

AMiA – Born of Revival and Genocide

The Mission of Province de l'Église Épisopale au Rwanda

~ Rev. Michael J. G. Pahls ~

Beginning in 1999, a group of concerned Anglican clergy and leaders from the United States began meeting with groups of conservative Anglican Archbishops in Singapore and Kampala to discuss what was then described as a “crisis of faith and leadership” within the Episcopal Church in the United States of America (ECUSA). Following those meetings, a plan for intervention was drafted for presentation in July of 2000 to the house of bishops of Province de l'Église Épisopale au Rwanda (PEER).¹ In August of that same year, Archbishop Emmanuel Kolini of Rwanda and Archbishop Moses Tay of Singapore formally consecrated two American priests as missionary bishops, thereby creating the Anglican Mission in America. Since 2000, the renamed Anglican Mission in the Americas (AMiA) has functioned as a “missionary province” of PEER with the dual purpose of giving alternative oversight to dissident conservative American Episcopalians and “reaching the 130 million un-churched in the U.S. and some 20 million in Canada with the transforming reality of Jesus Christ.”²

The consecrations have proved to be quite controversial, and the status of AMiA in the greater Anglican Communion remains disputed. While AMiA believes itself to be part of the worldwide Anglican Communion through the Province of Rwanda, and while the majority of the Anglican Provinces of the Global South concur, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, did not extend an invitation to its eight³ bishops to represent the church at the decennial of Bishops of the

Anglican Communion in July 2008. Furthermore, the *Windsor Report* of the Lambeth Commission on Communion, published in 2004 as a response to various challenges to the integrity of the worldwide Anglicanism, criticized Kolini and Tay for their unilateral exercise of episcopal functions without the consent of the relevant diocesan bishop. The report concluded that these actions had “[gone] against not only against traditional and often-repeated Anglican practice (as reaffirmed most recently by, for example, resolutions at Lambeth 1988 and 1998), but also against some of the longest-standing regulations of the early undivided church (Canon 8 of Nicaea).”⁴ However contested its ecclesiological status, the AMiA has enjoyed extraordinary growth in the United States and Canada, now numbering 132 parishes and claiming an estimated 15,000+ individual adherents.⁵ At nearly a decade since its creation, some preliminary reflection can begin on its theological identity. More importantly, some account needs to be attempted with regard to its ecclesial and ecumenical status so as to make it intelligible to the larger catholic whole.

Beginning in 1983, the late Pope John Paul II identified the task of the “new evangelization” as a primary theme of his pontificate. In *Redemptoris Missio*, his major encyclical on the subject of evangelism, he frankly acknowledged the contemporary declension of Christianity in “countries with ancient Christian roots.” He spoke directly of the modern situation where “entire groups of the

baptized have lost a living sense of the faith, or even no longer consider themselves members of the Church, and live a life far removed from Christ and his Gospel.”⁶ For these situations he identifies a need for methods and expressions that exceed the ordinary “pastoral care of the faithful.” In these cases, he writes, “what is needed is a ‘new evangelization’ or ‘re-evangelization.’” To this end, John Paul II sought to “to give a fresh impulse to missionary activity by fostering the commitment of the particular churches...to send forth *and receive* missionaries.”⁷

While acknowledging the lamentable differences in ecclesial vision that prevent Rome from recognizing the validity of non-Catholic missions as a full evangelistic expression of the church, the broader ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion would strongly contend that both the burdens and boundaries of this new evangelization transcend the territories and churches who presently commune with the Bishop of Rome.⁸ In this light, I will explore the AMiA as a species of the new evangelization, initiated by a younger Global South church in the context of a Global North field with previously established Christian roots. More pointedly, I will argue that this missionary enterprise incarnates a uniquely African species of the new evangelization in that it derives a particular identity from the *balokole* spirituality of the East Africa Revival and operates on an interventionist paradigm developed in reflection on the Rwandan Genocide⁹ I will speak of these in turn as a distinctive African missional spirituality and a distinctive missional mandate.

