Green!

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 10 2007, 04:35 PM

QUOTE (Popeye @ Oct 10 2007, 05:26 PM)

(2) there IS a canonical procedure, which is seen by many as antiquated

Which is? Takes effect how?

QUOTE

(3) Bates has stated in the past that the establishment of the office was a mistake and ought not be continued after the current holder is no longer in office (whether he still believes that, I don't know, but that has been his stated position).

Any documentation where he expresses that? Just curious to see how that will pan out.

QUOTE

Regarding the election of Epps: He's going to replace Bishop John Holloway.

IOW it is true, Epps has been nominated. Any word on Fr. Heniser (sp?) as mentioned in a previous post?

QUOTE

I am what I am.

Don't you mean to say "I yam what I yam"?

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 10 2007, 04:37 PM

QUOTE (Crowded House @ Oct 10 2007, 05:35 PM)

QUOTE

"Nat is making a good point, although it does appear he is making an exit strategy of some sort - if nothing changes he will still stay!"

Did you mean to say he will leave?

No it appears that Nat Sherman is saying he will stay, regardless of what happens at the HOB. Remember, the charismatic "hearing from God" always goes before reason, common sense etc.

He says "the people in the CEC are hoping and trusting that the Lord will not abandon them." and "they want a miracle". So if that miracle doesn't happen, he falls back to "hearing from God" abandoned or not.

Soylent Green!

Nat? Any clarification?

What about others?

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 10 2007, 04:50 PM

Haven't checked the blogs yet today... ahhh.. Crowded House 😊

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 10 2007, 04:53 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 10 2007, 03:15 PM)

It appears Natty the Fatty has been drinking again!

Scotch and Cigars anyone?

Mr Sherman u seem to know a lot, perhaps u r too close to have a proper perspective on SC??

Sacramental wine anyone? Or is it fruit punch. Drink up! -NSV



Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 10 2007, 04:55 PM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 10 2007, 03:36 PM)

How are those still in the CEC to 'hear from God' as you propose? A flash from the skies??

And what if nothing changes at the CEC, then how will they hear?

And some will say it thundered... -NSV



Posted by: Guest Oct 10 2007, 05:43 PM

QUOTE (stlouismb @ Oct 10 2007, 04:35 PM)

QUOTE (Popeye @ Oct 10 2007, 05:26 PM)

(2) there IS a canonical procedure, which is seen by many as antiquated

Which is? Takes effect how?

QUOTE

(3) Bates has stated in the past that the establishment of the office was a mistake and ought not be continued after the current holder is no longer in office (whether he still believes that, I don't know, but that has been his stated position).

Any documentation where he expresses that? Just curious to see how that will pan out.

QUOTE

Regarding the election of Epps: He's going to replace Bishop John Holloway.

IOW it is true, Epps has been nominated. Any word on Fr. Heniser (sp?) as mentioned in a previous post?

QUOTE

I am what I am.

Don't you mean to say "I yam what I yam"?

The Canonical Procedure:

Representatives from the Patriarch's Council, the U.S. Primate's Council, the Archbishop's Council, the Bishop's Council and the St. Michael's Rector's Council meet for prayer and decisionmaking; spelled out in the canons. Won't be followed at all if Adler steps down or is removed. Firstly, because no one elected is going to relocate to SC, and secondly, because the office will be dead in the water anyway.

Bates' statement: not in writing, in verbage.

Re: yam: I sweet potato that I sweet potato.

Posted by: Popeye Oct 10 2007, 05:44 PM

Oops...above is by me. Popeye. I yam what I yam.

Posted by: Crowded House Oct 10 2007, 05:51 PM

QUOTE

the office will be dead in the water anyway

What do you mean by that? Also you say "no one elected is going to relocate to SC" why is that a prerequisite?

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 10 2007, 05:58 PM

I understand a new bible is being mustered: The CEC Study Bible. It is being published by Etch A Sketch. -NSV



Posted by: Celina Oct 10 2007, 06:03 PM

I guess its all a big joke to you isn't it Nat Sherman?

Well for us in the Cec its not.

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 10 2007, 06:04 PM

QUOTE

What do you mean by that? Also you say "no one elected is going to relocate to SC" why is that a prerequisite?

Well the office of "patriarch" is a joke in the first with the CEC is so small. And Adler has made a joke of it.

I don't think that moving to SC would be a prerequisite, and if it was it would be a dumb one. The only official prerequisite I know of is the blue rimmed glasses! 🤪

Posted by: Dot Guy Oct 10 2007, 06:05 PM

QUOTE

I guess its all a big joke to you isn't it Nat Sherman?

Well for us in the Cec its not.

I thought it was funny! Though, probably not conducive to healing. I have made a few jokes here and there too, forgive me if it has offended any of you.

Posted by: stlouismb Oct 10 2007, 06:26 PM

Humorous posts that contain humor only, might be better on the Humor Forum Topic here: http://z6.invisionfree.com/On_Our_Way_Home/index.php?showtopic=42. But, if there is a shred of seriousness, please be at least mindful of how difficult this situation is to many both in and out of the CEC.

A little humor is helpful in a discussion like this IMHO. Which is why I summoned Ned (Stupid) Flanders.

I think, Celina, that if you read btwn the lines of Nat, he indicates that he too is still in the CEC, and still "hopeful"/ I hope that helps.

Posted by: Celina Oct 10 2007, 06:38 PM

Yes thanks Mike u r a good sport.

Notice still Nat hasn't answered the request to clarify his curious exit strategy/philosophy.

"Hearing God" trumps all? What does that mean "hearing God"? Especially in a situation such as this. Seriously.

Posted by: Just Readin' Oct 10 2007, 07:45 PM

2nd email sent out today.....

Bishop David?

