

Responses from the Aboriginal and Islander and Multicultural Church to Resolution 84

The following statements from the
Uniting Aboriginal and Islander Christian Congress (UAICC)
and National Conferences of migrant-ethnic churches
clearly illustrates their strong opposition to Resolution 84.

Contents:

- 1) Introduction: The Uniting Church a multicultural church
- 2) Statement by the Uniting Aboriginal & Islander Christian Congress in relation to Proposal 84.
- 3) Statement from the Ethnic congregations within the Synod of Victoria and Tasmania in response to Assembly Resolution 84 - August 2003.
- 4) The Uniting Church in Australia – Chinese National Conference, March 2004 Statement on Homosexuality.
- 5) Resolution from the Indonesian National Conference, September 2004.
- 6) The Position of Korean Churches in UCA on Resolution 84 of the Assembly meeting.
- 7) The UCA national conference of Tongan churches policy on Homosexuality
- 7a) Supplement to the above document:

“The belief in the incompatibility of Christian faith with homosexual practices. The doctrinal basis of the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga’s rejection of homosexual relations amongst gays and lesbians as unnatural and unchristian”.
- 8) National Conferences of Migrant-Ethnic congregations within the UCA who have expressed opposition to R84.

1. The Uniting Church a Multicultural Church

During the Fourth Assembly in 1985 the Uniting Church adopted an historic statement that “The Uniting Church is a Multicultural Church”. In Resolution 85.89.1 the Uniting Church said, “It is essential therefore to provide for full participation of Aboriginal and ethnic people, women and men, in decision making in the councils of the church.”

However, the adoption of Resolution 84 by the 10th Assembly in Melbourne in July 2003, has raised an important question as to how seriously the Uniting Church takes its multicultural identity. The Uniting Church is proud of the fact that there are about 150 migrant-ethnic groups from 26 different cultural traditions who worship in languages other than English, and it is proud ‘of the creative contributions of people of different racial and cultural groups’ to the life of the church. But, how seriously does the Uniting Church take migrant-ethnic congregations biblical, theological and cultural reflections on issues such as resolution 84 and its implications.

In the circumstances created by R84, many migrant-ethnic people believe that the Uniting Church has reverted to type and acts as an imperialist/colonial church in relation to migrant ethnic and indigenous Christians: dismissing their theological and biblical objections to R84 as ‘emotional’ and ‘cultural’ i.e., based on irrational taboos. The assumption being that the migrant ethnic and indigenous peoples will grow out of their backwardness into the more enlightened Western cultural experience.

These present circumstances reveal that the Uniting Church has rejected the voice of migrant-ethnic people in its decision making and thus reinforced its identity as mono-cultural and imperialist. Rather than being a multicultural church, it has become a mono-cultural church. It is understandable, therefore, how many migrant-ethnic people would feel that the UCA has blatantly disregarded and disempowered them from fully participating in the decision making processes of the councils of the church.

Aboriginal, Islander and migrant-ethnic congregations play a vital role in the life of the UCA, they provide many different social and cultural stand points which the church can use to judge whether or not it has misrepresented the intention of the gospel in its policies and doctrines. It is only when we are exposed to a different way of understanding the gospel that we can really ‘test the sufficiency of our faith’ or whether or not a particular truth claim is true or false (Newbigin, L. Gospel in a Pluralist Society, Eerdmans USA 1989: 244).

In the following documents we see clearly the Aboriginal, Islander, and migrant-ethnic congregations telling the Uniting Church that in passing and defending R84 it misrepresents the church's tradition and the gospel of Jesus Christ.

The church has embarked on a dangerous course in approving R84 since it can only bring division and disintegration to the church, forfeiting its place in the one holy, catholic and apostolic tradition of the church (*refer Watson, G. 'What is the bottom line' 2003 p. 4*).

As Aboriginal, Islander and migrant-ethnic congregations we therefore ask that the following documents be endorsed by the Uniting Church of Australia to be the biblical and theological basis for its stance on sexuality and leadership.