The AMiA and the East Africa Revival

A theological understanding of AMiA begins with an appreciation of Rwanda’s

unique expression of Anglican Christianity as it has been refracted through the experience of the East Africa Revival. In a recent issue of *The Christian Challenge*, Bishop Chuck Murphy, Chairman of AMiA, writes of the mission being “rooted in the history and tradition of East Africa’s revival” and therefore of his commitment “to gathering, planting, and serving dynamic Anglican churches in North America.”¹⁰ This sentiment is shared by Archbishop Kolini, who speaks with pride that the African church is able to export its unique experience of Christianity. In a 2001 address at Light of Christ Anglican Church in Denver, Kolini noted: “You brought your religion to Africa, but today, history is changing.”¹¹ The homepage of AMiA’s website echoes Kolini’s sentiments: “For decades the American church sent missionaries to Africa and Asia. Now, Africa and Asia have reached out their missionary arms to embrace Anglicans in America.”¹² Tying this missional effort to directly to Rwandan Anglicanism, it adds, “The Episcopal Province of Rwanda provides oversight for the Anglican Mission, and we share East Africa’s revival DNA.”

The East Africa Revival constitutes what Brian Stanley has called “An African initiative within a European tradition.”¹³ The first Anglican missionaries of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) arrived in the kingdom of Buganda (present day central Uganda) in 1877. Roman Catholic missionaries from the White Fathers arrived the following year and so began an intense rivalry to win converts. Although Anglicanism became the *de facto* established religion of the region following the Bugandan colonial concordat with the British in 1900, the Roman Catholic practice of mass baptisms compelled Anglicans to follow suit and this resulted in the “spread of a [merely] nominal

Christianity" throughout the Uganda Church.¹⁴

In June 1928, Joe Church, a Cambridge educated, Anglican physician with a background in the "Higher Life" or "Keswick" movement, took charge of an unfinished hospital located in the first station established by the CMS in Gahini, Ruanda.¹⁵ His first year was plagued by spiritually listless staff and a severe famine that extended throughout the country. In a state of pronounced spiritual defeat he took a holiday at Kampala to seek "a new infilling of the Holy Spirit and the victorious life."¹⁶ While in retreat at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Schofield on Namirembe Hill, he was met by Simeon Nsibambi, a young African who had heard a talk by Church the previous March about "surrendering all to Jesus." Recalling the lesson, Nsibambi inquired whether Church had any more to tell him. Church confessed to his state of spiritual need and the two began an extended time of biblical study, guided by cross-references to the Holy Spirit in a copy of the *Scofield Reference Bible*. Both men underwent a profound spiritual transformation as a result. Recalling the experience in a letter to his prayer partners at the Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union, Church wrote, "[Nsibambi and a friend] have kneeled in my room with me, deciding before God to quit all sin in faith and have claimed the Victorious Life and the filling of the Spirit." Notably, this was not experienced as a privatized moment of renewal for he continues,

There could be a Revival in the Uganda Church if there was someone who could come, Spirit-filled, and point these thousands of nominal Christians to the Victorious Life. Pray for this – a real deepening of the Spiritual life and conviction of sin in the Uganda Church,

and then the out-pouring of the Spirit Himself will follow.¹⁷

Church had encountered no small resentment at his demand that the staff commit to six months work in village evangelism prior to taking up work in the hospital. This seems to have been due to the perceived prestige of hospital work, as the anger only increased with Church's announced policy of paying hospital workers at the same rate as Bible teachers and evangelists.¹⁸ Among the most discontented was a young African named Yosiya Kinuka. In an attempt to bring Kinuka around to his way of thinking, Church sent him to visit Nisibambi in Kampala. Kinuka later recalled the experience in a December 1934 issue of *Ruanda Notes*. As a portrait of what would later be written large across the region, his words are worth quoting at length:

I had never seen such a fervent Christian before. We kept talking about the subject of being born again. Simeon had heard that the spirit of the hospital was bad and he asked me the reason. When I began to tell him he turned to me and said that it was because of sin in my own heart, and that that was the reason why the others on the staff were bad. I agreed with him that I was not right, and he taught me many more things, but my heart was still unchanged. In the motor lorry on the road back to Gahini I kept pondering over these things, and before I got back I was deeply convicted. My sins became like a burden on my back, and I yielded to Christ.

