Office of the Unity Board Administrator



Cape Town September 4th, 2023

Sallie Greenfield and John Dyer.

Ref.: E-mail of 03.09.2023 to Jørgen Bøytler.

You are bringing attention to the **Unity Synod 2016**, **Resolution 5**.

You are citing, from the resolution as follows: "This resolution proscribes that the "Unity Synod, the Unity Board and the Unity Executive Committee has the RIGHT AND DUTY to hear both parties, to give careful consideration to all matters, to seek to understand the issues and seek a way forward."

What is not mentioned in your note is from the first bullet point in US2016.5.: ..a code of conduct will include the following:

when a conflict, as a rule between several groups or entities within a Province¹ develops and the conflict involves the leadership, and in the event that the synod, being the highest appeal body within the province, is unable to find a solution to the said conflict, the Provincial Board notifies the Unity office as early as possible.

The Concerned Moravians (CM) is a group of individuals, some of whom are members of the Moravian Church, but not a recognized group within a Unity Province. This conflict is not between leaders or between the leadership of a Moravian Church Province and a provincially mandated group. The conflict is between and independently registered group, the (CM), which is not recognized (by the MCSP Synod or PEC) within the Provincial structure nor recognized in the MCSP Provincial Church Constitution. As such, the conditions are not met to allow the code of conduct to be implemented effectively.

To open communication between the Unity and a body independent of any Provincial structure would be an overreach of the Unity Board's authority since neither the Provincial Elders Conference, nor the Unity Board nor Unity Synod has any authority over CM.

¹From time to time, a conflict with an individual arises within a province and is dealt with by the province and/or its synod and it may not need Unity interventions.