Rev. Hedley Fihaki

Rev. Lulu Senituli

29 April 2005

What is the bottom line?

In Galatians 1:8., Paul can envisage a situation when he or an ‘angel from heaven’ may become apostate by ‘handing on’ a tradition other than that which he had initially ‘handed on’ to them – another gospel. *‘But even though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you any gospel other than that which we preached to you, let him be cursed.’*

In 1 Cor. 11 this same word, which is used of ‘handing on’ is also used to describe the action of Judas Iscariot on the night of Jesus’ betrayal. There is thus a link in the apostle’s mind between Judas’ action and the possibility of the church’s apostasy in ‘handing on’ in ‘traditioning’ another gospel. Thus the church becomes apostate when it seeks other lords and other spirits than that gifted by Christ himself. (Cf. para 5 of the Basis of Union) Every aspect, all parts, of Christian doctrine/teaching is founded upon and derives its authority only in so far as it witnesses to Christ on the basis of the apostolic testimony and the church’s tradition.

In the process of the church’s action in passing resolution 84, it decided not to decide the issue of ordination of practicing homosexual persons; that is persons who ‘express’ their sexuality in this manner. But de facto by this non-decision it allows the ordination of homosexual persons. In this it has determined to incorporate into the church’s order what the New Testament and the tradition of the universal church holds to be a sin. By this decision the church has set itself apart from the universal tradition of the church and the clear teaching of the apostles in their witness to Christ and has thus become as a consequence an apostate church, a disordered church.

The Assembly passing of resolution 84 is (*also*) a denial that there can be any Christian anthropology; or Christian doctrine/teaching concerning the human creature. It has determined by its non decision that it is up to different groups (read Presbyteries) and or individuals to determine what is the basis of one of the foundational aspects of the human creature social and biological existence. In choosing to go this way the Assembly evinces the acceptance of the worldview of post modernity.there is no such thing as the truth. There is merely this truth or that truth according to the operating context; there is my truth and your truth. All we have recourse to is a shifting sea of relativities none of whose views can be compared critically.Relativism and its colleague, political correctness, now replaces the old fashion idea of factual correctness.

Rev. Dr. Gordon Watson B.A., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D.(Edinburgh)
“What is the bottom line?” Newtown Summit September 23, 2003.

2. Uniting Aboriginal and Islander Christian Congress.

Statement by the Uniting Aboriginal and Islander Christian Congress in relation to *Proposal 84*

The Uniting Aboriginal and Islander Christian Congress (UAICC) believes it is called by God, through the power of His Creator Spirit to witness to the saving grace of God offered to His people through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

We believe that we are called to be His faithful servants, not only to Indigenous Australians, but to all people.

He has formed and fashioned our lands and bestowed upon us our law and culture from the beginning of time. We are created in His image.

He continues to speak to us through our cultures and languages and guides and empowers us through the Spirit of the Risen One.

Like all Christians, whatever our background, the Gospel challenges us – our cultural heritage and traditions, our law and community life.

As subjects of God's grace, we seek to conform to His will for our lives and be transformed in all that we are and do through repentance and faith.

From the perspective of our own spirituality, our cultural heritage and Christian understandings, we do not believe that homosexual relationships and practices are right or Godly. We are unable to find in the Bible or in our own law any justification for homosexuality.

We are therefore opposed to any decision of the Assembly or any other council of the Church that condones such relationships or practices. We cannot agree with this standard of behaviour.

For cultural reasons it is difficult for many of us even to discuss such matters in public and in mixed gender settings. The debate that the Church is now conducting on homosexuality is one that is very difficult for many of us to participate in.

We believe that membership into the body of Christ's people is open to everyone, without qualification. We do not wish to exclude people on the basis of their sexual orientation. Nor do we wish in anyway to vilify or unjustly treat people in homosexual relationships.

