

Women bishops

Women bishops working group next steps, 31 January 2013.

There will be mediated discussions in February followed by a House of Bishops meeting and then a consultation to close at the end of February on new proposals for women bishops legislation.

The announcement is attached.

Article in *The Wey*, the Guildford Diocesan newspaper Feb / March 2013 issue.

Attached is my published article in women bishops.

Decision of House of Laity meeting, 18 January 2013.

The House of Laity today rejected a vote of no confidence in the Chair of the House of Laity.

I was one of the 80 people who voted for the Chair. 47 voted against the Chair and 13 abstained. The papers in the debate are below. The Church of England news item is here:

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2013/01/house-of-laity-rejects-vote-of-no-confidence.aspx>

Papers for House of Laity meeting, January 2013.

A special meeting of the General Synod's House of Laity has been called for 18 January to debate a motion of no confidence in the Chairman of the House of Laity because at the November Synod he had spoken against the draft women bishops legislation.

Attached is the paper proposing no confidence.

Attached is the speech against which the accusation is made.

I intend to vote against the motion of no confidence, because I believe that people should not be expelled from office for giving their view. I would welcome any views to be sent to me prior to the meeting.

New working group on women bishops, 19 December 2012.

On 19 December, the Church of England announced the membership of a new working group to assist the House of Bishops "to a decision on the new package of proposals which it intends to bring to the Synod in July."

Attached is the official Church of England announcement.

On 20 December, the group Reform published a statement that they regretted that the membership of the new working group did not include anyone who was a conservative evangelical. Nevertheless they remain committed to the process. Attached is the Reform statement.

Women in the Episcopate - Synodical Process (GS Misc 1039), 19 December 2012.

At a meeting with parliamentarians on 13 December, the Bishop of Durham undertook to provide a memorandum to Parliament on the Synodical process. This was published on 19 December. Paragraphs 1-10 are a helpful explanation of how Synod works. Paragraphs 11-16 are a helpful outline of next steps. Attached is the document.

Interview on BBC Radio Surrey, 19 December 2012.

Anne Martin, General Synod member who had voted in favour of the draft legislation, and myself who had voted against the draft legislation, were interviewed on BBC Radio Surrey. Attached is a transcript of the interview.

Debate in Parliament, 12 December 2012.

The House of Commons debated the issue and passed a motion from Ben Bradshaw MP "That this House has considered the matter of the Church of England Synod vote on women bishops".

The transcript of the debate is on the parliament website at the following link, beginning at column 376:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121212/debtext/121212-0003.htm#1212124000002>

In column 382 of the debate, Mr Bradshaw says:

"New Zealand, Australia, the United States, Canada and South Africa all have women bishops, and they have systems that are without any legislative alternative for episcopal oversight; they have voluntary pastoral care. From what I hear, that works well and people are perfectly happy with it, and the women bishops themselves deal with it very sensitively."

It is often said how well non-legislative arrangements work for traditionalists in other countries, but I have never heard any traditionalist in those countries say that themselves. For example, the traditionalist bishop Keith Ackerman, Chairman of Forward in Faith North America said in October:

"We started out as a respected minority, then we became a recognised minority, then we became a welcomed minority, then we became a tolerated minority, then we became a marginalised minority, and then we became a persecuted minority. This is all capped off by the election of a female Presiding Bishop and then we became an extinguished minority. The reason being that she insists on doing all the consecrations of bishops, so no matter what one's integrity may be in The Episcopal Church, a man being called to a bishop who is a traditionalist would be consecrated by the Presiding Bishop."

(I.e. no traditionalist can now become bishop in The Episcopal Church in the US because no option is provided other than consecration by the female Presiding Bishop, whose sacramental ministry he cannot theologically recognise).

A transcript of his speech is attached.

Statement from the House of Bishops, 11 December 2012.

The House of Bishops have issued a statement setting out a new process to enable women to become bishops.

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2012/12/statement-from-the-house-of-bishops-on-defeat-of-women-bishops-legislation.aspx>

The full statement can be read via the above link. A key extract is:

"For any such proposals to command assent, the House believes that they will need

(i) greater simplicity,

(ii) a clear embodiment of the principle articulated by the 1998 Lambeth Conference "that those who dissent from as well as those who assent to, the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate are both loyal Anglicans",

(iii) a broadly-based measure of agreement about the shape of the legislation in advance of the beginning of the actual legislative process."

