

# Presenter of resolution calls for continued conversation

DEAR FRIENDS:

There is no gloating on our part over the divided house vote earlier today concerning Resolution # 1 on Evolutionary Scientific Thinking. While we are pleased that some 440 of the Conference members voted to support the Resolution, as written and developed by our colleague Henry F. Schwartzman (retired Elder), we regret the sense of hurt and distress on the part of those who voted against.

First a brief word of explanation: Although we on the WesleyNexus Board had no role in structuring the Resolution's language, we felt it important that we support the Resolution which advocates a constructive discussion of sound theology and the scientific insights that inform our thinking in the 21st century, particularly when it means attracting young people into our churches.

Because the Connectional Table had voted concurrence of the Resolution, we were compelled to present it as written and to advocate its passage through the floor debate. We had prepared a shorter, substitute motion with less contentious language that was to be presented from the floor (it had already been loaded into the power-point system for display for the Conference), but there were too many people standing at the microphones for our colleagues in the house to gain recognition to speak. From where I was standing facing the lights from the podium, I could not even tell where our folks were situated, and Bishop Matthews did an admirable, totally unbiased job in recognizing alternating speakers for and against.

My intention was to answer the first question from the floor by calling for the prepared substitute Resolution, but no one asked a single question – there were only speeches for and against, so when the “debate” closed, I had only the opportunity for the closing statement.

While I am gratified that the Conference supported the Resolution, I regret that the rules of the Conference



Members at annual conference voted on several resolutions.

constrained my preferred course of action. Now I hope we can move on to build opportunities for constructive dialogue. Thus my appeal.

On our website – [www.wesnexus.org](http://www.wesnexus.org) – (which has its main purpose in serving as a resource for dialogue between sound theology and scientific thinking) there is an opportunity for a visitor to enter an email address and become an interactive participant in the ongoing discussion. That is one way in which you can make your voice heard, and we will respond to you.

Secondly, during the coming months, we will be sponsoring several presentations and open discussions at local churches in the conference. It would be very constructive, especially those of you who felt you must vote against the Resolution of Scientific Thinking, to join us in these dialogue opportunities. It would be our sincere hope that helpful information and mutual understanding might emerge from these occasions, and we would be especially pleased if you could bring some young people into the dialogue.

Our deep gratitude is being conveyed here to all who supported the resolution, and also for all those who engaged in the floor debate this morning. Our subsequent discussions should be more open and the dialogue more fruitful. We pray God's blessing on us all.

Sincerely,  
E. Maynard Moore,  
on behalf of the Board of Directors WesleyNexus, Inc.  
[Wesleynexus@aol.com](mailto:Wesleynexus@aol.com)