It seems that I am soon to be made a bishop. It is a position which I have not sought, for which I have not campaigned, and, in all truth—at least for the past few years---have not desired. All this has come about not because I have come to a place where my leadership abilities are profound and undeniable or because my accomplishments are such that they cannot be ignored. Quite the opposite, in fact. It has come about because our bishop, The Most Reverend John Holloway, age 53 and the father of four, suffered a massive stroke in early June and has been severely disabled since that time. As in war, when a commander is wounded or killed, someone has to be promoted so that the battle may continue and the enemy defeated. So it is with me. Our commander is wounded and I am to receive a battlefield promotion. Such was the decision of our American House of Bishops in Orlando last Monday.

The good news is all this is that, in our communion, bishops, with the exception of retired or auxiliary bishops, must also be pastors of their own church. This means that I continue to serve as the rector, or senior pastor, of the church I helped to found over eleven years ago. I will still be in the pulpit nearly every Sunday morning, will be visiting the hospitals to pray for the sick, will be blessing the new born babies within minutes after they are born, and will be teaching the scriptures and being involved in the life of the parish. I will even be continuing to write articles for the newspaper and, occasionally, for magazines and journals. I still desire to meet with the other clergy from different denominations for breakfast each Wednesday because it is enjoyable and they

have been a great support to me in that past.

Some things will change. I am in the process of resigning from some committees, positions, and work groups and there will need to be greater delegation of duties and responsibilities in the church and in the diocese. I have already stepped down as a chaplain in the Georgia Defense Force and from chaplain duties at the Fulton County Police Academy. There will be other adjustments as well. One thing I desperately need to do is to finish my doctoral paper at Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry so, somewhere, I need to carve out the time and complete a long overdue process.

It seems strange to me that I will have a new designation. Whereas, at present, I am "Father David Epps," or "The Reverend Father David Epps," I will soon be "The Most Reverend David Epps," People who know me are aware that I am not very "reverend" and am certainly not "the most reverend." The people in my church will most likely continue to call me "Father David," a designation with which I am most comfortable since it conveys relationship rather than position.

I will be the "acting bishop" of the Mid-South Diocese which includes Tennessee and Georgia. I suppose I will have to cheer for the Bulldogs now (except when they play Tennessee). When, in the grace and mercy of God, Bishop Holloway returns to health and resumes his duties, then I will stand aside and serve as his auxiliary or assisting bishop. Until that time, I will do my best to do my duty to those who are engaged in the battle. My family and congregation are excited about all this. I am less so. I have been in the ministry a long time and served in a similar position, with less responsibility, in another denomination so I am well aware that much work, much anguish, and much heartache and heartbreak is ahead. There will be good times as well, but I'm not certain that they make up for the pain ones sees and experiences.

When I was elected last Monday, the bishops gave me the news and then apologized for having elected me. There was no applause, no backslaps, no cheers of congratulations. The moment was sober because the challenges ahead are daunting. I am, of course, honored and humbled. And, for the foreseeable future, there will no funds available to carry out the work—this promotion will actually come at a cost to my church and me. I will be consecrated in November, the Lord willing. I feel intensely unworthy which, in truth, I am. But I will do my duty. Lord have mercy. Pray for me.

Father David Epps is the founding pastor of Christ the King Church

4881 Hwy 34 E., Sharpsburg, GA 30277 between Peachtree City and Newnan.

Services are held Sundays at 8:00 and 10:00 a.m. He is also the Vicar of Christ the King Church in Champaign, IL. He may be contacted at frepps@ctkcec.org <<mailto:frepps@ctkcec.org>> . The church has a website at www.ctkcec.org <<http://www.ctkcec.org>> .

Posted by: Centurion Oct 10 2007, 07:54 PM

Thanks for posting that email.

Was hoping news about some more pressing matters would be forthcoming from the HOB.....

Posted by: xcec Oct 10 2007, 10:36 PM

QUOTE (Celina @ Oct 10 2007, 06:38 PM)

Yes thanks Mike u r a good sport.

Notice still Nat hasn't answered the request to clarify his curious exit strategy/philosophy.

"Hearing God" trumps all? What does that mean "hearing God"? Especially in a situation such as this. Seriously.

I hate to be the bearer of bad news for you Celina (as seems apparent) but he probably meant in the vein of HearingGod as in ADler "hearing God" tell him his next wife would be the wife of one of his priests and then carrying a picture of her around in his wallet.

Sorry, but that is how I interpret his statement "hearing God."

Posted by: Celina Oct 10 2007, 11:02 PM

Hi Xcec

Yes you may be right, there is that danger for it to become very subjective. Perhaps it comes down to accountability and confirmation of one's "hearing from God." If you are in submission, esoteric "words" are not given much validity.

It sounds like you speak from experience, and do I detect a bit of anger/ disappointment, if I may ask?

So how do you now approach hearing from God? Have you seen abuses of it in your own life?

Posted by: xcec Oct 10 2007, 11:14 PM

QUOTE (Celina @ Oct 10 2007, 11:02 PM)

Hi Xcec

Yes you may be right, there is that danger for it to become very subjective. Perhaps it comes down to accountability and confirmation of one's "hearing from God." If you are in submission, esoteric "words" are not given much validity.

It sounds like you speak from experience, and do I detect a bit of anger/ disappointment, if I may ask?

So how do you now approach hearing from God? Have you seen abuses of it in your own life?

No Celina, not really angry or disappointed anymore; simply stunned that this is so prevalent in the church at the highest levels -

and public no less. AND it's happening again only a year later than the last time.

I say it simply should not be in leadership of the church, CEC or otherwise, no matter whether "men with clay feet" or not.

Paul dealt forcefully and severely with the sins of those in leadership and perhaps we need to do the same today. There is no room for MORE offense to Christ caused by His own in leadership. Many parables also deal with sin in leadership issues and the consequences.

Are really loving these men who sin so severely and publicly by allowing them to retain their positions of "power" over the flock? Don't we damn them even more with millstones around their neck by allowing them to stay as priest's, bishops and patriarch's?? Where are those who protect the flock??

I seem to remember Malcolm smith having to give up his bishopric for divorcing his wife and marrying another. How does Adler stay in power with no penalty??

I left the CEC in the first round and am glad to not be in the second round. I have had a year to have the scales removed form my eyes and now that I can actually see, I am sad at the sight.