I fully support these aims. Point (iii) stresses the need to have some general agreement on the basis of the legislation before we proceed. I would encourage everyone to pray that in the next few months the various parties will all commit themselves to reaching a mutual agreement, so that the Church can move forward together.

Meeting of the laity of Guildford Diocese, 11 December 2012.

On 11 December, the four lay representatives of the Guildford Diocese on the General Synod: Peter Bruinvels, Keith Malcouronne, Anne Martin and myself, spoke to a meeting of about 300 lay people in the diocese. We explained our reasons for how we had voted on the *Draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure* and we listened to the views of the 51 people who spoke in reply.

I gave a hand out which shared my explanation of the history of what went wrong, and looked to the future on to how we could go forward together (footnote 13 has been updated to give more detail). Attached is the paper.

The Bishop of Guildford, Rt Revd Christopher Hill closed the meeting sharing the outcome a House of Bishops meeting earlier in the day which had resulted in the 11 December statement from the House of Bishops (see above).

GENERAL SYNOD

Women Bishops: Working Group on new legislative proposals

Please see below a statement which the Chair of the Working Group has asked to be circulated to Synod members.

William Fittall
Secretary General

31 January 2013

Synod members will have seen that, on 11 December, the House of Bishops established a working group drawn from all three Houses of Synod to advise it on the preparation of fresh legislative proposals to be brought before the Synod in July. The Archbishops announced the names of the ten members of the Group on 19 December.

We held our first meeting on 3 January and met again yesterday. At our first meeting we decided to invite 15 people to join us for intensive facilitated discussions on 5/6 February. We sought nominations for some of these places from interested groups and issued some invitations to named individuals.

We thought long and hard about the best arrangements and came to the conclusion that an event of this kind, at which we could do intensive and focused work with the help of outside facilitators, would be what was most productive at this stage of the process.

After our conversations conclude at the end of Wednesday afternoon the Working Group will be meeting the Archbishops and other members of the House of Bishops Standing Committee that evening in preparation for a special meeting of the House of Bishops on Thursday 7 February.

It will be for the House to decide what should happen thereafter in the light of the conversations that have happened. My expectation is that the House will issue a statement and give the working Group a fresh mandate for the next phase of its work. I would also hope that, shortly thereafter, there will be an opportunity to circulate a consultation document enabling all Synod members to make a contribution. Given the timescale to which we are working we shall probably need to seek responses by the end of February.

The ten of us who have been appointed to serve on the Working Group – 4 bishops, 3 clergy and 3 laity – are very conscious of the weight of expectation and responsibility placed on us. Do pray for us and for all those involved in the various discussions during the week of 4 February

+Nigel St Edmundsbury and Ipswich

Adrian Vincent. Article for *The Wey* newspaper, February 2013, plus footnotes.

Introduction

I was invited by the editors of the Guildford Diocesan newspaper, *The Wey*, to contribute up to 350 words to their February/March 2013 issue on the women bishops vote. Below is the text of my article, to which I have added footnotes which gives source materials for more information.

Article

“I go to St Nicholas’ Church in Pyrford and help at the youth club of the Church of the Good Shepherd. In 2010 I was elected as a lay member of General Synod. I share responsibility for the hurt caused to so many by the failure of the women bishops legislation.

On my website www.adrianvincent.org.uk I give a full explanation¹. In short, in 2006 the Bishop of Guildford chaired a working group that proposed a way to ordain women as bishops whilst also providing for traditionalists². 348 Synod members voted in favour, only one voted against.³

But when the legislation was drawn up, it did not include the provision that the Bishop of Guildford had proposed⁴. In 2010 the two Archbishops tried to correct this, by proposing an amendment that would have met the needs of traditionalists. Most General Synod members voted for the Archbishops’ amendment, but it was voted down by the House of Clergy.⁵

In 2011, 42 out of 44 dioceses voted for women bishops. Eleven of those dioceses then passed motions calling for the draft legislation to be amended to provide for traditionalists⁶. In 2012 the Bishops made an amendment that increased provision⁷. But in July some leading campaigners for women bishops threatened to vote against the women bishops legislation unless the Bishops removed that provision for traditionalists⁸. The Bishops removed it.

¹ See for example, <http://www.adrianvincent.org.uk/issues.html>

² <http://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2006/01/pr0606.aspx>

³ General Synod Report of Proceedings, February 2006, Volume 37 No. 1. page 268 for the motion, page 308 for the voting figures.

