

## **Why Did AMiA Break Away from the Anglican Province of Rwanda?**

*By Dan Claire, Chuck Colson and Tommy Hinson of RenewDC*

*January 14, 2012*

On December 5, 2011, after 11 years as a mission of the Anglican Province of Rwanda, the Anglican Mission in America (AMiA) abruptly broke away from the Church of Rwanda, thereby severing its ties to the worldwide Anglican Communion. This article and the appended timeline are an effort to summarize what happened from the perspective of the Rwandan House of Bishops, based on extensive interviews with the bishops as well as public documents.

### **How Did the Conflict Begin?**

During the past year, the relationship of Bishop Chuck Murphy, Chairman of the AMiA, and the Rwandan House of Bishops broke down. Under new leadership last January, the House of Bishops sought to understand their working relationship with the AMiA for the sake of providing better accountability and oversight. Murphy, however, preferred to maintain the autonomy he had enjoyed under Emmanuel Kolini, the former Rwandan Archbishop. Kolini retired at the end of 2010 but has sought to remain the primary Rwandan liaison with Murphy and the AMiA. Onesphore Rwaje, the new Archbishop of Rwanda, values collaborative and collegial leadership, and has endeavored to include the entire House of Bishops in overseeing the AMiA.

After taking office at the beginning of 2011, Rwaje together with the House of Bishops sought to establish principles and processes to govern Rwanda's relationship with the AMiA. Among other things, they asked to meet with the full AMiA Council of Bishops in September, and to receive a full accounting of the AMiA's tithe to Rwanda. Murphy refused the joint meeting in September, saying that it was both cost-prohibitive and impractical to do so when they could all meet together in Texas in January 2012 after the Winter Conference. The Rwandan House agreed to delay the joint meeting until then. With regard to financial accounting, Murphy chose to have the AMiA's Executive Director, H. Miller, make a presentation at the House of Bishops meeting in Rwanda on June 27, 2011. In the interest of time, however, the House of Bishops asked Murphy in their meeting to give a summary and provide them with a written report. At this, Murphy announced that he had a plane to catch and left the meeting. From there, he returned to the hotel and met with former Archbishop Kolini for several hours before departing Kigali that evening.

Murphy then developed a plan for the AMiA to become a missionary society outside of the direct oversight of the House of Bishops of Rwanda. When he returned to Rwanda in September, he first shared this plan with Archbishop Rwaje and Bishop Laurent Mbanda privately, asking for their endorsement. When they asked clarifying questions regarding the proposal, Murphy asked them to keep the proposal confidential and not share it with the House of Bishops. On the next day, during the September House of Bishops meeting, he surprised Rwaje by introducing this plan to the full House of Bishops, while also warning them against "reverse colonialism." The House of Bishops asked that Murphy keep this matter confidential until a joint committee could present a proposal for discussion in

December. Murphy, however, began unfolding the plan to successively larger groups in the USA during the fall of 2011.

The House of Bishops made numerous attempts to communicate with Murphy via telephone, email, and in person. Meanwhile, Murphy continued to develop the missionary society plan. As a last resort, the House of Bishops wrote to Murphy on Nov 30 expressing numerous concerns and calling him to repentance. They were grieved that Murphy had:

- “constantly disregarded the decisions and counsels of the House of Bishops”;
- “misused the authority given to him” in advancing a plan to break away from the Province of Rwanda, and had ignored their repeated requests to halt;
- dodged their questions regarding financial gifts designated for Rwanda
- used “abusive language” in speaking of the Rwandan bishops (e.g. “knucklehead, reversed colonialism, lawlessness”).

The letter called Murphy to respond within seven days with a letter of apology and an end to his efforts to take AMiA out of Rwanda. Murphy responded on December 5 by submitting his letter of resignation and leading many of the other AMiA bishops to join him.

