

## Robert Duncan

---

**From:** Jim McCaslin [jimmccas@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 01, 2004 2:42 PM  
**To:** 'Harmon, Kendall'; 'Curran, Don'; 'Babb, Kevin'; 'Yumoto, Ted'; 'Reed, Ryan'; 'Mudge, Shaw'; Hays, Mary; 'Lambert, Paul'; 'Jones, Philip'; 'Brenner, Tad'; 'Anderson, David'; 'Adams, Jim'; Duncan, Bob  
**Cc:** 'Guernsey, John'; 'Brust, Cynthia'; 'Brust, Ellis'  
**Subject:** RE: Concerning the Network

Dear Friends,

The below exchange, as it now stands, does not bode well for our common future. I do not know Don Armstrong so my analytical comments are based on what I sense in these messages. I think that many of the issues raised here are of supreme importance to Anglicanism in this country.

From what I can see, Don in very much invested in this work, has done much good, and is correctly sensing a pull of Network leadership out of his hands. His view of his role and the role of ACI goes well beyond being the theological charism for our common work.

He is interested in maintaining "the broadest appeal" for the Network. Broad is good in the sense that we need all the support we can get. However, broad becomes counterproductive if it waters down our direction and commitment to the point that our ultimate purpose is compromised and the Network becomes confused about who it is and where it's going.

Therefore, our initial central task may well be a revisiting of who we are, what our priorities of purpose are, and how big our umbrella is. What exactly is the "end game"? How many different purposes can it include with integrity? Don mentions "exit" and "parallel church" strategies negatively and a "staying" strategy positively. Many of us are convinced, as are many of the Primates, that the ECUSA leadership has created schism and departed from the faith once delivered, that it is showing no signs of repentance, and that the Network with support from the Primates seeks to maintain the faith and be recognized at the "legitimate expression of American Anglicanism" (See Charter). Others sound more like they are still working to reform ECUSA from within and have no intention of "leaving the church." How well can we legitimately tap dance (integrate) around these two approaches?

Don seems to think that he and his associates are already doing the work of the new concept of "regional deans." Don wants to continue his work in this area. Don is clearly unhappy with the "usual cast of AAC folks." I don't know what this is about, but it seems very serious since, again I say, the AAC is the only Secretariat that we have, - and a very effective one - and they are the ones who "brung us to the dance" thus far. Would we now relegate them to some minor role as "merely" one member of the Network? We voted David as the Network Secretary at our Council Meeting in January.

Don offers up his "Network of rectors from around the country" who would be reluctant to get involved in "just another large bureaucracy." Again, he does not want to make room at this point for a Network structure growing away from his vision for it and control of it.

He sees the distancing of the Network from him and the ACI as making "no sense," and he is not interested in giving up control of the website.

Bishop Duncan's response was tactful and a graceful attempt to hold all the players together, which is essential if possible. He appropriately attempts to get Don to see that the key role for ACI is theology. He also tries to make a case for having website control in Pittsburgh (if not with the AAC in D.C.) +Bob attempts to convey the urgency of the situation and the task before us.

My friends, I hope that there is some way we can get Don on board quickly if possible. It seems to me, that with parishes around the country needing to see immediate leadership and action on the part of the Network, we must move speedily to nation-wide affiliation, policies and procedures, and communication, which is controlled by the Network web site out of D.C. or Pittsburgh.

3/2/2004

DRFPD 3-0470

Our first agenda item again is our mutual vision and purpose. We must get clear here so that all else will fall in line.

I hope this doesn't seem too pointed, and I have not had much time to leave it for more prayerful pondering as I must run to catch my airplane for Pittsburgh.

In Christ,

Jim+  
Jesus, All for Jesus

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Duncan, Bob [mailto:DUNCAN@pgh.anglican.org]

**Sent:** Friday, February 27, 2004 9:03 AM

**To:** 'Adams, Jim'; 'Anderson, David'; 'Brenner, Tad'; 'Jones, Philip'; 'Lambert, Paul'; Hays, Mary; 'McCaslin, Jim'; 'Mudge, Shaw'; 'Reed, Ryan'; 'Yumoto, Ted'; 'Babb, Kevin'; 'Curran, Don'; 'Harmon, Kendall'

**Cc:** 'Brust, Ellis'; 'Brust, Cynthia'; 'Guemsey, John'

**Subject:** FW: Concerning the Network

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Robert Duncan [mailto:duncan@pgh.anglican.org]

**Sent:** Friday, February 27, 2004 8:39 AM

**To:** 'GraceRector@aol.com'

**Cc:** 'Anderson, David'; 'Salmon, Ed'; 'Stanton, James'

**Subject:** RE: Concerning the Network

Dear Don,

Thanks for your good letter.

Network Steering Committee very much wants you and the ACI involved in the ongoing development of the Network. The Steering Committee is having its first face to face meeting next week here in Pittsburgh. One of our key issues is relationship to the organizations that have helped create us: ACI, AAC, Ekklesia, in particular. We will also begin to figure out what our relationship to the Global Mission Partners (orthodox successor to EPGM) group might be. When we come out of the meeting we want to have a trial way forward (at the least) to operationalize these relationships.

My earlier communication this week (2/24) was an initial proposal about involving you and Ephraim and Philip at the level of the convocational deans (chaired by John Guemsey) as a starting point of more active involvement in the process (and shaping the process) by which parishes join the Network. We are laboring to do make decisions consistent with the provisions of the charter, but not to have the best outcomes unnecessarily restricted by them.

One of the instructions I have from the Network Bishops (given at the Organizational Convocation) is the importance of the Network's independence/distinctiveness, especially from the AAC. Please understand that the steering committee's decisions on incorporating in Pennsylvania, the address in Pittsburgh, and the decision to bring the website here are all aspects of this identity establishment. We belong to the dioceses that have associated, and the parishes that are drawing together in the regional convocations (of which many more than six now appear likely). Interdependence with ACI, AAC, Ekklesia – appropriate to the charism of each (and ACI has our theological charism for sure) – is my goal. How we get there – and as speedily as possible – is a major task before the steering committee next week. Again, if you have an operational suggestion as to how we can tie ACI into the steering committee's work I would be glad to receive it. Even if you don't, the steering committee's task next week will be precisely to try to do so. Be assured of that, for it is that important.

The website request is about communicating the steering committee's vision and decisions clearly and immediately. It is also about the "look" of the website, which we believe visually needs to reflect our dual identity as in the Episcopal Church AND in the Anglican Communion. (A national firm has been hired to

3/2/2004

DRFPD 3-0471