⁴ General Synod Report of Proceedings, February 2008, Volume 39 No. 2. pages 350-362.

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/40991/ropjuly2008.pdf>

⁵ General Synod Report of Proceedings, July 2010, page 168.

[http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1155179/july%202010%20consolidated%20with%20index%20\(with%20full%20bookmarks\).pdf](http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1155179/july%202010%20consolidated%20with%20index%20(with%20full%20bookmarks).pdf)

⁶ Report by the Business Committee on the Reference to the Dioceses, GS 1847,

[http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1379450/gs%201847%20\(women%20bishops%20-%20business%20committee%20report\).pdf](http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1379450/gs%201847%20(women%20bishops%20-%20business%20committee%20report).pdf)

⁷ This was to add clause 5(1)c to the text of the draft Measure. See pages 6-8 of GS 1708-09ZZ “DRAFT BISHOPS AND PRIESTS (CONSECRATION AND ORDINATION OF WOMEN) MEASURE AND AMENDING CANON NO. 30. ARTICLE 7 REFERENCE TO THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS”

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1478244/gs%201708-1709zz%20report%20from%20the%20hob%20on%20the%20art%207%20reference%20june%202012.pdf>

⁸ E.g. Dr Elaine Storkey, *The Church Times*, page 2, 15 June 2012.

General Synod July 2012 Report of Proceedings: page 218 speech by the Ven Rachel Treweek

[http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1527142/july%202012%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1527142/july%202012%20(2).pdf)

I have always said I will vote for women bishops legislation that also meets the theological needs of traditionalists. When the last real provision was deleted in July, I had no real choice but to vote against.

Some say this put me in the minority. But in a 2012 survey of churchgoers, 75% agreed that traditionalists are “faithful Anglicans who should not be forced out of the Church of England”.⁹

We can achieve the joint goals of women bishops and provision that meets the needs of traditionalists. In December the Bishops announced talks to achieve, “a broadly-based measure of agreement about the shape of the legislation”. We can get there if those in the talks are determined to reach agreement. Please pray for them.”

⁹ Pages 24-26 of November 2012 issue of ‘New Directions’ <http://www.forwardinfaith.com/news/new-directions-archive.html> The 75% figure is the 44.3% + 30.6% in the answers to Question 10 of the survey: “Please indicate which of the following most closely represents your view. I believe that those opposed to the ordination of women...

Have no business being in the Church of England any longer (1.6%);

Have had adequate time to get used to the idea (16.4%);

Are faithful Anglicans who should not be forced out of the Church of England because they cannot accept women bishops as a matter of conscience (44.3%);

Should be enabled to stay in the Church of England by means of some form of provision which meets their position of conscience (30.6%);

Should have the right to veto the introduction of women bishops (7.2%).”

[Note: 1,080 people answered the survey (Q.1a), 88.3% were members of the Church of England (Q.1b), 90.4% were lay people (Q.18)].

GENERAL SYNOD

HOUSE OF LAITY

Motion of no confidence in the Chair of the House of Laity

My reason for asking members of the House to debate this motion is that I do not have confidence in our Chair since:

- His speech against the measure followed directly after Justin Welby's and therefore I believe directly undermined what the Archbishop elect had said
- Since it was against it did not support the views of the House of Bishops as a whole
- Speaking as the Chair of our House his speech was instrumental in convincing some of the undecided members of the House to vote against
- I believe the speech was therefore a significant contributor to the reputational damage the Church of England is already suffering at the hands of the press, which is also manifest in the comments of the Prime Minister, the emerging reports of withdrawal of financial support, the angry reaction of church members and the disbelief and ridicule expressed by many of our secular friends, all of which I believe will damage the mission of our church
- The failure of the Measure is already giving momentum to the idea that the only likely solution now is a single clause Measure, which would result in a worse outcome for the minority groups than was on offer on Tuesday

I have always been one of the first to say that individuals must vote according to their consciences; however leaders have other responsibilities and accountabilities. I feel that if I am to support the leader of a group of which I am a member then that leader must show wise and good judgement and I do not believe that this has happened.

Canon Stephen Barney

Leicester 325

GENERAL SYNOD

HOUSE OF LAITY

Unedited transcript of Dr Giddings's speech during the debate on the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure (GS 1708D) at the November 2012 group of sessions of the General Synod

Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford): I want first, as Chair of the House of Laity, to welcome Bishop Justin as Archbishop-elect and express my very great appreciation for the speech he has just made. Sadly, although I agree with almost everything that he said, I cannot agree with his conclusion.