### **Did the Rwandan House of Bishops treat Bp Murphy unjustly?**

In a letter directed to Archbishop Rwaje on December 5, Murphy complained that the Rwandan disciplinary process had been unjust, and compared his situation to that of Israel under Pharaoh immediately prior to the Exodus. Rwaje, on the other hand, believed that he had acted fairly, inasmuch as Murphy was his duly-appointed representative to the AMiA. Rwaje’s requests were not especially onerous. Was it wrong for him to ask for a financial accounting of the AMiA tithe? Was it wrong for him to ask Murphy to halt efforts to withdraw the AMiA from Rwanda? Since Murphy ignored the previous letters and other interactions in which he was instructed to stop until they could study the issue and meet together with all the bishops, wasn’t a godly admonition and a call to repentance the appropriate and biblical next step? Yet instead of repentance, Murphy chose schism. Even if Bishop Murphy felt he were wrongly treated, when an archbishop and the full house of bishops of an orthodox province bring discipline, the biblical response is first to repent and seek restoration of the relationships, and then work through any disagreements.

### **What about the money?**

Recent statements from Murphy and the AMiA still haven’t answered the financial questions raised by the House of Bishops. The common understanding of the AMiA’s 10-10-10 stewardship principle was that individuals tithed to the local parish, the parishes tithed to the AMiA, and the AMiA tithed to the Church of Rwanda. As it turns out, the AMiA tithe appears to have been disbursed at the discretion of Murphy and Kolini. This is problematic because giving at the local church and national levels were to the institutions and not to the leaders. In other words, individuals tithed to the parish and not the rector’s discretionary fund. Likewise, churches tithed to the AMiA and not the Chairman’s discretionary fund. Yet the AMiA’s tithe to Rwanda did not go fully and completely to the institutional church in Rwanda.

For several years congregations and clergy in the AMiA have been asking questions regarding the AMiA's tithe to Rwanda. Murphy has said repeatedly that tithes are gifts, and givers have no right to ask how gifts are used. The Rwandan House of Bishops began to ask for an accounting as well, and have continued to ask for one. A press release posted on the AMiA website on December 9 reveals few details. The four people mentioned by name in the press release (Rwaje, Bilindabagabo, Rucyahana, and Conger) are all persons who have raised questions about Murphy's accountability. Are these the only four persons who received designated support from the AMiA during 2004-2010, or is this a partial accounting?

Murphy has insisted that the AMiA's membership in the Evangelical Council of Financial Accountability (ECFA) should put this matter to rest. However, the question posed by the Rwandan House of Bishops (and many in the AMiA) lies outside the purview of the ECFA. While there is no accusation of wrongdoing, Murphy should remove all suspicion by answering the repeated question of the House of Bishops and giving a full account of how the AMiA tithe was spent.

### **What about theological changes made to the Rwandan canons?**

In 2007, under the direction of Kolini, Kevin Donlon revised the canons for the Province of the Church of Rwanda. These revised canons were rushed through an approval process in the Rwandan House of Bishops in early 2008 without careful study. Many changes were made by Donlon, including adopting Roman Catholic sacramental theology (thus deviating from the 39 Articles of Religion), making the Rwandan bishops the sole legislators in their dioceses (in contrast to Rwandan practice) and giving Murphy almost unlimited power in AMiA as Primatial Vicar. These changes, made without any input from the clergy and the parishes, have been a major source of contention in the AMiA ever since.

Last month, Rwaje stated that he and the Rwandan House of Bishops would welcome any efforts to revise the Rwandan canons in accordance with the Articles of Religion. Several other Rwandan bishops have also affirmed this commitment.

### **Who's in charge?**

When Bishop Murphy submitted his letter of resignation on December 5, he resigned from Rwanda and not the AMiA. While the AMiA for eleven years has been a mission of the Anglican Province of Rwanda, it also is a non-profit corporation in the United States, and Murphy remains the chairman of the board of the latter. When Murphy resigned, most of the AMiA bishops followed suit. However, Bishops Thad Barnum and Terrell Glenn chose to remain with Rwanda.

Unless they choose to resign, all AMiA clergy remain canonically resident in the Province of Rwanda under the episcopal oversight of Rwaje. (In other words, their credentials as ordained ministers are officially held by the Archbishop's office.) Rwaje has delegated pastoral care of these clergy to Barnum and Glenn.