However, as Indigenous Christians, we do not believe that homosexual behaviour is an acceptable moral standard in the leadership of our Church and the Congress.

The following day members of the Congress sought to provide further clarification on their position, and to register their concern that the Congress had not been properly heard by the Assembly. They then made the following comments which further explain their position on this issue.

There are clear cultural and biblical imperatives why we do not support the ordination of homosexual ministers. In an Aboriginal child's upbringing, their attitudes to these matters are ingrained in their psyche through the teachings of their mother as they sit around the fire.

The fire's warmth burns upon our lips and face the moral teachings that are passed on from one generation to the next. In our cultural traditions, homosexuality is unacceptable. Where does a nation come from? It is birthed through the act of procreation. Strong taboos surround homosexual practices in our traditional cultures and any public discussion of these matters.

Our Biblical understandings affirm our own cultural beliefs on this issue. Whilst we have learned that the Gospel challenges our culture and heritage in different ways, we believe in this case that the Gospel and our law are in agreement.

Our experience of the church in the past, when it has enacted its doctrine on our culture and community life, has often been destructive, putting in jeopardy our cohesive social relationships, relationships to land and our ability to be independent and self-sufficient. For example, this has happened in relation to our traditional marriage systems.

We consider that the acceptance by the Church of same sex relationships will also eventually lead to the Church's recognition of same sex marriages and the acceptance of the use of bio-technology to enable gay and lesbian couples to have children.

Whilst part of the Church insists that there is one standard that says celibacy in singleness and faithfulness in marriage, the acceptance of homosexual relationships seems to us to make the Church have a double standard – a double standard that we find difficult to accept.

We acknowledge that the Uniting Church has been a strong advocate and supporter of the Congress. However, the Church's acceptance of the rights of homosexual people to sexuality and leadership in the uniting church 52 be ordained places it in opposition to the Congress on this matter. It appears to us that the empowerment of one group has been at the expense of disempowering the other. For the Congress, this simply reinforces our sense of marginality in the Church and in the Australian society generally. We continue to be dominated by values, economy and political power of western society.

The Church's decision also puts us in a position where we are seen to be acting discriminately against others and therefore being liable to persecution and the likelihood of prosecution.

The UAICC refuses to accept that the ordination of people living in homosexual relations is right.

3. Statement from ethnic congregations within the Synod of Victoria and Tasmania in response to Assembly resolution 84 – August 2003.

After Assembly, 25 lay and clergy leaders from ethnic congregations from the Victorian Synod Multicultural network met in Melbourne on July 2003, to discuss resolution 84 and they developed the following statement.

We are deeply disturbed by Assembly Resolution 84 which allows presbyteries the possibility of ordaining candidates whose sexuality is expressed in homosexual behaviour.

We believe that this is not acceptable to most ethnic congregations.

We are deeply troubled that the wider community could identify ethnic congregations with presbyteries and a church that permits practising homosexual persons to be ministers and deacons.

Our understandings of Christian discipleship with our experience of many cultures makes it very difficult to accept this kind of Uniting Church leadership.

We are generally not willing to accept the notion of 'right relationships' as it now stands, though some of us are better able to live in the tension this notion creates, than others.

Most of our people are confused, embarrassed, angry and grieving. We ask, 'How can Assembly not express what we believe is the majority ethnic position, in a Uniting Church that desires to be a multicultural church?'

We see possible division ahead. We do not want this to happen, because we love the hospitality the Uniting Church offers in Christ to all cultures.

Three urgent requests arising from resolution 84:

We ask the Assembly Standing Committee to provide the scripture that validates and reconciles with the Resolution 84.

We ask the Assembly Standing Committee to enable the voice of ethnic congregations to be clearly heard on this matter and to encourage ethnic congregations to take action within the discipline of the Uniting Church.

We ask the Assembly Standing Committee to explain in a simple and practical way how 'right relationships' could apply to the life and work of local ethnic congregations.