As Chair of the House of Laity, it is part of my role to ensure that the views of the whole House are heard, particularly on final approval business. Synod already knows that a substantial majority of the House and of laypeople generally are in favour of women bishops and of this draft Measure. Many speeches today are making that point. Therefore, I want to focus on a significant minority of laypeople who are opposed in principle to women bishops and to the content of the Measure before us.

Essentially, I wish to say that it is unwise to go ahead with a Measure dealing with fundamental matters of ministry and doctrine with a significant minority of our Church unable to accept its provisions. I do believe that we can find a better way.

On 7 February this year in Westminster Abbey, representatives of the Church of England and the URC took part in a service of penitence and reconciliation to mark the 350th anniversary of the Great Ejection of non-conforming ministers in 1662. In November 2003, this Synod endorsed the covenant for unity with the Methodist Church in 'a spirit of penitence for...our past divisions, believing that we have been impoverished through our separation and that our witness to the gospel has been weakened accordingly'.

Surely we do not want to make the same mistakes again? Can we not find a better way of taking this historic step of allowing the consecration of women as bishops without unchurching those who cannot in conscience accept it?

Last week I received a letter from a former distinguished lay member of this Synod who cannot in conscience accept the sacramental ministration of women bishops. He says, 'All I ask for is a place in that one CofE where I can continue and flourish with integrity and mutual respect, but it is precisely that which this proposed legislation denies me'. I do not agree with his views on sacramental ministry but I do not see why our disagreement requires that one or other of us has no future in the Church of England.

In 1992 I voted in favour of ordaining women to the priesthood but knowing it was unacceptable to many of my fellow Evangelicals because of their understanding of the biblical teaching on headship. I voted for that legislation because it was designed to ensure that those who could not in conscience accept it could remain with us. Today's legislative package will not achieve that.

Do we really believe that such diversity of opinion no longer exists? Legislation does not remove diversity of opinion. It is diversity. It is not prejudice. It is not simply refusal to

accept change. It is solidly theologically based judgement. That is not my view; that was recognized fully in the Rochester report. We may disagree with the dissenting minority but does that mean we have to exclude them from a future in this Church?

Those who have worked for reconciliation in various areas of life know that you cannot achieve a solution unless all parties agree to and own it. That is the missing piece in this legislative package. Those for whom the provision is intended do not own it.

We have been told that we have debated these matters long enough. Long enough perhaps for those who are in the majority and can impose their will, but not long enough to gain the consent of those who are opposed and whose consent is essential if we are to remain a united and growing Church committed to mission. We should not be in this position. We can and should find a better way.

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2012/12/working-group-on-new-legislative-proposals-on-women-bishops-announced.aspx>

Working group on new legislative proposals on women bishops announced

19 December 2012

The Archbishops of Canterbury and York have announced the membership of the new working group established by the House of Bishops following the defeat of the women bishops' legislation.

The group includes members of all three houses of the General Synod - Bishops, Clergy and Laity - and a senior member of clergy who is no longer on the Synod. The members are:

The Rt Rev Nigel Stock, Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich (chair)

The Rt Rev Dr Christopher Cocksworth, Bishop of Coventry

The Rt Rev James Langstaff, Bishop of Rochester

The Rt Rev Dr Martin Warner, Bishop of Chichester

The Very Rev Vivienne Faull, Dean of York

The Ven Christine Hardman,

The Rev Dr Rosemarie Mallett

Dr Philip Giddings

Dr Paula Gooder

Mrs Margaret Swinson

The group's task (see PR 160.12 <http://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2012/12/statement-from-the-house-of-bishops-on-defeat-of-women-bishops-legislation.aspx>) is to assist the House when it meets in February and again in May to come to a decision on the new package of proposals which it intends to bring to the Synod in July. The group has been tasked to arrange facilitated discussions in February with a wide range of people of a variety of views. It is expected to have two initial meetings in January.

Once draft legislation is ready for introduction to the Synod there will be a separate decision, in the usual way, about the membership of a new Steering Committee. That Committee will have the responsibility for the management of the legislation through Synod. Steering Committees are always composed of members of Synod who support the legislation.

The membership of the Revision Committee is settled after first consideration of the legislation.