The status of congregations affiliated with the AMiA is unclear for a number of reasons, including varied by-laws from parish to parish, poor record keeping, and imprecise definitions in the canons of both the Church of Rwanda and the AMiA. For this reason, it

falls to every parish to declare whether they prefer to remain under the spiritual oversight of the Province of Rwanda, or to follow Murphy and his colleagues in the AMiA.

### **Where do things stand?**

Archbishop Rwaje and the House of Bishops are grieved by the resignations and the fractures within the AMiA. Particularly in light of their spiritual heritage in the East African Revival, they mourn the divisions that have occurred in the body of Christ. Likewise, they are saddened by the ways that they have been mischaracterized. At a time when they are enjoying unprecedented unity as a House of Bishops, why do they continue to be described as a divided house? Further, their motives have been misunderstood. Why have their efforts to work together as a team with the full AMiA Council of Bishops and to achieve transparent communication and finances been construed perversely as a lust for power? These unforeseen and undesired outcomes are heartbreaking to the Rwandan bishops.

Rwaje and the House remain willing and eager to receive Murphy and his colleagues “with open arms” should they decide to return to Rwanda and reconcile with them. At the same time, if what the AMiA leaders genuinely want is freedom, then the Rwandan bishops do not want to stand in their way, especially after having been characterized as power-hungry.

On January 16-18, 2012, Rwaje and a delegation from the Rwandan House of Bishops will gather and host a sacred assembly in Raleigh, NC, for worship, reconciliation and connection. In prayer and dialogue with those in attendance, they will explore ongoing interdependent global mission together, trusting the Lord to provide a clear path ahead. For more information about the sacred assembly, visit [www.missionrwanda.org](http://www.missionrwanda.org).

## **Appendix: 2011 Timeline for AMiA & the Province of Rwanda**

To understand what happened between the Anglican Church of Rwanda and AMiA leadership, it is helpful to follow the events of 2011 through known sources of correspondence and public events. These details provide the context for understanding Bishop Murphy's decision to break away from the Province of Rwanda.

*January 23, 2011: Abp Rwaje Succeeds Retiring Abp Kolini*

A new chapter begins in the relationship between Rwanda and the AMiA. Archbishop Kolini's retirement marks the first transition in leadership within Rwanda since the AMiA's inception.

*February 10, 2011: Bp Bilindabagabo Letter to Abp Rwaje*

Bishop Bilindabagabo writes, "It has come to my attention that there is evidence that there may be a lack of transparency concerning the issue of the tithe and other funds paid to the Province of Rwanda by our brethren of the AMiA. Financial reports from the Provincial Finance Committee indicate that far less money is being reported than what the AMiA has actually given." He informs Abp Rwaje that he has "asked the offices of the AMiA for a complete report of all monies sent to Rwanda for the last five years." He requested specific reports detailing which bank accounts money was deposited into.

*March 31, 2011: Rwandan House of Bishops Meeting*

On March 31, 2011, the Rwandan House of Bishops determine that there is "a need to get together as Rwandan House of Bishops with AMiA's leaders, to discuss about our respective roles in the ministry of AMiA." The House of Bishops desire to have a "common understanding" of the AMiA and of each partners' role. Rwaje sends a letter to Murphy informing him of this resolution.<sup>1</sup>

The resolution is a significant development in the life of the AMiA. Under Kolini, the role of the Rwandan House of Bishops was far less significant in AMiA affairs.<sup>2</sup> However, the new Archbishop wants to establish a new working relationship with the AMiA involving "teamwork, as well as administrative and managerial principles."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Abp Rwaje to Bp Bilindabagabo, June 6, 2011. "As you remember, in the meeting of our House of Bishops on March 31, 2011, we resolved that there is a need to get together as Rwandan House of Bishops with AMiA's leaders, to discuss about our respective roles in the ministry of AMiA in order to have a "common understanding" of the ministry we are all involved in, and to get to know each one's role in this ministry. I wrote a letter to Bishop Chuck Murphy about that resolution."

<sup>2</sup> Retired Bp John Rucyahana to Bp Murphy, October 25, 2011. "Archbishop Rwaje has a transparent policy to consult with the House of Bishops and the church councils on the issues pertaining to church management and institutional business. Unlike the former Archbishop who took decisions without consulting the House of Bishops and church councils and did not even inform them of what he has/had done on their behalf as church leaders."