So no. No more disappointment or anger. Simply incredulousness. (Is that even a word???)

I sign this now with eyes wide open...

xcec

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 02:18 AM

Hi Xcec

thanks for the post.

I see your point about becoming enablers - certainly not good.

So how do you deal with issues at your church now? Are you sure there are no secrets or any other problems? Sin can manifest in many different ways. How would you find out and what would you do about it? Leave again? Then what?

I hope you understand these are real questions I wrestle with.

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 02:35 AM

Xcec - as a follow up:

now that your eyes are wide open and with a year of 20/20 vision, what is your advise to us who are still in the CEC? If we stay, we call for changes and how is this brought about? What kind of changes? Who can we trust to bring these about? If we leave, whereto? Where is the safe harbor?

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 07:25 AM

QUOTE

now that your eyes are wide open and with a year of 20/20 vision, what is your advise to us who are still in the CEC? If we stay, we call for changes and how is this brought about? What kind of changes? Who can we trust to bring these about? If we leave, whereto? Where is the safe harbor

Hi Celine:

I'm in the CEC and with no blinders. Very concerned about all that has happened in the last several years, the church's response to it and of course this latest drama...hard to say how it will all end up! It becomes harder to be inspired when the people who lead you seem to dissappoint you, hurt others and deny it all in God's name !

Here are my two cents:

NO changes whatsoever will come about in the CEC unless clergy who love the vision and the LAITY who finance it with their tithes and offerings demand it. Yes, there is very little room for any voice to be heard other than those in the inner circle in the HOB, Patriarch's council, even your local rector's councils... BUT people eventually respond to letters , email, calls AND when the funds begin to stop...they try to motivate, rail, threaten , call down God's wrath and..... then they litsen!

Safe harbor..that is so funny!!!! 🙄 Some would say home to Rome....of course not all altar boys would agree. I guess with Episcopalians you know what you get...but then again...trading a dysfunctional, quasi fundamentalist sinking boat for a liberal sinking ship is not a great choice. Orthodoxy is nice...for chanting and incense and if you like museums...but imho same challenges...bishops bully...laity litsen! If you get a nut in power...hard to get rid of!

I do not think any communion is completely safe as long as there are people running it. MUCH LESS SAFE when all do not have a say and there is no opennness or accountability. Wherever you are you need to be responsible for your life, the safety of your family and DEMAND accountability from your leaders at all levels.

Good luck 🙄

seraph

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 07:39 AM

[QUOTE]What kind of changes?[/QUOTE]

You are kidding...right???

If you are a lay person....

When was the last time you actually had a say on who was a member of the rector's council? Is there any voice of the laity, or are all from the rector's buddylist? Is that a healthy thing????

When was the last time you actually found out what was said at a HOB or patriarch's council meeting? Who is your voice there? Did you have any input on who goes? Are your interests, concerns and dreams reflected or even voiced there???

In all the crises of the last two years DID ANYONE LISTEN TO YOUR PLEA OR PAIN? Were you asked to help discern a solution???? If your church had...where do you tell that and to whom??? NO convention to send delegates to, no chance for laity to send or elect a representative to at least listen in on the councils...Who decided that and why????

Did you approve the budget for the church? Or help decide what the mission priorities for the church or your parish are? Did anyone even ask you? Are the clergy in your church paid? Do they have insurance? Who decided that????...its the money you gave! Have you ever seen a financial statement for your parish, diocese missions, the national church....EVER?????

If you have trouble with your rector...or bishop...where do you turn? Is there a process in place for your grievances and concerns? It took 4 years for any attention to be given to members of Church of the Messiah in Florida about problems with their bishop...in the end he was deposed BUT NOT BECAUSE OF THE problems the parish had been having!

These are just a few observations....So then friend...what changes do you feel are needed??? 🙄

seraph

Posted by: Nemo Oct 11 2007, 08:12 AM

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 11 2007, 07:39 AM)

These are just a few observations....So then friend...what changes do you feel are needed??? 🙄

Our current government is not the only possible episcopal model: http://pncc.org/who_structure.htm

A little more lay oversight through elections would be a good thing, given the current circumstances, and not necessarily unprecedented. Even the Pope was elected by the laity until 1059.

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 08:42 AM

QUOTE (Nemo @ Oct 11 2007, 08:12 AM)

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 11 2007, 07:39 AM)

These are just a few observations....So then friend...what changes do you feel are needed??? 🙄

Our current government is not the only possible episcopal model: http://pncc.org/who_structure.htm

A little more lay oversight through elections would be a good thing, given the current circumstances, and not necessarily unprecedented. Even the Pope was elected by the laity until 1059.

I agree there are other models which could, in our context, be healthier....certainly could not be any worse than what we have had so far!!!! PNCC, ECUSA, even the CEEC have a good mix in which all orders of ministry are involved to an extent in governance and there are checks and balances for accountability.

The CEC model "Government of God" and all that jazz....is way too.....*top/clergy/bishop friendly.... oligarchy/good old boyz* heaven. If all people were extremely holy or robots it would be great...given our limitations unworkable. 🙄

I do think that the decision makers/ powers that be in the CEC are way too attached to their precious consensus government (aka: what I say goes... God said so) to allow major changes...! Unless, this crisis brings about changes at the top...that could be a catalyst for people to demand real changes and maybe see some happen...or not! Time will tell!

blessings

seraph

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 10:09 AM

Hi Seraph.

Thank you so much for your thoughtful response.

I wish I was kidding. I am at a loss.

Perhaps what we, the laity of the CEC, should do is to join and put together a Manifesto. A letter of Demands.

As it is today, our individual grievances/needs/rights get lost in the shuffle. As a result nothing happens. Nothing changes as frustration grows.

What do you think? Time for action?