4. Chinese National Conference, March 2004 Statement on Homosexuality

The Conference heard presentations on the Uniting Church polity & code of ethics. The Conference delegates shared the deep pain and sense of confusion relating to the possibility of ordination of practicing homosexuals. We unanimously resolved to state our view on the issue of homosexuality.

- 1 In accordance with Roman 1:26-27 and 1 Cor. 6: 9-10, we believe our Bible clearly tells us: homosexual behaviour is a sin. We unreservedly accept the biblical teaching and recognise that homosexual behaviour is a sin.
- 2 In 1 Timothy chapter 3, it states the criteria for those exercising leadership in the church. Any such person must set a good example within the church and be of good repute outside the church. We believe practicing homosexuals fail in meeting such standards both inside and outside the church. That said, we firmly oppose the ordination of practising homosexual persons to the ministry of God.
- 3 In Luke 19:10, we seek to follow the example of Jesus our Lord, that the door to our church be opened, so that people in same sex relationship are welcomed, together we learn and experience the redemption of His gospel. We all need repentance and returning to God.
- 4 Our sins are redeemed by the righteousness of God through the sacrifice of Christ Jesus. His infinite love is manifested to the world. The righteousness and love of God are held in balance and neither is excluded. We must not selectively emphasis His love and sacrifice His righteousness and holiness. This is not the forgiving love of God.

Chairperson
Peter Teo

Secretary
Rev Kau Lee

5. The 7th Indonesian National Conference 2004 at Wamberall, NSW, resolved:

Part I

We, the Indonesian National Conference, deeply regret and reject the decision of the Assembly of UCA to adopt Proposal 84 which allows the possibility of the ordination of practicing homosexuals.

(Kami, the Indonesian National Conference, sangat menyesalkan dan menolak keputusan Assembly UCA yang menerima Proposal 84, yang mengizinkan kemungkinan mentahbiskan para pelaku tindak homosexual)

Indonesian congregations do not accept practicing homosexuals in church leadership

(Jemaat Indonesia tidak menerima adanya tindak homosexual dalam kepemimpinan gereja)

This decision is based on our biblical and theological understanding.

(Keputusan ini didasarkan pada pemahaman kami yang bersifat akitabiah dan teologis)

Part II

We believe the church needs to take a firm stand on this very important and crucial issue.

Therefore we request the 11th Assembly in 2006 to decide whether to accept or reject the ordination of practicing homosexuals, thereby removing the present confusion and ambiguity.

(Kami yakin bahwa gereja perlu mengambil sikap tegas dalam masalah yang sangat penting dan menentukan ini.

Oleh karena itu, kami memohon Assembly yang ke-11 tahun 2006 untuk mengambil keputusan menerima atau menolak pentahbisan para pelaku tindak homosexual sehingga dengan demikian menghilangkan kebingungan dan ketidakpastian yang sekarang ada)

Part III

We request the Assembly Standing Committee to urge presbyteries not to ordain any practicing homosexual candidates from now until the 11th Assembly in 2006.

(Kami memohon agar the Assembly Standing Committee untuk menekankan dengan tegas kepada Presbyteries untuk tidak mentahbiskan calon pendeta

yang melakukan tindak homosexual mulai sekarang sampai pertemuan Assembly ke-11 tahun 2006)

Part IV

Following the decision of the 11th Assembly in 2006 on this matter, Indonesian congregations at the next Indonesian National Conference will determine whether they are able to remain in the UCA

(Menanggapi keputusan yang akan diambil oleh Assembly ke 11 pada tahun 2006 tentang hal ini, jemaat Indonesia pada INC yang berikutnya akan menentukan apakah mereka akan terus bernaung di bawah UCA)

To do:

1. Request to INC new committee to widely distribute this statement to Assembly Standing Committee, Synods, all Presbyteries, and Media of UCA, as well as all church partners in Indonesia.