<sup>3</sup> Abp Rwaje to Bp Murphy, October 31, 2011. "Since the change of leadership in our province and in your presentation at the February 2011 Winter Conference a new chapter in working relationship was acknowledged. Administratively, the Province of Rwanda has been praying and wanting to establish proper

*May 31, 2011: Bp Bilindabagabo Letter to Abp Rwaje*

Alarmed by the discrepancy between AMiA financial reports and actual deposits made into the provincial accounts of the church, Bilindabagabo writes to Rwaje requesting again “a clear accounting of what happened to 1.2 million US dollars that was given to Rwanda but apparently never found its way into the proper Provincial accounts.”<sup>4</sup> Rwaje responds on June 6, 2011 assuring Bilindabagabo that they would receive answers at the June 27-28 House of Bishops meeting.<sup>5</sup>

*June 27, 2011: Rwandan House of Bishops Meeting*

The House of Bishops meeting is shortened due to unrelated and unexpected circumstances in the Province. Murphy’s hope of obtaining permission to consecrate more AMiA bishops is not included in the meeting agenda. The Rwandan Bishops unanimously resolve to call a meeting in Kigali in September for all bishops, Rwandan and AMiA, to discuss ways of working together more collegially. Murphy refuses, saying that it is both cost-prohibitive and impractical to do so when they could all meet together in Texas in January 2012 after the Winter Conference. The Rwandan House agrees to delay the joint meeting until then.

The Rwandan bishops ask Murphy to answer questions regarding the AMiA tithe. Murphy has brought AMiA Executive Director H. Miller to give a presentation on the topic. In the interest of time, the Rwandan bishops request direct answers from Murphy and a written report. Murphy indicates that he is unprepared to do so.

During lunch, Murphy chooses not to eat with the bishops. After lunch, he announces that he has a plane to catch and leaves the meeting. After that, he meets for several hours with Kolini before flying home that evening. He later refers to this trip as a “painful visit.”

---

principles and procedures to guide our working relationships. The storming that happened in June was acknowledged by all of us as a new beginning with realization of a new house. The House of Bishops of Rwanda is very much open and supportive of continuing a relationship with AMiA. Never at any time did the House of Bishops conceive any possibility to hurt the relationship with AMiA. That working relationship remains our cherished goal. Our aim is to work as a team. After analyzing the context in which our Province has been operating, as a House of Bishops we have come to a conclusion that there is a need for teamwork, as well as administrative and managerial principles.”

<sup>4</sup> Bp Bilindabagabo to Abp Rwaje, June 9, 2011. The May 31, 2011 letter is not available though thoroughly referenced in this and Abp. Rwaje’s letter to Bp. Alexis on June 6, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> Abp Rwaje to Bp Bilindabagabo, June 6, 2011.

### *Late Summer 2011*

Murphy meets with retired Archbishops Kolini, Yong, and Tay to discuss the formation of a new missionary society involving their oversight. Murphy fails to consult with Rwaje before discussing this proposal with the retired archbishops.<sup>6</sup>

### *September 27, 2011: Rwandan House of Bishops Meeting*

Murphy travels to Rwanda to attend the September House of Bishops meeting. Prior to the meeting, he and Donlon present the missionary society concept to Rwaje and Mbanda at the Serena Hotel.<sup>7</sup> Murphy asks that Rwaje and Mbanda keep the concept confidential until he has discussed it with his colleagues in the States. The next day in the House of Bishops meeting, Murphy once again fails to produce the financial reports. Instead, he surprises Rwaje by presenting the missionary society concept. The House determines to “have a joint design group to prepare a presentation to the December 21 House of Bishops.” They also agree that this “was a new concept that was still a confidential matter in the process of conception.”<sup>8</sup> Murphy warns the House of the dangers of “reverse colonialism” at this meeting.