<http://reform.org.uk/news/src/archive/12-2012/title/reform-media-statement-dec-20-2012>

Reform Media Statement Dec 20, 2012:

Posted on 20 December 2012

PRESS STATEMENT FROM REFORM

Following the announcement of the formation of a House of Bishops Working Group on 19th December, Reform chairman Rod Thomas has written to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. The letter reaffirms Reform's commitment to the process of seeking a new way forward on women bishops legislation, but says that the membership of the working group leaves it feeling 'apprehensive'.

Prebendary Rod Thomas said he was 'nonplussed as to why the membership of the working group does not contain anybody who shares our convictions about male headship - despite the fact that this was a key concern underlying the vote on 20th November.

We very much wish to contribute to fresh proposals that will command broader agreement in the General Synod than was achieved last month. Achieving such an outcome depends on hearing clearly the needs of those who were both for and against the draft Measure. Our fear is that the constitution of the working group might make this more difficult. Nevertheless we will seek to contribute positively during the discussions that are planned for next February.'

End

NOTE TO EDITORS

Reform is an Anglican evangelical network which works for the promotion of the gospel. It believes the Church will be more effective in proclaiming the good news of Jesus Christ the more it follows the teaching of the Bible.

There are currently 1700 members of Reform, both lay and ordained.

To see the Church of England announcement of the working party, [click here](#).

GENERAL SYNOD

Women in the Episcopate – Synodical Process

1. To make it possible for women to be consecrated as bishops the General Synod needs to approve a measure and an amending canon. All measures (the equivalent of Acts of Parliament) require scrutiny by the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament, and then approval by the House of Commons and House of Lords before receiving the Royal Assent. Canons are submitted to Her Majesty, via the Ministry of Justice, for the Royal Assent and Licence of the Crown.
2. It is, in principle, possible for both measures and canons to confer enabling powers under which subordinate instruments may be made. For example, the legislation defeated in November would have required the production of a code of practice, made by the House of Bishops and approved by the Synod. Similarly a canon could in principle provide for the House of Bishops to make regulations.

Decision making in Synod

3. Decisions of the Synod are normally taken by a simple majority vote of the whole Synod. But some decisions have to be taken by a division by Houses, in which case the business is carried only if it receives the support of majorities in each of the three Houses – Bishops, Clergy, and Laity. It is also open to 25 members of the Synod to trigger a division by Houses on any issue (other than on questions of procedure). Additionally, certain types of business require the approval of a special majority in each House or of the whole Synod.
4. The synodical legislative process is in some respects similar to that of the House of Commons and House of Lords. Upon introduction all draft measures receive first consideration in the Synod – the equivalent of the parliamentary second reading stage. They are then considered by a revision committee at the equivalent of committee stage. On return to the floor of the Synod they are considered at the revision stage – the equivalent of report stage. There is then an additional stage – final drafting – which primarily provides an opportunity for any minor drafting adjustments before the final approval vote.
5. Certain categories of legislation- including any measure to enable women to become bishops- are subject to the requirements of Articles 7 and 8 of the Synod's Constitution. Legislation falling within Article 7 can only come to the Synod for final approval in a form approved by the House of Bishops. It is open to the House to make such amendments as it sees fit before the Synod finally decides whether to approve the legislation.
6. The effect of Article 8 is that legislation falling within it, or the substance of the proposals embodied in it, has to be sent out to the dioceses at some point between the revision stage and final approval and can only proceed to final approval if at least 23 of the 44 dioceses of the Church of England give their approval. Approval is deemed to have been given by a diocesan synod if the Houses of Clergy and Laity vote in favour of the legislation.

7. The highest hurdle for the approval of any measure to enable women to become bishops comes at the final approval stage, when a two-thirds majority is needed in each of the Houses of Bishops, Clergy and Laity in the General Synod. It was this hurdle that the draft legislation on women bishops failed to pass on 20 November.

