

- We initially shared challenges, gratitude, and hopes for what to accomplish. A common theme was a hope for re-engagement in our work after a time of laying fallow.
- Susan Russell gave us a re-cap of what we've done so far. She reminded us of our enabling resolution. Susan found our Chicago meeting to be an example of the communion across distance that exists between us. We live in a polarized and demonizing world, but how can we model living each other even in disagreement about essentials?
- We talked about the exercise for engagement across difference that we had formulated at our Chicago meeting.
- We asked: By when do we need to submit a report? Advent 2020 was our answer. We have an April 2020 meeting scheduled face-to-face.
- We had further discussion about what we need and hope to accomplish between now and then:
 - F. Ellis: Perhaps we recommend that this work be ongoing, e.g. a standing committee? There is so much to do.
 - C. Wells: I heartily agree. We can do A, B, and C, but we may not get to D, E, and F. So we may in part be tasked with asking good questions, that others will take up.
 - S. Brokenleg: I'd like to offer to do a facilitated process.
 - G. Brewer: I have 4.5 years left as bishop; Bp Ely and Gray-Reeves are retiring. We're setting a legacy for younger leaders, and I want to ask them what they need, not so much my generation.
 - J. Hylden: I've experienced communion across difference on various Facebook groups, and I've found it hopeful. Should we solicit their feedback, and/or feedback from others in the church?
 - M. Gray-Reeves: I wonder if restorative justice practices could be of use to us.
 - T. Ely: It seems like our prior work hasn't gone anywhere in the wider church. Where's the conversation? Can we encourage/solicit more? I feel like we've been fairly idle since our meeting in Chicago.
 - F. Ellis: I'd like to do more local follow-up, but we've been idle.
 - S. Russell: I too feel as if we've dropped the ball, but we can now pick it up again toward making a report.
 - M. Escobar: I'd like to encourage us all to keep on praying for each other and finding areas of common ground. I'm not sure that we need more resources created by a Task Force or by the nat'l church.
 - J. Hylden: I'd like us to get into the tricky issues of polity and doctrine. From both right and left, it seems like making ordination vows are an issue: can we all in good conscience vow to uphold the doctrine, discipline, and worship of this church? From the left, I've heard the BCP described as a form of "spiritual

apartheid”; and from the right, were the BCP to change, I’ve heard misgivings about whether conservatives could vow to uphold doctrines that they think to be false. So it seems to be a difficult circle to square from the perspectives of both right and left.

- C. Wells: What does an “unqualified place and voice” for both perspectives look like? We need to flesh this out.
- T. Ely: This all relates back to marriage. How do we get to “mutual flourishing” with respect to it? We shouldn’t lose sight of the context of our work—it’s marriage differences.
- G. Brewer: Agreed, that’s the crucible.
- J. Bauerschmidt: Agreed, that’s the context. For us, we want to know what’s the way forward with respect to conservatives, given the progressive trajectory of the wider church? How can we find an honored place in the community?
- S. Brokenleg: How did the church deal with difference before? Ordination of women, slavery, and how other churches have dealt with issues about sexuality.
- M. Gray-Reeves: Are there historical documents we can research?
- C. Wells: I’m reminded of “mutual flourishing” language borrowed from the C of E, and its ‘five guiding principles.’
- S. Russell: Listening to the wider Communion is good, but we’re not the C of E.
- T. Ely: What about the recent actions taken by the Canadian church? How does this play in?
- M. Gray-Reeves: There wasn’t a ‘communion across difference’ conversation concerning women’s ordination. But it’s really important to have it. This may be the first time that we’re not compromising or struggling to win or lose, but instead trying to stand together. It’s a different conversation than legislation passing or losing. It’s more than just putting up with each other in the same room.
- J. Bauerschmidt: Agreed. This isn’t how we used to function, which was binary. No one asked the question about mutual flourishing. This is a real opportunity.
- S. Russell: Remember the difference between feeling excluded on the basis of what you believe or on the basis of who you are. Also, remember that there will be future debates about we don’t know what! Making it normative to ask the question about mutual flourishing is important.
- F. Ellis: In Dallas, we’re one of three congregations with alternative episcopal oversight. This includes our rector search. We can now have a rector who is married to someone of the same sex, which wasn’t allowed before by diocesan canons.
- J. Bauerschmidt: What about a Zoom call in November? (All agreed.)
- S. Russell: What can we do between now and then?
- A. Haeffner: Can we take the conversation exercise we came up with in Chicago locally? (All agreed.)
- J. Bauerschmidt: How about making progress with doctrine and polity, like Jordan said?
- M. Gray-Reeves: Yes, I’d like to work on that. (MGR, JLH, and M. Escobar agree to work on this together; w/ M. Escobar expressing interest in looking for images of communion across difference in Scripture.)
- T. Ely: Let’s try to put our document from Chicago into wider circulation.

- S. Brokenleg: The Lakota speak of “walking in a good way”—is this what this is like? Not defined, but discerned?

Next meeting: Nov. 5, 2pm Pacific time