### *October 2011: Presentations of the Missionary Society Proposal in the US*

Murphy presents the missionary society proposal to North American clergy in larger and larger venues, despite Rwaje’s request to keep this a “confidential matter.” In three successive meetings, Murphy, Donlon and other AMiA staff share the proposal with the Council of Bishops, the Network Leaders, and a Presbyters Retreat. During the October 25-26 Presbyter’s Retreat, Murphy says, “I’m only on the sixth step out of ten. I’m in a process of trying to tell you the latest thinking around the mission.” Murphy allows questions of clarification about the proposal, but does not allow feedback regarding the proposal.

---

<sup>6</sup> Bp Barnum, “First Steps Toward Reconciliation;” AMiA CoB Letter, December 21, 2011. “This past summer a process of discernment was initiated by Bishop Murphy with our Council of Bishops regarding next steps in formalizing the structures of the Anglican Mission in a manner consistent with what the Holy Spirit has led us into over the past fourteen years.”

<sup>7</sup> Abp Rwaje to Bp Murphy, November 11, 2011. “As previously mentioned, as House of Bishops, we have not discussed the new Missionary Society. It is true that you shared the concept insisting that it is still in an embryonic state (meeting held at Serena hotel with Fr Kevin, +Mbanda and myself and in the House of Bishops’ meeting) and we agreed to keep it as a confidential issue until further discussed. You were requested by the House of Bishops to provide us a draft document on the new Missionary Society, and its governance for our study before we could discuss it in our December House of Bishops’ meeting (Dec. 21, 2011).

<sup>8</sup> Abp Rwaje to Bp Murphy, October 31, 2011. “As you shared with us in our September 27 House of Bishops, the Missionary Society was a new concept that was still a confidential matter in the process of conception. The agreement was that we would have a joint design group to prepare a presentation to the December 21 House of Bishops.”

*October 25, 2011: Bp John Rucyahana's (retired) Open Letter to Bp Murphy*

After hearing about Murphy's actions, retired Bishop John Rucyahana writes Murphy expressing his concerns. He implores Murphy "to reconsider this move," but if he does choose to move forward that he do so "in consultation with the Province of Rwanda." He warns Murphy by writing, "It would be very sad to start with a wave of the Holy Spirit and end up with a human agenda."<sup>9</sup>

*October 31, 2011: Abp. Rwaje's Letter to Bp. Murphy*

Rwaje expresses, "serious issues are emerging that raise concerns on the causes of the birth of the new missionary society and our working relationships." The "cherished goal" of the House of Bishops is to continue the relationship with the AMiA. But, Rwaje says, "Our aim is to work as a team." He goes on, "After analyzing the context in which our Province has been operating, as a House of Bishops we have come to a conclusion that there is a need for teamwork as well as administrative and managerial principles."

Abp Rwaje also addressed several "accusations" made against the House of Bishops: They were: (1) "The interpretation of what is expressed as the painful visit with the House of Bishops in June"; (2) "the reverse colonialism"; (3) "the spirit of rebellion and lawlessness"; and (4) "the assumption that the new Archbishop does not make decisions."

Rwaje concludes his letter by "requesting that all procedures towards the formation of the new missionary society be halted until we go through the Jerusalem moment (come to a common mind through consultation at the Winter Conference meeting of all the bishops, Rwandan and American)." Rwaje also notes that Murphy has held numerous meetings discussing the missionary society despite his agreeing to keep the matter confidential.<sup>10</sup>

*November 3, 2011: Anglicans Unscripted Airs Rumors of AMiA Missionary Society*

Having spoken with "clergy and bishops inside the AMiA," Kevin Kallsen and George Conger discuss on Anglicans Unscripted (AU) #16 unconfirmed reports that the AMiA is planning to break away from Rwanda.

*November 3, 2011: AMiA Press Release*

The AMiA issues a press release in response to AU # 16. Press officer Cynthia Brust writes, "These conversations (about the missionary society) with leadership on both sides of the Atlantic remain ongoing, and it is important to note that no decisions have been made—we are in a process of conversations only, and frankly any public discussion is premature at best." She also claims that "Bishop Murphy enjoys a positive, honest, open, and collaborative relationship with Archbishop Onesphore Rwaje and the House of Bishops of Rwanda." And she adds, "Remaining connected to Rwanda remains a high value in these conversations, and we have no reason to believe this would change."