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 10:16 AM

Definitely time for action. Don't let up. Keep speaking the truth. Keep pounding on the door. Insist on being heard. Insist on answers. Yes, yes, yes!! Stand up for what is good and right and do whatever is in your power to do to see that the Church becomes more whole.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 11 2007, 10:18 AM

Oops ... sorry that last remark was from me. I just forgot to log in.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 11 2007, 10:28 AM

QUOTE (Nemo @ Oct 11 2007, 08:12 AM)

QUOTE (seraph @ Oct 11 2007, 07:39 AM)

These are just a few observations....So then friend...what changes do you feel are needed???



Our current government is not the only possible episcopal model: http://pncc.org/who_structure.htm

I wish we could look more like these guys, in terms of governance. I agree with all the good ol' boys club comments, seen it first hand for years. That's why I am so cynical. -NSV

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 10:39 AM

Firewheel you said

QUOTE

do whatever is in your power

That is just it, as individuals, we have absolutely no voice!

Nat Sherman - are you willing to do something about it?

Let's unite and let our voices be heard. For the love of our people, our children, our leaders, our communion!

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 10:53 AM

Nat - that is right we are growing cynical, frustrated - losing trust and confidence in our leaders. What good is that!? We can either leave and say "bye bye" to the mess, or if we stay we need to do something about it. We have an obligation to do something, don't we?

We talk about making changes and holding them to accountability etc. etc. but what does it all mean if we are not willing to **do** anything about it?

I say we organize a group of CEC laity, collaborate online, form a "demand letter" and present it to our leaders. We **MUST** mean business.

UNITED WE STAND

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 10:54 AM

QUOTE (Celina @ Oct 11 2007, 10:39 AM)

Firewheel you said

QUOTE

do whatever is in your power

That is just it, as individuals, we have absolutely no voice!

Nat Sherman - are you willing to do something about it?

Let's unite and let our voices be heard. For the love of our people, our children, our leaders, our communion!

start in your parish....there you are not just a number but a person and have more power than you think...

seraph

Posted by: **seraph** Oct 11 2007, 10:58 AM

QUOTE (Celina @ Oct 11 2007, 10:53 AM)

I say we organize a group of CEC laity, collaborate online, form a "demand letter" and present it to our leaders. We MUST mean business.

UNITED WE STAND

Until HOB and the PC is over there is not much you can say or do...! You will be accused of jumping the gun, not trusting they will deliberate and "hear God" for the Communion.

After that is said and done.....if its all business as usual thenyour idea is a good one....I'll sign...

Demand letter sounds a bit much...concern or petition letter may be easier to swallow....

blessings

seraph

Posted by: **Nemo** Oct 11 2007, 10:59 AM

QUOTE (Celina @ Oct 11 2007, 10:39 AM)

Let's unite and let our voices be heard. For the love of our people, our children, our leaders, our communion!

OK -- What do you want to say?

?

Posted by: **Ancient Neophyte** Oct 11 2007, 10:59 AM

I pity all of you! Why waist your time with this floundering communion? See it for what it truly is, has been, and will continue to be... a "bridge"! You all came from somewhere and hopefully you know where you are going. This communion will not be new Rome! Never has been, never will be. It is not the "Western expression of Orthodoxy" never has been, never will be! It is not the "fastest growing denomination in the world". And for those of you plan on sticking around for the next 30 years to "stick it out", you may find that the captains of this fairy will end up leading all of you to the "safe harbor" whether you like it or not.

Posted by: **Nat Sherman** Oct 11 2007, 11:17 AM

I have had more personal spiritual growth in the CEC than anywhere else. Some, in fact most of it has been hard, but hard doesn't mean bad. In fact it has been very good! I personally refuse to put my hopes or the hopes of my family in the hands of men. I will never do this, NEVER. I must trust God through men but I know that men will ALWAYS let you down, always. Why? Because they are men!

Over and over again I have seen God bring something amazing out of what men meant for harm, or control. My life and the fruit of it are based on my faithfulness and the Lord's faithfulness; not because of the faithlessness of others.

Like the brothers of Joseph in Gen 50:

"Do not be afraid, for am I in the place of God? ((Right where God wanted him.)) But as for you, you meant evil against me; but God meant it for good, in order to bring it about as it is this day, to save many people alive."

What is most pathetic is that people cannot trust God to DO something. They make their choices and then expect God to put His rubber stamp upon it. Force His hand, if you will. Did our God cease from being the Awesome God, He is able? If you don't trust the Scriptures than we cannot even have a forum of discussion.

And as for my "exit strategy" I wont move anywhere until I (personally) hear from God. Not from a Rector's Council or a Bishop, but God. And should He choose to speak through those souces; at the end of the day, I am the one who will be held accountable for me and my house. I still have to hear Him! -NSV



"The power of accurate observation is commonly called cynicism by those who have not got it." - G. Bernard Shaw

Posted by: **Celina** Oct 11 2007, 11:26 AM

Nemo:

I would have these questions addressed, in the words of Seraph:

QUOTE

When was the last time you actually had a say on who was a member of the rector's council? Is there any voice of the laity, or are all from the rector's buddylist?

When was the last time you actually found out what was said at a HOB or patriarch's council meeting? Who is your voice there? Did you have any input on who goes? Are your interests, concerns and dreams reflected or even voiced there???

Were you asked to help discern a solution???? If your church had...where do you tell that and to whom??? NO convention to send delegates to, no chance for laity to send or elect a representative to at least listen in on the councils...Who decided that and why????

Did you approve the budget for the church? Or help decide what the mission priorities for the church or your parish are? Did anyone even ask you? Are the clergy in your church paid? Do they have insurance? Who decided that????...its the money you gave! Have you ever seen a financial statement for your parish, diocese missions, the national church....EVER????

If you have trouble with your rector...or bishop...where do you turn? Is there a process in place for your grievances and concerns?

VERY LEGITIMATE QUESTIONS IN MY OPINION

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 11 2007, 11:29 AM

Just let me encourage those who remain in the CEC to be faithful to the teachings of Scripture and what the Scripture says ought to be the life of a minister, a deacon, a bishop.

Don't let the fear of the outcome dissuade you from making your petitions and requests known.

For the sake of the Church, for the sake of your children, speak the truth.

It's painful. It's not fun. But God will honor it, and God will give you the grace.