(Memohon Pengurus INC yang baru untuk menyebarluaskan pernyataan ini kepada Assembly Standing Committee, Synods, dan Presbyteries, dan Media UCA, dan juga semua gereja yang berafiliasi di Indonesia)

2. Urge all Indonesian congregations to strongly consider joining The Reforming Alliance within the Uniting Church in Australia

(Menganjurkan kepada semua gereja-gereja Indonesia agar sungguh-sungguh memikirkan untuk menggabungkan diri dengan The Reforming Alliance within the Uniting Church in Australia)

Rev Apwee Ting, Chair of the INC 2004 – 2006

6. The Position of Korean Churches in UCA on Resolution 84 of the Assembly Meeting

The following statement was prepared by members of the Council of Korean churches meeting in Sydney and was then made available to Korean newspapers and Korean congregations.

Blessings, God's Peace and grace to all Koreans, Korean churches and Korean members of UCA. As you may know, there was a 10th Assembly Meeting from 12-19 July in Melbourne. Some mass media has published that the UCA has made the decision to ordain homosexual people. In many ways, the UCA has tried to assist congregations to understand the matter correctly, which has been misled by the media. Particularly it has done this through 'Pastoral Letters' from the President and Moderators, and 'Questions and Answers', and the church has been asked us to pray on this matter. The Korean churches in the UCA have also recognised the seriousness of this matter and have tried to find out further information to respond.

Firstly, the Korean Council has closely read the Assembly documents and had a long discussion. On 29 July, the Korean ministers invited the NSW Moderator, Alistair Christie, the Assembly Multicultural Ministry Director, Helen Richmond, and the NSW Board of Mission Director, Tina Rendell to clarify and to discuss further. From this meeting, we have decided to make our position public to all Koreans and members of Korean churches.

1. The 10th Assembly Meeting (July 17 2003) Resolution 84
(The resolution with Korean translation)

2. Position of Korean Churches in UCA on the above Assembly Resolution
The Korean churches in UCA have confirmed the following backgrounds and meanings, after reading the documents and discussion with church leaders.

a) The core value of the UCA has been to embrace various people with God's grace and inclusiveness if possible.

b) The Assembly Meeting has not decided to ordain gay leaders. It has reconfirmed that the Presbytery has the authority on ordination, and if a Presbytery decides to ordain a gay person, it is possible and it could happen.

c) However, any Presbytery and congregation can decide not to, and reject the gay ordination or accept a gay leader.

d) The Korean Churches have confirmed that the UCA will respect our position not to ordain or accept gay leaders, as some other Presbyteries have also made it clear.

After the Korean Council has carefully examined, we have reached the following conclusions.

- 1) We confirm that the homosexual relationship is not Biblically correct.**
- 2) We do not accept gay people to become a leaders in the church.**
- 3) We will continue to pray and to do our best that the UCA go to a right path in this matter.**

We seek an understanding from all Korean members and ask to pray in faith about this as being part of God's family. We specially ask all Korean members in the UCA to pray for the UCA and for the UCA Korean congregations so that we can renew and make our faith strong in God. The blessing and guidance of God be with you.

7. The UCA national conference of Tongan churches policy on Homosexuality.

Because the 1997 Uniting Church Assembly chose not to make a definitive statement on homosexuality, many of our people feel very confused over the Uniting Church's beliefs about homosexuality. It is therefore very important for the UCA national conference of Tongan churches to make a very clear statement and set a policy on homosexuality for the guidance of our Tongan people in the Uniting Church.

We want to state our position very clearly now regarding homosexual practice in the Uniting Church. We cannot wait another 3 years. Our young people are confused and they need clear guidance now.

We therefore affirm;

- a) that homosexual practice is contrary to the teaching of scripture which has been affirmed by the church historically and ecumenically,
- b) that those who advocate through promotion and practice of any sexual lifestyle or behaviour contrary to the teachings of scripture will be deemed unfit for church leadership,
- c) that self avowed practicing homosexuals are not to be accepted as candidates into ordained ministry, settled designated ministries, or appointed to any positions of leadership,
- d) that ceremonies that celebrate homosexual relationships shall not be conducted by ministers who serve Tongan congregations of the UC.