---

<sup>9</sup> Bp Rucyahana to Bp Murphy, October 25, 2011.

<sup>10</sup> Abp Rwaje to Bp Murphy, October 31, 2011.

*November 3, 2011: The Washington Statement Goes Public*

Three AMiA clergy from Washington, DC—Dan Claire, Chuck Colson and Tommy Hinson—distribute an essay questioning the merits of the missionary society proposal. They state, “Our purpose in writing this document is to speak the truth in love, in hopes of fostering honest and open dialogue together, for the sake of our shared Gospel mission to North America.”<sup>11</sup> The essay is originally released for use within their congregations and among regional clergy and friends of common concern. However, because it corroborates some of what was initially reported in AU #16, the essay spreads quickly via the Internet and is dubbed “The Washington Statement.”

*November 5, 2011: AMiA Publishes Statement Condemning Internet Rumors*

The statement, signed by Rwaje and Murphy, describe the online commentary regarding the AMiA’s relationship with Rwanda as “the work and design of the Enemy.”<sup>12</sup> Rwaje later expresses regret in being pressed by the AMiA to sign this statement without knowing what was happening internally within the AMiA.

*November 10, 2011: AMiA Council of Bishops Meeting*

At the Council of Bishops meeting, Bishop Terrell Glenn resigns. He explains his resignation as the result of a broken relationship with Murphy over a period of six years. “For a while now, Bishop Murphy and I have sought to resolve personal issues between us. Regrettably, we have been unsuccessful.” Murphy continues to press ahead with the missionary society proposal gathering the support of the remaining bishops with the exception of Bishop Thad Barnum.<sup>13</sup>

*November 11, 2011: Abp Rwaje’s Letter to Bp Murphy*

The Rwandan House of Bishops continues to hear about internal turmoil within the AMiA. Rwaje writes, “We are concerned and want to caution your moves.” He reiterates his request for Murphy to halt the development of the new missionary society. He then articulates the process to which they had all agreed in order to determine if the new missionary society was indeed the best way forward.

As previously mentioned, as House of Bishops, we have not discussed the new Missionary Society. It is true that you shared the concept insisting that it is still in an embryonic state (meeting held at Serena hotel with Fr Kevin, +Mbanda and myself and in the House of Bishops’ meeting) and we agreed to keep it as a confidential issue until further discussed. You were requested by the House of Bishops to provide us a draft document on the new Missionary Society, and its governance for our study before we could discuss it in our December House of Bishops’ meeting (Dec. 21, 2011).

---

<sup>11</sup> The Washington Statement by Dan Claire, Chuck Colson, Tommy Hinson

<sup>12</sup> “A Statement from the Archbishop of Rwanda and the Primate of the Anglican Mission in the Americas,” November 5, 2011.

<sup>13</sup> Bp Barnum, “First Steps Toward Reconciliation”

Rwaje closes the letter expressing his preferred process saying, “We need to look back and to learn from our journey together, consider where we are today, together chart the future road map of where we want to be and how to get there under the guidance of Holy Spirit.”

*November 17, 2011: Rwaje, Mbanda, Murphy & Donlon Meet in Arlington, VA*

The original purpose of the meeting had been to discuss in further detail the missionary society proposal. Instead, the meeting begins with dialogue regarding Glenn’s resignation and online speculation regarding the relationship between AMiA and Rwanda. Murphy and Donlon push for disciplinary action to be taken against Glenn and Claire. Rwaje refuses and encourages reconciliation instead.

In the time that remains, they make an effort to address the stated purpose for the meeting. Murphy emphasizes the necessity of the missionary society concept. Rwaje, on the other hand, says that the problem is not so much structural as it is procedural. There is an urgent need for good working relationships between AMiA and Rwanda, as well as within the AMiA. Rwaje emphasizes the importance of policies and procedures for transparency and open communication.