Your children will thank you.

Been there and lived to tell,
Firewheel

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 11 2007, 11:31 AM

One other important note:

Faith without works is dead. So I am not suggesting that we sit on our butts. We must be ready for action and ready to respond. We must be the moral and ethical compass. Maybe even the John Baptist in the situation, without fear. I will confront and even physically assault the Patriarch of the CEC if God told me to do this, and I believe I can hear that from Him because I am willing too. Sometimes it takes a real human slapinz to affect a real paradigm shift. We must stop being fools. It is not their church unless we allow it to be. We are the Church. It says so in da book. And I've read it, and Jesus wins at the end of it. -NSV



Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 11:33 AM

Nat you said

QUOTE

Force His hand, if you will. Did our God cease from being the Awesome God, He is able? If you don't trust the Scriptures than we cannot even have a forum of discussion.

Those of us who have stayed **can hardly be accused of being impatient**. God is able, yes indeed. But could He be calling us to attend to our OBLIGATION to demand what is right and true from our leaders?

Could it be that in our neglect we have become willing participants with just as much blood on our hands?

So now we are "forcing God's hands"????

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 11:39 AM

QUOTE

Faith without works is dead. So I am not suggesting that we sit on our butts. We must be ready for action and ready to respond.

So let's unite, collaborate to form a petition letter. Let's get signatures. Then let's present it to them! HOW ELSE WILL THEY HEAR FROM US?????

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 11 2007, 11:44 AM

Ahhh, is that what He is telling us to do? Each man must hear this for himself. Your petition should be with God. You sound pissed, you should share that with Him, be in His face, like I am with it. I come **BOLDLY** in the Throne Room with this one!

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 11 2007, 11:48 AM

I'm not trying to amass an army or anything. Honest, I'm not.

But, as one who (after literal and intense prayer and fasting and numerous drafts and revisions) made my voice known, I can tell you that I am glad I did.

For me to have stood by, knowing what I knew, having experienced what I experienced, and not to have said anything, would have been a clear-cut case of enabling.

For me to have stood by, knowing what I knew, having experienced what I experienced, and not to have said anything, would have been setting an example for my children that I was not willing to set.

Not with malice or mockery, but with a heavy heart, I made my voice known. And I encourage you who feel so led to do the same. Come what may.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 11 2007, 11:51 AM

Nat ... I'm not arguing with you. I'm just giving my perspective. I can appreciate what you're saying.

But, what's so wrong with people saying "Guys, there's a problem. What are you gonna do about it?". Why are you so wary of that?

Even in the closest of relationships ... ie marriage ... there oughta be room for that kind of expression.

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 11:52 AM

Guys:

For those of us who are still in the CEC and, despite 3rd degree burns love convergence worship and the vision we felt brought us here... Priests and lay people alike....reality check:

The CEC US is not a monster organization, not wealthy, no grand real estate, no endowments, no insurance in most places, no retirement funds. It is a mom , pop operation held together by the tithes of a mere 4000-8,000 people of whom a full 25-30% are clergy.....

How does an unfair system without accountability get enforced in that setting???? Because we let it!!!!!! Most people in the church I attend are in ministry as volunteers..lay and clergy alike...getting fired is no biggie when you are not paid for what you do...it is very sillynothing to lose ...no fear!

Change at this stage is possible...its not the same as in rich ECUSA or the RCC where mmost of the cards are held by those with the power and the bucks!!! In our reality ...no bucks, no authority other than the one you allow and fund!! you dont tithe ...they don't eat! It should not be a fearful thing to politely insist on an evaluation of the systems in our Communion and ask for changes where needed.

Of course I do hold out hope the HOB and PC willcome out with a striking revelation and implement sweeping changes....for the better...maybe???

blessings

seraph

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 11:55 AM

sorry ...it is definitely NOT a mom's operation....more like a pop and dysfunctional uncles.... ! It is a nickel and dime operation...though "God owns the cattle on a thouthand hills" and all that!

blessings

seraph

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 11:58 AM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 11 2007, 11:44 AM)

Ahhh, is that what He is telling us to do? Each man must hear this for himself. Your petition should be with God. You sound pissed, you should share that with Him, be in His face, like I am with it. I come **BOLDLY** in the Throne Room with this one!

faith without works is dead....done praying then be doin!

Posted by: Nemo Oct 11 2007, 12:05 PM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 11 2007, 11:48 AM)

But, as one who (after literal and intense prayer and fasting and numerous drafts and revisions) made my voice known, I can tell you that I am glad I did.

And then what happened?

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 11 2007, 11:31 AM)

.

QUOTE

I will confront and [B]if God told me to do this, and I believe I can hear that from Him because I am willing too

🙄 Are you in any way related to Harmon? Regardless, I'd have to challenge your assumption on this. To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome. Perhaps you haven't learned as much as you think. Not trying to insult you, just inject a healthy CHECK. Writing letters, verbally confronting and even walking out are all perfectly acceptable ways to petition for change. Please leave the physical threats out of the mix. Thanks.

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 12:07 PM

Nat I am with Firewheel:

QUOTE

But, what's so wrong with people saying "Guys, there's a problem. What are you gonna do about it?". Why are you so way of that?

I cannot stand by idly any longer. I feel the Lord is telling me to take a stand. I feel obligated. Its either that or leave. To stay and do nothing will turn me into mangled mess - spiritually, mentally perhaps even physically.

Nat I am not calling for a mutiny (is that what you are concerned about??) but for us to put our voices together and deliver a signed petition.

Seraph is right :

QUOTE

In our reality ...no bucks, no authority other than the one you allow and fund!! you dont tithe ...they don't eat! It should not be a fearful thing to politely insist on an evaluation of the systems in our Communion and ask for changes where needed

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 11 2007, 12:13 PM

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 11 2007, 11:51 AM)

But, what's so wrong with people saying "Guys, there's a problem. What are you gonna do about it?". Why are you so way of that?

Even in the closest of relationships ... ie marriage ... there oughta be room for that kind of expression.