It is very important that each Tongan congregation in the Uniting Church should;

- 1. Clarify to its members the beliefs of the congregation with regards to homosexuality,
- 2. state clearly the requirements of the ministers and leaders with regards to homosexuality when preparing profiles of the congregation,
- 3. Inform other councils of the church (including its presbytery, and synod) of its position.

Recommendations:

- 1. That this statement and affirmation be accepted, endorsed and adopted by the Uniting Church in Australia National Conference of the Tonga Churches,
- 2. That this resolution be communicated to the assembly's standing committee, the standing committees of every synod of the UC, all presbytery's, and all ethnic councils or congregations of the Uniting Church.

Reaffirmed by the TNC executive in 2004

7 (a) THE BELIEF IN THE INCOMPATIBILITY OF CHRISTIAN FAITH WITH HOMOSEXUAL PRACTICES

THE DOCTRINAL BASIS OF THE FREE WESLEYAN CHURCH OF TONGA'S REJECTION OF HOMOSEXUAL RELATIONS AMONGST GAYS AND LESBIANS AS UNNATURAL AND UNCHRISTIAN

Introduction:

The heart of the following statement is the Church's absolute faith in God as contained in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and earth." Therefore, God is creator of all things.

This absolute faith in God is illuminated and guided by the Holy Bible and the Church's doctrine of God. It is therefore most important that the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga should clearly state its theological and biblical stance on the matter of incompatibility of homosexual practices with Christian faith. It is ungodly and a sin for a male person to commit sexual relations with another male person, and or a female person to commit the same with another female person.

The basic tenet of our faith is the divine truth with which we reckon three factors:

1. The Holiness of Life
2. The Doctrine of the Christian Church.
3. The God-given Rights of Man and Woman.

1. The Holiness of life. A life of holiness is the experience of relationship between a person with God. Such holiness of life is God's gift to a person who is not capable of returning the same holiness to God. However, a person must live a holy life because God is holy and requires the same from all people, as declared by the Leviticus law of 11:44; 18:22; 19:2; and 20:13. A person is required by God to live and keep holy and thus holiness of life is bestowed on that person by God.

God created man to be in fellowship in spirit, mind, and body. God did not intend for man to be alone. Therefore God created woman to be in fellowship with man in body, mind, and spirit.

The biblical and doctrinal foundation of this fellowship is holy matrimony as clarified in Genesis 2:24, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." And they shall receive the blessings of procreation in marriage in order to preserve God's creation of man and woman, (Genesis 1:28).

It is a fact that homosexual relations between a man and another man or a woman and another woman cannot preserve human beings in this world as God has intended. Therefore homosexual relation is incompatible with both the natural status as well as the Christian belief in the holiness of life as demanded by a Holy

God.

Thus marriage is the only acceptable and just institution where a man and a woman is united in body, mind, and spirit.

2. The Doctrine of the Christian Church. Christianity believes that the man Jesus Christ was the true and total incarnation of God in the world in body, mind, and spirit. This was the historical fact from birth to ascension (33 years). It is the same Christ that the Church represents. They are people called by God and are united in their faith in Christ. It is that faith which gives them life and vocation as church, the *ekklesia*. Its biblical and doctrinal sources is 1 Corinthians 12: 12-30, where St. Paul presented the Church as the Visible Body of Christ. This visible body is represented by people who are united in their faith in God, and thus the head of that body is Christ. When Christ becomes the head of the body, the church is then clothed with new humanity whose divine essence becomes of God in justice and holiness.