Murphy asks whether there are any additional outstanding issues regarding the missionary society proposal. Rwaje indicates that although he had originally agreed to a discussion of the missionary society concept with the full House of Bishops in Rwanda on December 21, 2011, he chooses in light of the broken relationships in the AMiA to defer this discussion until all the bishops of Rwanda and AMiA meet together in January. Until then, he reiterates that no further actions should be taken regarding the missionary society proposal. He also stresses the priority of genuine Christian reconciliation between Murphy and Glenn.

*November 30, 2011: Rwandan House of Bishops Letter to Bp Murphy*

The Rwandan House of Bishops meet to discuss all that has transpired and determine that the AMiA situation requires immediate intervention. They write to Murphy expressing several grievances. The bishops are concerned that he:

- has “constantly disregarded the decisions and counsels of the House of Bishops”;
- misused the authority given to him by the Archbishop in advancing his plans to launch a new Missionary Society;
- ignored two requests to halt conversations about the Missionary Society proposal;
- dodged questions of financial transparency while promising at the September House of Bishops meeting to send all the financial transactions meant for Rwanda;
- used “abusive language” directed towards the Rwandan House of Bishops (“knucklehead, reversed colonialism, lawlessness, etc . . .”) through this process.

The letter calls on Murphy to respond within seven days with (1) a letter of apology, (2) an agreement to cease attempts to advance his missionary society proposal, and (3) a letter of commitment pledging to refocus on the AMiA. If Murphy fails to respond, then the House considers him to “have made a de facto choice to withdraw” from his position.

An unknown source leaks this letter to George Conger of Anglican.TV and AnglicanInk.com.

*November 30, 2011: Rwandan House of Bishops Letter to AMiA Congregations*

The House of Bishops expresses that their “hearts were broken by the resignation of Terrell Glenn.” But, they affirm that “Terrell remains one of us and under the leadership of the Archbishop of the Province of Rwanda.” Additionally, they say, “we have been praying for the Washington Group. Openness, transparency, and speaking truth in love should be encouraged.”

The letter assures the AMiA of their support and stand with them. The House encourages the churches to “stand firm” and to “focus on the higher calling of being obedient to the Great Commission, preaching the news, planting healthy churches and growing them and encouraging the believers.”

The AMiA national office refuses to distribute this letter to clergy and congregations.

*December 5, 2011: Anglican Ink publishes “Recant or Resign, Rwanda tells Chuck Murphy.”*

*December 5, 2011: Bp Murphy et al respond to Rwandan Bishops’ Letter*

Murphy together with most AMiA Bishops resign from the House of Bishops of Rwanda. (Barnum and Glenn do not.) Murphy states that the Rwandan letter “lacks the canonical due process that would make it possible to resolve some of the matters expressed.” In his opinion, this leaves him “without any possibility of appropriate defense and advocacy.” Murphy also cites the leak of the Rwandan letter to the press as something that makes “any constructive conversation more difficult.”

Murphy offers apologies and explanations for some of his statements, but does not accept responsibility for the lack of financial transparency. He goes on to announce the launch of his new missionary society, comparing the move out of Rwanda to Israel’s exodus from Egypt.

*December 9, 2011: AMiA Issues a Press Release Regarding Finances*

Three tables and a brief explanation provide only a partial accounting of the tithe to Rwanda, and raise more questions than they answer.

*December 9, 2011: Rwandan House of Bishops Responds*

Rwaje accepts the resignation of Murphy and his colleagues. The House of Bishops appoints Barnum and Glenn to provide pastoral oversight to those clergy and churches that have been associated with the AMiA. The House issues a letter of encouragement to the clergy and congregations of the AMiA.

*December 16, 2011: Former Archbishops Provide “Apostolic Covering and Oversight”*

Retired Archbishops Kolini, Yong and Tay write to Murphy and his colleagues, offering spiritual covering for them and their followers. They appoint Murphy as “Lead Bishop” over the emerging AMiA Missionary Society. They decry what they describe as character assassination against Murphy.