You are right on! I am holding up a banner that reads, "**Hear from God**"

One thing I am very grateful for is that my spiritual father has taught me to hear from God. He will not hear for me, or tell me what to do. His prayer is that I would hear.

In SC it is very different, you are told what to think and do by your 'shepherd.' For, "He has made us to be a kingdom and priests..." We must not rely upon others to hear for us. This is out of wack! -NSV



Posted by: **Celina** Oct 11 2007, 12:14 PM

NEMO:

QUOTE

QUOTE (Firewheel @ Oct 11 2007, 11:48 AM)

But, as one who (after literal and intense prayer and fasting and numerous drafts and revisions) made my voice known, I can tell you that I am glad I did.

And then what happened?

The cynic in me says: nothing happened!

But at least she did what she needed to do, nothing happened, and consequently she and her husband left.

Isn't that right, Firewheel, isn't that what happened?

Posted by: **Nat Sherman** Oct 11 2007, 12:28 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

Are you in any way related to Harmon? Regardless, I'd have to challenge your assumption on this. To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome. Perhaps you haven't learned as much as you think. Not trying to insult you, just inject a healthy CHECK. Writing letters, verbally confronting and even walking out are all perfectly acceptable ways to petition for change. Please leave the physical threats out of the mix. Thanks.

Then you don't know the scriptures my friend. ((Perhaps you could point out the scripture, my good reverend father??) You should relax a bit. Chill, as they say...

My point was that I am willing to do whatever the Lord tells me to do. That is part of hearing God. Randy was a close friend and the man I used to know would do the same. -NSV



"The only rules that really matter are these: what a man can do and what a man can't." - Jack Sparrow, Pirate

"the kingdom of heaven has been forcefully advancing, and forceful men lay hold of it." -Jesus, Lord

"Faith is a foot forward action." - Miles Davis (just kidding)

Posted by: **Tony aka: the Baloney Man** Oct 11 2007, 12:33 PM

Good Afternoon all,

This has been very interesting read. I am sorry you all are hurting and feeling duped (my interpretation). I know that is what I felt last year after I left the CEC. As many of you know that I came Home To Rome back at Easter of this year and am glad to be in a much bigger place where I can blend in to the wood work if you know what I mean..... I am much more at peace and feel a lot safer place.. Thanks Be to God 😊

All in all my heart goes out to you all and I will continue to follow your dialogue and continue to pray for you as you move forward from here. Lord in your Mercy Hear Our Prayer 🙏

Feel free to contact me via PM if you need to vent or a listening ear. Bless you all in your Journey through this new round. Again I am praying for you all...

Blessing to all Tony 🙏

Posted by: **Firewheel** Oct 11 2007, 12:35 PM

And then what happened?

Well, we got a psuedo apology. "We're sorry you were offended" kind of apology.

And promises of a face to face visit. Which never happened.

And some who are still in leadership in the CEC, behind the scenes, emailed me with more heartfelt responses. But, only privately.

And, we left.

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 11 2007, 12:41 PM

Celina:

I'm not sure what you're saying. "Nothing happened". I'm not sure what that means.

Enlighten me.

Firewheel

Posted by: Firewheel Oct 11 2007, 12:42 PM

Oh, I get it. (Sorry)

I guess if you read my previous post you'll see that basically you're right. Nothing happened.

If nothing means a pseudo apology and a face to face visit that never happened and some "under the stole" comments from leadership to address my concerns.

You're right.

Nothing happened.

And we could no longer stay.

Posted by: Nat Sherman Oct 11 2007, 12:44 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

Regardless, I'd have to challenge your assumption on this. To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome. Perhaps you haven't learned as much as you think. Not trying to insult you, just inject a healthy CHECK. Writing letters, verbally confronting and even walking out are all perfectly acceptable ways to petition for change. Please leave the physical threats out of the mix. Thanks.

Doubtless you will get holy and say, he without sin, cast the first stone...

But that doesn't change the fact the physical altercation can be of the Lord. You probably have an issue with spanking children too. Although I hope not...

STONE anyone, confess first (good Catholics), then lopez.

Keep smiling! -NSV

Posted by: CEC Guest Oct 11 2007, 12:47 PM

So on the 8th "Jim" asked a question about confidentiality and secrecy that has had me thinking. Why because it comes down to an all-knowing God and fallible men. I found it very interesting that the RCC's "Catechism of the Catholic Church" says the following:

2511 "The sacramental seal is inviolable" (CIC, can.983 ss 1) Professional secrets must be kept. Confidences prejudicial to another are not to be divulged.

No axe to grind here. Just a thought to inject as we each wrestle with our understanding and response to how God chooses to enact His government, in the Church, on Earth. I choose to let God be God (as it seems nearly all posting here do as well) while constantly seeking to hear HIM and obey. I agree with Nat it is my responsibility to hear...I'll add...to choose life (Gen) daily. And thus the hard part of the thought...God is certainly big enough and I small enough that there are some secrets I just don't know nor should know by HIS will (not man's will but HIS will). Either HE is truly God and able to save me/us or HE isn't God. Whether it wise or not...I'm betting on the first!

For your pondering...

(My background is RCC until I joined the CEC around 10 yrs ago or so...I won't discuss more about me so please don't ask)

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 01:12 PM

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 11 2007, 12:28 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

Are you in any way related to Harmon? Regardless, I'd have to challenge your assumption on this. To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome. Perhaps you haven't learned as much as you think. Not trying to insult you, just inject a healthy CHECK. Writing letters, verbally confronting and even walking out are all perfectly acceptable ways to petition for change. Please leave the physical threats out of the mix. Thanks.

Then you don't know the scriptures my friend. ((Perhaps you could point out the scripture, my good reverend father??) You should relax a bit. Chill, as they say...

My point was that I am willing to do whatever the Lord tells me to do. That is part of hearing God. Randy was a close friend and the man I used to know would do the same. -NSV



"The only rules that really matter are these: what a man can do and what a man can't." - Jack Sparrow, Pirate

"the kingdom of heaven has been forcefully advancing, and forceful men lay hold of it." -Jesus, Lord

"Faith is a foot forward action." - Miles Davis (just kidding)

In words that should be familiar . . .