At Gahini I began at once to witness to the others, and to show them that they were on the road to destruction, and I parted from their company. I repented openly of stealing and began to make restitution for my past failure. One even threatened to burn down my home. But a wonderful thing happened to him; he was truly

converted too and is now one of my greatest friends.

This new life that began in me has never left me, and I am always longing to excel more in it.¹⁹

From this point Yosiya Kinuka joined Nisibambi's brother, Blasio Kigozi, in taking up the cause of calling previously baptized Africans at Gahini to true repentance and conversion of life as they themselves had experienced it. A. Stanley Smith, the Anglican missionary in charge of the Kabale Hospital in Southwestern Uganda, noted the difference. "A new spirit came into the hospital staff, and one by one they came out for God. Those young men were characterized by the same zeal as that first seen in Simeon Nsibambi. There grew in them too a new spirit of prayer."²⁰ The results of this labor were so successful that by February of 1932, Church could write of an area-wide awakening in Gahini:

We have seen teachers who at one time were always weak and grouching, now suffering persecution and hardship gladly for Christ. We have seen many cases of senior Christians who at one time thought little of slipping a few of our francs or other things into their pockets when no one was looking, coming up voluntarily to confess and restore the things. . . . Above all I can say, without the slightest shadow of a doubt, that I have seen Africans truly saved and living really changed lives. I have learnt that at heart the African is by no means such a child as he is made out to be, and that his sense of sin, his need, and his spiritual experiences are the same as our own.²¹

According to contemporaneous accounts, by December 1933 the local awakening of spiritual life fanned into larger movement of revival. During a Keswick-styled con-

vention hosted by Joe Church at Gahini, things went badly and the meetings seemed to produce little fruit. At the final prayer service, however, one of the *balokole* Christians named Kosiya Shalita became burdened by the superficiality of the meeting and slipped out to complain to Church. Reflecting on the meeting the next year in the March 1934 issue of *Ruanda Notes*, Church recalled the conversation between them:

He said he could not stick it any longer; people praying beautiful long prayers, many of them hypocrites he knew who needed to be broken down before God. He wanted to ask Mr. Holmes to stop the meeting. We agreed that nothing but the Spirit of God could break men's hearts. . . . A remarkable thing happened a few minutes later. While everyone was bowed in prayer one of the African Christians got up and began confessing some sin he had committed, and then all sat up. It seemed as though a barrier of reserve had been rolled away, A wave of conviction swept through them all and for two and a half hours it continued, sometimes as many as three on their feet at once trying to speak.²²

Before long the *balokole* revival had moved into Southwestern Uganda by means of a second Keswick-style convention led by Church, Kigozi, and Kinuka at Kabale in September 1935.

Immediately prior to his death from a relapsing tick fever in January 1936, Blasio Kigozi prepared three points to be added to the discussion agenda of the Synod of the Church of Uganda. Though only a deacon, Kigozi wrote with a sense of boldness drawn from an experience of prayer the previous May and confronted the gathered Synod with its spiritual laxity. His inquiries were read posthumously at the meeting:

1. What is the cause of the coldness and deadness of the Uganda Church?
2. The communion service is being abused by those who are known to be living in sin and yet are allowed to partake. What should be done to remedy this weakness?
3. What must be done to bring revival to the Church of Uganda?²³

Kigozi's proposed answers to his own questions were:

1. That complacency in the leaders, together with a loss of urgency and vision in their teaching, were the causes of coldness and deadness.
2. That revival could only come by way of the new birth, the coming of the Spirit, and the claiming of His power.²⁴

From this synod meeting, the revival gained popular support among Ugandan Anglicans and gradually spread throughout Rwanda and into Burundi and Uganda. By late 1939 it extended even further into Tanzania, Kenya, southern Sudan, and eastern Zaire.²⁵ The experience of revival also transcended traditional denominational lines and was embraced by Danish Baptist, American Quaker, and Free Methodist missionaries working in the region.²⁶ Thirty years on, the revival was still making its impact felt through the influence of *balokole* teams traveling over the continent and in Europe and North America.²⁷

A Distinctive Missional Spirituality

The East Africa Revival was characterized by several features that one could speak of as a distinctive African refraction of the

Keswick spirituality. The first is an intensified impulse for public confession of sin and the manifest sense of duty to make restitution where possible. The practice became so ubiquitous during the years of the revival that specific controls had to be conceived to inhibit its abuse.²⁸ In his brief study of the revival, Brian Stanley has made use of the work of African religions scholars to posit that the practice constituted a new initiatory rite, "whereby the African Christian declared his deliverance from traditional [pagan] society and his open commitment to the new society of the Revival fellowship."²⁹

A second feature was the practice of cultivating a transparent life, accountable to other revived Christians. Speaking of this as "walking in the light," becoming a *mulokole* came to imply the obligation to receive the rebuke and correction of others where one's behavior was observed to fall short of biblical standards of holiness. The resulting culture of mutual accountability radically democratized the *balokole* communities and came to transform the old custodian-ward power dynamic between colonial missionary and indigenous Christian. Evidence of this can be seen in the bold willingness of Simeon Nisibambi to evaluate the spiritual caliber of arriving Anglican missionaries: "Do you know," he told Church, "I can tell after I have shaken hands with a new missionary whether he has got the real thing or not."³⁰ Writing of his own experience of conviction upon being confronted by Yosiya Kinuka about an angry outburst, Joe Church wrote,

I had to ask forgiveness publicly from the Africans after God had helped me see it and repent. ... You cannot hide in Africa! We were beginning to see that we had come as missionaries to bring the light,

but every now and again that light was turned round to shine on us.³¹

The effects of this democratization among the *balokole* led to a third feature of revival: indigenous lay initiative and leadership. While many of the revival teams had a clergyman or two among them, Western missionaries and ordained clergy were not the principle agents of the revival's propagation. In fact, the prelates (largely colonial expatriates) and missionaries were regularly numbered among the revival's chief opponents. Some were cautious about the tendency toward censoriousness in *balokole* circles.³² Most, however, simply resented the willingness of the indigenous population to question the depth and sincerity of their faith. Meg Guillibaud, longtime CMS missionary to Rwanda, recalls one such conversation witnessed between one *mulokole* and a senior church leader in which the latter blustered, "I have been a baptized and confirmed Christian for many years. I can read. Why do I need to be born again? Who are you to tell me how to live?"³³ By far the most potent force behind the revival's spread was what MacMaster and Jacobs call "ordinary people obeying God." They write,

Fellowships came into being and spontaneously reached out to other Christians in love. They desired communion because they had experienced a oneness in Christ. They encouraged each other to stay in their denominations if at all possible, but to continue in meaningful, ongoing fellowship with one another as born-again brothers and sisters.³⁴

Lay women also played a prominent role in the spread of the revival—often at significant personal cost. In Tutsi culture, for example, women were rarely allowed to travel in public outside the household *ruko* (an enclosure surrounding a domes-

tic compound). In the days of the revival, however, *balokole* women risked violence and persecution in demanding to attend fellowship meetings. Eventually, they too were numbered among revival teams going from village to village and sharing their testimonies.³⁵