*December 20, 2011: Abp Duncan Letter to ACNA*

After meeting with Bishops Murphy, Loomis, and Rodgers, Archbishop Duncan writes to the ACNA about “efforts to find a path forward” through the present “brokenness.” Despite the AMiA’s claim to remain a Ministry Partner within the ACNA,<sup>14</sup> Duncan clarifies that the AMiA “lost its status as a Ministry Partner since that status had been predicated on AMiA’s relationship with Rwanda.” Additionally, “the resigned bishops lost their status in our College of bishops as a result of their resignation from Rwanda.” Duncan expresses his intent “to enter into a process” to restore relationship with those “who will rally to the Pawleys vision and leadership.”

However, Duncan recognizes that this meeting was only a “partial beginning.” The letter stresses “the importance of our Provincial relationship with the Province of Rwanda (a sister GAFCON Province) and with His Grace Archbishop Onesphore Rwaje.” Forward movement is only possible when “issues and relationships have been adequately addressed and necessary transitions are in progress.”

*December 21, 2011: AMiA Council of Bishops Letter*

After meeting with the ACNA leadership, the bishops of the AMiA issue a statement. The Council of Bishops apologizes “for the fallout that you have felt from the collision” with the Rwandan House of Bishops. An apology is offered to Rwanda as well “for the missteps that we have made;” the missteps are not enumerated.

The bishops explain the catastrophe as a product of two transitions: (1) a new Rwandan House of Bishops seeking “to transition our partnership toward a leadership model that would allow this newly constituted House to exercise much greater control over the day-to-day operations and direction of the Anglican Mission” and (2) Murphy’s plans to formalize “the structures of the Anglican Mission in a manner consistent with what the Holy Spirit has led us into over the past fourteen years.”<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> A Pastoral Declaration for Ministry in the Anglican Mission in the Americas, “From an ecclesiastical perspective the Anglican Mission has pastoral oversight from a team of sponsoring Primates and is governed in the interim time of discernment as a matter of discipline and order by the Constitution and Canons of Anglican Church in North America through a memorandum of agreement dated in 2010 and 2011. As the Mission is not a ecclesial jurisdiction in the canonical sense, this Pastoral Declaration is put forth to assist us in developing this work in its next chapter. The ecclesiastical organization of the Anglican Mission as Ministry Partner with ACNA provides for ecclesial structures that complement this particular ministry which has precedent in the historic church. The Anglican Mission as an emerging Mission Society is in partnership with other orthodox Anglicans and shares in the vision to build up the Anglican Province in North America.”

<sup>15</sup> Compare this analysis to Abp Rwaje’s perspective on Rwanda’s intent. Abp Rwaje to Bp Murphy, October 31, 2011. “Since the change of leadership in our province and in your presentation at the February 2011 Winter Conference a new chapter in working relationship was acknowledged. Administratively, the Province of Rwanda has been praying and wanting to establish proper principles and procedures to guide our working relationships. The storming that happened in June was acknowledged by all of us as a new beginning with realization of a new house. The House of Bishops of Rwanda is very much open and supportive of continuing a relationship with AMiA. Never at any time did the House of Bishops conceive any possibility to hurt the relationship with AMiA. That working relationship remains our cherished goal. Our aim is to work as a team. After analyzing the context in which our Province has been operating, as a House of Bishops we have

*December 23, 2011: Abp Rwaje Christmas Letter*

Rwaje writes expressing his thanks “for the support shown to the Province of Rwanda by my friend and colleague, Archbishop Robert Duncan.” On behalf of the Rwandan House of Bishops, he communicates their heartbrokenness “over the shame that this division has brought to our Lord and to his bride.” Rwaje expresses his hope that the Lord Jesus “will repair and restore what has been so badly broken.” He closes the letter by inviting the clergy and laity to a sacred assembly with himself and other Rwandan bishops in Raleigh, NC, on January 16-18.

*January 3, 2012: Nairobi Meeting*

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Eliud Wabukala, Archbishop of Kenya and Chairman of GAFCON, hosts a meeting between AMiA and Rwandan leaders for the purposes of reconciliation. There has not been an official communiqué following this event.

---

come to a conclusion that there is a need for teamwork, as well as administrative and managerial principles.” Abp Rwaje sought to establish “teamwork, as well as administrative and managerial principles,” rather than to “exercise much greater control over the day-to-day operations and direction of the Anglican Mission.”