St. Paul then asserted that Christ's relationship with the Church is the basis for holy matrimony between a man and a woman. This is his teaching as found in Ephesians 5:22-30, where he instructed the faithful that marriage relationship between a wife and husband is to emulate the relationship between the Church and Christ the head of the Church, and her pride. It is equally the same interaction between the wife and husband as Christ and the Church. Here the wife is encouraged to be obedient to the husband who is the head of the family as Christ is the head of the Church, (Ephesians 5:22-23). The husband is to love his wife as Christ loves the Church even in offering his life as a living sacrifice, (Ephesians 5: 25).

St. Paul relates this wife and husband union to Christ's relationship with the Church to the divine call in Genesis 2:24, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." When the Church becomes the body of Christ it presents the ideal relationship between a wife and a husband. Thus such marriage relationship is between a woman and a man, and not between a man and another man or a woman and another woman.

3. The God-given Rights of Man and Woman. In the beginning God gave both the first man and first woman the rights, privileges, and dominion over all the earth, (Genesis 1:28-29). That dominion rule is responsible stewardship which is required of them by God the Creator of the heavens and the earth. They are not to do as they like but to be accountable to God.

Stewardship is keeping on behalf of the proprietor goods and services in responsible and profitable manner. Man and woman are the crown jewel of God's creation. Their stewardship role is to keep and develop the sacredness of creation according to God's will, and not of their own choices. God is the owner and man and woman are God's creation.

Some scientists have testified that the greatest number of deaths throughout the world today is caused by aids, and as a result of homosexual relations between man and man and woman and woman.

Homosexual lifestyle is sin that has killed millions of people throughout the world, and it causes God's holy wrath. St. Paul reminds us of the deadly consequences of our own disobedience to God. In 1 Corinthians 3:16-17, we are told, "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy that person. For God's temple is holy, and you are that temple."

Therefore the General Conference of the Free Wesleyan Church of Tonga has approved this statement and to be entered into the Constitution as the following:

Illicit sexual relations that are not natural and therefore not Christian.

When a sexual relationship is not of its natural status and therefore not Christian, whether that be committed between a man and a man, or between a woman and a woman, such person shall not be accepted as catechist or preacher or an ordained minister or an employee of the Church. Unless an unequivocal and confirmed instrument of repentance and complete change of lifestyle is approved and accepted by the Church, shall such person may be admitted to the standard processes of candidacy.

BIBLICAL TEXT.

Leviticus 18:22 And you shall not lie with a male as one lies with a woman; it is detestable.

Leviticus 20:13 And a man who lies with a male as one lies with a woman, both of them have done a disgusting thing; they shall certainly be put to death; their blood shall be on them.

(Deuteronomy 23:1-7; Romans 1:26-27; 1 Corinthians 6:9f.; Exodus 20:14, 17; 22:19; Leviticus 20:10-16; Matthew 5:32; 19:19; Mark 10:11-12; Luke 16:18).

*Translated from Tongan to English by Rev. Dr. Tevita Tonga Mohenoa Puloka..
26 February 2005.*

8. **National Conferences of Aboriginal and Islander Members and Migrant-Ethnic congregations within the UCA who have expressed opposition to R84 either by official statements or through their National Conference discussions.**

NATIONAL UNITING ABORIGINAL AND ISLANDER CHRISTIAN CONGRESS

National Chairman: Rev Sealin Garlett

National Administrator: Rev Shayne Blackman

CHINESE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Chairperson: Pastor Peter Teo

Secretary: Rev Kau Lee

INDONESIAN NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Chairperson: Rev Apwee Ting

Secretary: Rev Harry Indriato

COUNCIL OF KOREAN CHURCHES

Chairperson: Rev David Chi

Secretary: Rev Ju Min Hyun

TONGAN NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Chairperson: Rev Jason Kioa

Secretary: Rev James Latu

FIJIAN NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Chairperson: Rev Dr Jovili Meo

Vice Chair: Rev Veitinia Waqabaca

Secretary: Mrs Viniana Ravetali

VIETNAMESE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Contact Person: Rev Bui Chi Ai