A final feature of the East Africa Revival was its openness to ecstatic or "charismatic" manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Although not a "Pentecostal" movement in the classical sense, from May 1936 onwards Gahini did experience reports of revelatory dreams, visions, "falling under the power" (a trance-like state), weeping, shaking, and miraculous healings.³⁶ According to MacMaster and Jones, these manifestations were not emphasized overmuch, but they do insist that the *balokole* were less likely to return to tribal shamans than were their nominal Christian counterparts and that many did experience healing and deliverance in response to their fervent prayers.³⁷

Together these features constitute a distinctive African missional spirituality that the East African Christians themselves are deliberately trying to export. One cannot listen to an Anglican from the Global South without hearing something of the confidence that they have "come of age" and therefore have something vital to contribute to Christianity's testimony of Jesus. At the Lambeth Conference in 1998, many British and American participants were taken aback at the insistent contributions of their African counterparts. Acting with a fully consolidated sense of identity, the African bishops eschewed what Archbishop Henry Luke Orombi of Uganda called the "bullying tactics" of liberal American groups of bishops attempting to suppress their positions on theology and sexual morality.³⁸ Quite to the surprise of all, the stubbornness of the

African constituency was rewarded with the reaffirmation of traditionalist teaching on sexual holiness that guided the Anglican Communion in the intervening decade.³⁹

When ECUSA and the ACC signaled their intentions to depart from this teaching in 2003 and 2004 respectively, the various Anglican provinces of East Africa declared themselves to be in “impaired” or “broken” communion with both. In September 2003, Emmanuel Kolini boldly declared, “We denounce and declare that the Episcopal Church of USA has departed from the doctrine, discipline, and worship of Christ.”⁴⁰ Through continued primates’ meetings at London in 2003, Northern Ireland in February 2005, Cairo in 2005, Dar es Salaam in February 2007, and Jerusalem in 2008, the African caucus has continued to confront their North American counterparts with unqualified calls for repentance. In an interview given in September 2007, Orombi spoke for the whole caucus in explaining his refusal to participate at the Eucharist with his liberal counterparts in the Global North. His rationale is strikingly similar to that of Blazio Kigozi at the Ugandan Synod of 1936:

I did not take communion because we are not in fellowship. We are not pretending and this is not a time for pretending. . . . This is a very serious issue for doctrine and morals. . . . I cannot go there if someone is not willing to humble himself and confess his sins before he comes to communion. I reckon that the issue of our lack of relationship and fellowship with each other is because we are not agreeing on what is the basic teaching of the scriptures.⁴¹

Nigeria, Kenya, and Uganda have since followed Rwanda in consecrating missionary bishops to function in ECUSA and

ACC territories. In doing so the primates of the East Africa Churches explain their actions as maintaining relationships with fellow Christians—understood as fellow *balokole* Christians.⁴² Defending the various interventions in the face of accusations that they had further impaired the function of the Anglican Communion, Orombi argued,

We have an obligation to our people that we have been in relationship with for years. We are only responding to the plight of those people who they threw out or, perhaps, turned a deaf ear to. This is not because we want a territorial expansion of, say, the Church of Uganda. We have enough churches and can create more if you like. We are responding to needs that are there. We are responding to people that we know and that we love. We are responding to people with whom we have been mission partners for a long time.⁴³

While the creation of AMiA was certainly the work of archbishops and their missionary bishop appointees, the mission itself continues to retain the flavor of a grassroots, lay-driven endeavor, operating outside traditional ecclesiastical and colonial structures. With the solitary exception of Chuck Murphy, the other six missionary bishops have been charged by the Rwandan house of bishops to be directly involved in evangelism and in church planting endeavors. These responsibilities supplement their ordinary duties of episcopal oversight. Although there are “networks” that operate in broad geographical territories, relationships between bishops and clergy have largely been established on the basis of mutual affinity (though this is changing). Most importantly, there are many more developing church plants than there are priests to serve them. The aggressive effort to plant churches rapidly depends heavily

on lay initiation, lay propagation, and volunteerism.

