



## Summary – Resolution on Membership Guidelines

### Kansas City 2015

These comments were recorded at tables and sent in as table groups, but nearly all of the voicing in the comments were individual voices making statements which were recorded at the table discussion. Very few comments represented the consensus of all the table participants. Since not every person at every table talked it was impossible to give a meaningful statistical breakdown of various opinions. This summary is simply what stood out to me as I read through the comments several times.

The process of discerning this resolution and the hard work which had come before this resolution, took an emotional toll on the delegates. There were various comments which spoke of the sadness persons felt during the discernment, at the need to vote, and even following the vote. Comments were made in ways which speak of the difference between the two former denominations – that the rift of this issue has revealed a known fault line. Comments included people being torn between their own convictions and the desire to hold the church together.

There were several consistent comments which delegates offered. First and most often was the general confusion on the meaning of this resolution's relationship to the Forbearance resolution, which was passed earlier. Though some expressed an understanding of the concept as holding the two in tension, it was not understood and/or supported by persons on both sides of the divide. It was around this issue that the most cynical comments were voiced.

There seemed to be concern for the new expanded role of CLC and peer-to-peer accountability. Is there a continued trust level which is sufficient to have these conversations? Is CLC structured and ready to step up to this new task and will it hinder the ability of CLC participants to have honest frank conversations if there are decisions which result from these conversations? Will this indeed give CLC an increased amount of authority? There seems to be quite a bit of anxiety around how CLC will live into this new role.

Plenty of comments were voiced about waiting for four years before any changes can be made to the Membership Guidelines. There were a number of persons who did not understand this clause and spoke negatively about "not being able to talk about the issue for four years". Not surprisingly, those who wanted to have the church become more inclusive thought it terrible to wait four more years before anything changes. Many moderate voices expressed support of working deliberately over the next years to possibly change the church's stance. There were a few who thought that four years was way too soon.

While there were comments of real appreciation for and trust in the leadership of the denomination, there were also some brutally honest comments which spoke of not trusting the leaders of our leaders. Lack of trust in leadership, Executive Board, and others was a theme which came out from both sides with some regularity.

Lastly there were a number of comments which pointed out the inability of the Executive Board to be able to determine what the passage of this resolution meant, as people voted “no” from both sides of the issue. Comments cautioned the EB against concluding that the outcome of the vote on this resolution was a clear vote on inclusion or not in the church.

In the midst of the confusion and the pain of this resolution, there were numerous words of love for the Church, appreciation for the leadership of the board and Ervin, and a desire to get through this season together as a church.

*Summarized by Terry Shue.*