"Put the sword away"

"But I say to you, do not resist an evil person; but whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also. "

"But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother shall be guilty before the court; and whoever says to his brother, 'You good-for-nothing,' shall be guilty before the supreme court; and whoever says, 'You fool,' shall be guilty enough to go into the fiery hell. "

"And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, **Do violence to no man**, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.

"But now ye also put off all these; **anger, wrath**, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth."

Need I go on? There's many scriptures which even more so entreat us to charity, gentleness, meekness and avoiding violence. I'm quite surprised at your lack of understanding here. And 'no', I'm not clergy. Just a humble layman who's been enough few miles with the Master to have put away at least these fleshly things, though the road ahead still leaves much to be accomplished in me.

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 01:22 PM

Sooo what I am getting is that "hearing God" makes everything (everything???) irrelevant/immaterial? This would seem to lead to subjectivism or perhaps delusion.

Isn't this what got us into this mess in the first place? Who say ++Adler's visions aren't right. He is merely doing what he "hears God is saying" isn't he? How then can we judge him based on that approach?

Are there exceptions to this rule?

So no need to find the outcome of the HOB, right?

Posted by: Harmon Oct 11 2007, 01:44 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 11 2007, 11:31 AM)

.

QUOTE

I will confront and [B]if God told me to do this, and I believe I can hear that from Him because I am willing too

🙄 Are you in any way related to Harmon? Regardless, I'd have to challenge your assumption on this. To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome. Perhaps you haven't learned as much as you think. Not trying to insult you, just inject a healthy CHECK. Writing letters, verbally confronting and even walking out are all perfectly acceptable ways to petition for change.

Please leave the physical threats out of the mix. Thanks.

What is that you say about Harmon??

Come clean Guest and say what's REALLY on your mind.

What do you have against Harmon?

Posted by: xcec Oct 11 2007, 01:50 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome.

xcec

To Guest (number 50,004...?):

Man, even Jesus wasn't so harsh in his response to the "Sons of Thunder" who wanted to rain down fire and brimstone on the offenders. Nor did he condemn Peter when he ATTACKED and CUT OFF THE EAR of the guard. I don;t recall Him saying that is was "illegal" and "sinful".

Perhaps YOU need to check yourself with your scripture exegesis.

Posted by: seraph Oct 11 2007, 01:55 PM

Hi:

QUOTE

2511 "The sacramental seal is inviolable" (CIC, can.983 ss 1) Professional secrets must be kept. Confidences prejudicial to another are not to be divulged.

This of course is very reasonable and we all expect in in our relationships, professional contacts and at church...

QUOTE

No axe to grind here. Just a thought to inject as we each wrestle with our understanding and response to how God chooses to enact His government, in the Church, on Earth. I choose to let God be God (as it seems nearly all posting here do as well) while constantly seeking to hear HIM and obey

How God chooses to excercise HIS government may have nothing absolutely to do with "The Government of God" as the CEC has defined it !

Here we must be careful to discern our role in engaging our leaders and pastors....Paul certainly understood the role of Peter in the "Government of God" yet had no qualms about confronting his behavior. Barnabas understood apostolic authority I am sure , but he did not let Paul bully him into leaving Titus behind on a missionary trip..he and Paul separated.

There is a hearing God and a doing...we are not quietists! Sometimes the interpretation and working out of the "Government of God" by fallible people goes awry in a community...it is everyone's responsibility to be part of God's solution....that involves a lot more than praying and hearing God.

QUOTE

And thus the hard part of the thought...God is certainly big enough and I small enough that there are some secrets I just don't know nor should know by HIS will (not man's will but HIS will).

Agreed...I do not know how or why God chooses people, his destiny for me, for others...for +++Adler, ++Howard, ++Myers, the pope, +++Katherine Schorri, Mother's Teresa 50 years of darkness +VGR and his boyfriend...the hour of our death are all a mystery. I do not know when Christ is coming nor the particulars of the real presence....secrets and a mystery...

HOWEVER the finances of our parishes and dioceses and communion and missions should not be a mystery! We should expect to be part and party of deliberations on "our behalf" by our leaders, and should expect information which is meaningful about problems and situations that have affected us all...that should not be a mystery nor a secret at all!

QUOTE

Either HE is truly God and able to save me/us or HE isn't God. Whether it wise or not...I'm betting on the first!

God did save David...hey but thankfully he also had a couple of smooth stones! Paul was saved by God...thank God for the owner of the basket who lent it so he could be taken out of the city by the wall. I wonder waht Rahab's part really was to ensure God saved her family from the mess at Jerico....we play a role in God's purpose and action on our behalf...!

blessings

seraph 🙄

Posted by: xcec Oct 11 2007, 02:05 PM

Ya know what folks, I think there is a vast conspiracy to confuse going on here.

There are many, signing in under "guest" and other unknown names that seem to simply be attempting to egg on many in this forum with their ambush tactics.

There is also a major attempt to confuse many by accusing them of the "sin" of anger, when in fact they are trying to work out what to do about the betrayal they have been assaulted with by the leadership of the CEC.

The same thing happened last year when a forum got going and got notoriety. Many CEC-ers starting jumping in and out of the forum and making inflammatory accusations and statements about those that had been injured by those in leadership.

It is perfectly alright to be angry - so long as the anger does not fall into a condemnation and hatred. It is a fine line that is easily transversed.

Anger puts the opposing party on notice that they have "crossed the line" of trust, of relationship, etc.

If any here can say they don't get angry, I call them a liar. It is an emotion that happens... What we do with it determines if it falls into sin or not.

I think there are several hack-theologians trying to confuse and intimidate and it isn't going to work.

My 2 cents..

Posted by: hald Oct 11 2007, 02:25 PM

QUOTE (xcec @ Oct 11 2007, 03:05 PM)

Ya know what folks, I think there is a vast conspiracy to confuse going on here.