Finally, in contrast to the broader experience of North American Anglicanism, AMiA has been self-consciously stamped with an identity of openness to charismatic experience. Explaining the “experience of the Anglican Mission,” C. Fitzsimons Allison speaks of AMiA as a “three streams” movement, embracing an evangelical commitment to the bible, a catholic commitment to the historic creeds and liturgy, and a charismatic commitment to the vitality of the Spirit. Of the latter he writes,

We celebrate the power of God’s Spirit at work in the Church and the world, a focus often associated with the “charismatic” tradition. The Anglican Mission believes God’s Spirit was poured out at Pentecost and continues to move in a mighty way by demonstrating His presence through powerful acts and the transformation of believers.⁴⁴

The Black Man’s Burden: Genocide as Interventionist Missional Mandate

Although the experience of revival factors heavily in the distinctive Christian spirituality of East Africa, the relatively fresh experience of the Rwandan Genocide has stamped an already pronounced missional spirituality with a special mandate. In 1994, as hundreds of thousands of ethnic Tutsis and Hutu sympathizers were slaughtered up close in a flail of machetes, colonial expatriates fled the country *en masse*. Despite adequate international news coverage of events as they unfolded, most countries, including France, Belgium, and the United States, declined to prevent or stop the violence. When forces of the Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA) finally entered the country to halt the

killing they found an estimated 800,000 dead and thousands of women raped and thereby suffering from HIV/AIDS. In the aftermath, numerous Anglican clergy and four Anglican bishops, including Archbishop Augustin Nshamihigo, fled into exile having been directly implicated in the genocide. The remaining leadership appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury to intervene. Having persuaded Nshamihigo to demit his office after six weeks of pleading, a new Archbishop was elected and a painstaking ten-year effort was made to reconcile and heal the church.⁴⁵

The rhetoric of genocide and the evils of abandonment and delinquency have factored heavily in the defense of Rwanda’s interventionist mission strategy in North America. Emmanuel Kolini often speaks of what he calls “spiritual genocide.” As early as 1997, just three years after the killing was halted, he argued: “There is not one, but two genocides—a physical genocide and a spiritual genocide. Spiritual genocide refers to the presence of sin in people’s hearts.”⁴⁶ Applying this category in a direct way to Anglicanism the Global North, he has charged his liberalizing counterparts with prosecuting “a spiritual genocide of the truth.”

For the current generation of *balokole* in Rwanda, therefore, no thought can be had of waiting for the cumbersome mechanisms of ecclesiastical politics to sort themselves out. Bishop Josias Sendegeya of the Kibungo Diocese reasoned, “The Rwandan people know what it is to suffer. We experienced genocide and the horror that no one in the world would come to help us. What has happened in the Episcopal Church feels like a genocide, too. But it is spiritual rather than physical.”⁴⁷ At the formal consecration of the recently constructed Ruhengeri Cathedral

in the Musanze District of northern Rwanda, Kolini echoed these sentiments: "Ten years ago, when Rwanda cried out to the world for help, no one answered. So when we heard the American church crying out for help, we decided to answer."⁴⁸ This latter picture goes a long way toward explaining what was judged to be a precipitous action by many voices within the Anglican Communion. Such criticisms have rarely risen above facile charges of intolerant fundamentalism and have roundly failed to account for the unique Rwandan experience of Christianity and its sense of special mandate to carry a message of healing, reconciliation, and transformation *ad gentes*.

*The New Evangelization and AMiA:
Promise and Pitfalls*

The aim of this essay has largely been one of appreciation and commendation, as I believe AMiA to be a promising way for the new evangelization to advance in the present milieu. As Christianity's global shift to the South and East continues in the present century, northern and western Christians will in one way or another experience what Simon Escobar has recently described as "the Gospel from everywhere to everywhere."⁴⁹ Faced with receiving the evangel anew, Christians in these regions will require encouragement to not only send, but in John Paul II's words, to receive missionaries and to receive them with the expectation that they will hear the Lord "speaking to them by people of strange lips and with a foreign tongue" (Isaiah 28:11). To retreat from this would be to colonize the Gospel, blaspheme the Holy Spirit, and deny the Great Commission of Jesus as having reference to all the baptized. That being said, new evangelism in the AMiA mold does face some fairly significant perils and

I will note them briefly by way of conclusion.

First, while promoting itself as possessing the "revival DNA" of East Africa, one must seriously question whether the child looks very much like the parent. While I have noted some significant ways that AMiA has taken up features of the East Africa Revival, it has to be admitted that its "missionary bishops" are basically well-heeled, Caucasian, ex-Episcopalian men. This can be justified to a certain extent by appeals to cultural competence and the dire need of Rwandan clergy in Rwanda, but the long term hope is really to be found in a deliberate and mutually enriching interpenetration of horizons North and South. The Church's account of Jesus can only be deepened by experience of him through the eyes of the other. Settling for less than this would transform African episcopal oversight into a wax nose, providing the appearance of legitimacy but lacking the substance. "Walking in the light" requires the deliberate cultivation of accountability to the other. It is much easier to remain insulated from our African brothers and sisters than it was for Joe Church in Africa.⁵⁰

Second, while sampling at the democratizing effects of the revival, there remains precious little ecclesiological room in AMiA for the meaningful participation of women in the counsels of the church. Early in its life, AMiA adopted a policy that closed the offices of presbyter and bishop to women (AMiA does have female deacons).⁵¹ While a relative few women priests have been received in an *ex post facto* accommodation, and while recent substructures have been created to allow the ordination of women in the future, they have nowhere near the prominence that African women had in the 1930s and 1940s. Even where the

consecration of women priests cannot happen for reasons of conscience, alternative ecclesial space must be conscientiously created and avenues for their witness to the gospel strengthened.

Third, while transgressing ecclesial and colonial barriers that are perceived to inhibit the gospel, AMiA must continue to be vigilant against fundamentalist sectarianism, spiritual pride, and the heady exceptionalism that often accompanies them. This is as much about integrity of witness as it is about imagined pragmatic goods for the AMiA's best rationale for its existence: its strident case against the liberalizing exceptionalism of the American Episcopal and Canadian Anglican provinces. A puritanical "reformation without tarrying for any" ethos will only subvert that witness. Simply put, accountability to historic catholic theology includes accountability to historic catholic *ecclesiology*. The original definition of "heresy" (from *eiresis*) was "choosing for oneself" and this was contemplated as sin against the *church* even as it was contemplated as sin against God. AMiA will not long survive as a recognizable mission of the "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church" by "going it alone"

apart from the witness of the remaining constituents of the Anglican Communion and the still broader Body of Christ. For all its laudable zeal to generate structures that serve the exigencies of its particular mission in the world, AMiA is still amenable to a discernable catholic order and it must retain the ability to account for itself ecumenically.⁵² Our Lord's petition, "that [we] may be one" was offered "so that the world may believe" that he was sent by God (John 17:21). Ecumenical obligations, therefore, are integral to the evangelistic mission of the church and not extraneous to it.

If missiologists and demographers are correct, the rise of Global South Christianity will likely be the next wave in the ongoing emergence of the Kingdom of God in the midst of the kingdoms of this world. The present crisis of the Anglican Communion will eventually resolve and AMiA stands to serve at the center of a great moment in Christian history. While it has done admirable work in maintaining itself as a mission, it would be regrettable for it to exchange God's blessing for the "lentil stew" of just another Protestant denominational sect.

Fr. Michael J. G. Pahls has been an ordained minister since 1998 and has served parishes in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. He is currently pursuing doctoral work in Historical Theology at St. Louis University. His family includes a wife and two children. He holds earned degrees in Theology from Central Bible College, Springfield, MO and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