There are many, signing in under "guest" and other unknown names that seem to simply be attempting to egg on many in this forum with their ambush tactics.

And that right there is why I am registered, and my nickname is a direct derivation of my real name.

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 02:30 PM

QUOTE (Harmon @ Oct 11 2007, 01:44 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

QUOTE (Nat Sherman @ Oct 11 2007, 11:31 AM)

.

QUOTE

I will confront and [B]if God told me to do this, and I believe I can hear that from Him because I am willing too

🙄 Are you in any way related to Harmon? Regardless, I'd have to challenge your assumption on this. To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome. Perhaps you haven't learned as much as you think. Not trying to insult you, just inject a healthy CHECK. Writing letters, verbally confronting and even walking out are all perfectly acceptable ways to petition for change. Please leave the physical threats out of the mix. Thanks.

What is that you say about Harmon??

Come clean Guest and say what's REALLY on your mind.

What do you have against Harmon?

Just the tendency toward threatening violence. You did so the other week here. Can't say I've encountered anyone on any other forum, non-Christian even, who actually made any such threats, so the similarity struck me as odd. The post itself was meant to poke fun at both of you.

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 02:32 PM

QUOTE (xcec @ Oct 11 2007, 01:50 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome.

xcec

To Guest (number 50,004...?):

Man, even Jesus wasn't so harsh in his response to the "Sons of Thiunder" who wanted to rain down fire and brimstone on the offenders. Nor did he condemn Peter when he ATTACKED and CUT OFF THE EAR of the guard. I don;t recall Him saying that is was "illegal" and "sinful".

Perhaps YOU need to check yourself with your scripture exegesis.

To physically assault someone IS illegal in the U.S. Is that news to you?

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 02:34 PM

QUOTE (xcec @ Oct 11 2007, 02:05 PM)

Ya know what folks, I think there is a vast conspiracy to confuse going on here.

There are many, signing in under "guest" and other unknown names that seem to simply be attempting to egg on many in this forum with their ambush tactics.

There is also a major attempt to confuse many by accusing them of the "sin" of anger, when in fact they are trying to work out what to do about the betrayal they have been assaulted with by the leadership of the CEC.

The same thing happened last year when a forum got going and got notoriety. Many CEC-ers starting jumping in and out of the forum and making inflammatory accusations and statements about those that had been injured by those in leadership.

It is perfectly alright to be angry - so long as the anger does not fall into a condemnation and hatred. It is a fine line that is easily transversed.

Anger puts the opposing party on notice that they have "crossed the line" of trust, of relationship, etc.

If any here can say they don't get angry, I call them a liar. It is an emotion that happens... What we do with it determines if it falls into sin or not.

I think there are several hack-theologians trying to confuse and intimidate and it isn't going to work.

My 2 cents..

Anger and sin not. I simply challenged an inappropriate level of anger that literally threatened violence. Not questioning his right to be angry. Just telling him he needs to exercise a little self-control lest those in the CEC sit back and appreciate the fact that it may be a good thing that those with such fleshly reactions have or are thinking about leaving.

Posted by: Celina Oct 11 2007, 02:35 PM

Xcec:

QUOTE

There is also a major attempt to confuse many by accusing them of the "sin" of anger

Which post are you referring to? I didn't pick up on that, but you may be right.

I am angry, yes. Frustrated, yes. Growing cynical, yes.

We seem to be doing alot of talking here, but when it comes to ACTION, we all seem stumped. Any CEC'ers think the petition is a good idea? Shall we DO something at this time?

Posted by: xcec Oct 11 2007, 02:35 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 02:32 PM)

QUOTE (xcec @ Oct 11 2007, 01:50 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome.

xcec

To Guest (number 50,004...?):

Man, even Jesus wasn't so harsh in his response to the "Sons of Thiunder" who wanted to rain down fire and brimstone on the offenders. Nor did he condemn Peter when he ATTACKED and CUT OFF THE EAR of the guard. I don;t recall Him saying that is was "illegal" and "sinful".

Perhaps YOU need to check yourself with your scripture exegeesis.

To physically assault someone IS illegal in the U.S. Is that news to you?

Shall I slap my forehead now? Or wait a few moments for effect? (along with something like, "Gee Wilburrrr, I didn't know that!")

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 02:35 PM

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 02:32 PM)

QUOTE (xcec @ Oct 11 2007, 01:50 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome.

xcec

To Guest (number 50,004...?):

Man, even Jesus wasn't so harsh in his response to the "Sons of Thiunder" who wanted to rain down fire and brimstone on the offenders. Nor did he condemn Peter when he ATTACKED and CUT OFF THE EAR of the guard. I don;t recall Him saying that is was "illegal" and "sinful".

Perhaps YOU need to check yourself with your scripture exegeesis.

To physically assault someone IS illegal in the U.S. Is that news to you?

Oh, but Jesus did rebuke him, which is exactly what I did.

Posted by: Guest Oct 11 2007, 02:37 PM

QUOTE (xcec @ Oct 11 2007, 02:35 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 02:32 PM)

QUOTE (xcec @ Oct 11 2007, 01:50 PM)

QUOTE (Guest @ Oct 11 2007, 12:06 PM)

To even state your willingness (or is that desire?) to physically assault a man (an illegal and sinful act) and pretend that God told you to do it is incredibly worrisome.

xcec

To Guest (number 50,004...?):

Man, even Jesus wasn't so harsh in his response to the "Sons of Thiunder" who wanted to rain down fire and brimstone on the offenders. Nor did he condemn Peter when he ATTACKED and CUT OFF THE EAR of the guard. I don;t recall Him saying that is was "illegal" and "sinful".

Perhaps YOU need to check yourself with your scripture exegeesis.

To physically assault someone IS illegal in the U.S. Is that news to you?

Shall I slap my forehead now? Or wait a few moments for effect? (along with something like, "Gee Wilburrrr, I didn't know that!")

So even civil authorities recognize that it's wrong to physically assault someone, how much more should the Body of Christ? I can't believe I'm actually having this conversation. Shocking and disappointing to say the least.