Differences between Parliament and the Synod

8. In comparing synodical and parliamentary legislative processes there are three significant differences to bear in mind:
 - Most parliamentary legislation is proposed by the government. Governments can normally expect to command a majority in the House of Commons. The Church of England does not have a government in the same way. While legislation may be sponsored by the House of Bishops or the Archbishops' Council, neither of these bodies is an executive in the manner of Her Majesty's Government. Moreover, while there are informal groupings within the Synod, there are no parties and no whips. The outcome of votes in the full Synod turns therefore on individual judgements reached by each of its 470 voting members.
 - Membership of the General Synod is a part-time and wholly voluntary activity. The Synod is required to meet for at least two groups of sessions a year and in some years, as in 2012, meets on three occasions. Each group of sessions lasts for the inside of a week. Other bodies of the Synod, including legislative revision committees, can meet in between groups of sessions. But, even so, the timing and frequency of meetings have to take account of the fact that members of Synod, unless retired, have to take leave of absence from their day jobs in order to be present.
 - It is open to the Synod, before a legislative process starts, to express a view on the timetable that it would wish to see followed. It is also open to the steering committee- the group of members in charge of a particular piece of draft legislation- to try and force the pace. There is no equivalent of the parliamentary 'guillotine', whereby a binding timetable can be imposed. In addition, at the revision committee stage all members of the Synod have a right under Standing Orders to submit their own amendments and to attend the committee and speak to their proposals if they so choose.

Suspending Standing Orders?

9. It is, in theory, possible for the Synod to suspend its Standing Orders in relation to aspects of the procedure that would otherwise apply to legislation enabling women to be consecrated as bishops. But that would require the consent of three quarters of the members of the General Synod.
10. In addition, those requirements which are in the constitution could not be set aside by this means; primary legislation would be required. Relevant requirements imposed by the Constitution are for: the consent of the majority of the dioceses;

the agreement of the House of Bishops to the text which is to be submitted for final approval; and two-thirds majorities in each House at final approval.

How long?

11. The House of Bishops has already said, in its statement of 11 December, that new legislation needs to be simpler. How long it will take to reach the final approval stage depends to some extent, however, on whether, before it is introduced to the Synod, a broader measure of agreement can be secured in pre-legislative discussions than was achieved last time on the overall shape of the proposals.
12. When the last process started there remained radically different views on the desirable shape of the legislation and these points continued to be argued right through the process. Thus the revision committee received 297 submissions and had to meet on 16 occasions.
13. Much turns, therefore on the intensive facilitated discussions planned for the early months of 2013. Thereafter, once legislation has received first consideration in the Synod a further three meetings of the whole Synod will be required.
14. The period needed between these meetings will turn in particular on how long the revision committee takes and how quickly the reference to the dioceses can be undertaken. Last time these took, respectively, a year (because of the large number of amendments to be considered by the revision committee) and 15 months (to give the diocesan synods the option to seek the views of deanery synods).
15. No minimum timescale is, however, specified for these stages in the Standing Orders so it would be possible to complete both much more rapidly than last time. That would mean that the timetable for new legislation could be much shorter than the time taken by defeated legislation, which was introduced in February 2009 and did not reach the final approval stage until July 2012 (when the debate was adjourned until November so that the House of Bishops could reconsider an amendment that it had made).
16. It would, therefore, be possible for legislation introduced in 2013 to complete all its stages in the lifetime of this Synod, which ends in July 2015. Pending the discussions with all interested parties in the early months of 2013 it is too soon, however, to offer a confident prediction of what the timescale will be given the imperative need to avoid a second failure.

William Fittall
Secretary General
General Synod
18 December 2012

BBC Radio Surrey. 19 December 2012. Interview with Anne Martin & Adrian Vincent.

Typed up by Adrian Vincent from the audio recording on the website.

Nigel Williams (interviewer): "...the divisive issue of women bishops, four representatives of the Guildford Diocese... Anne Martin...you voted in favour of the legislation proposed, why was that?"

Anne Martin: Because a lot of hard work has been done to find a compromise that is acceptable to those in favour of women bishops and for those against, and I think that the legislation had come up with the best possible way we could do it.

Nigel Williams: Adrian, let's go to you, you voted against the legislation, so why did you take that stance please?

Adrian Vincent: When we had a survey of churchgoers last year, 75% of them said that they thought that traditionalists in the Church, who don't agree with the ordination of women, are still, nonetheless, faithful Anglicans who should not be forced out of the Church of England. And so I voted with *that* majority, because, as Anne said, we needed legislation that brought in women bishops but also gave provisions for traditionalists.

Nigel Williams: Anne, that sounds like a reasonable proposal doesn't it? That sounds acceptable?

Anne Martin: There are people understandably; the majority of people would like the Church to stay together, but there was an argument that the people who did not want women bishops had made compromise, whilst those who did had made no compromise, and this is not true. It's trying to find somewhere in the middle and to find absolute wording that everybody will accept is a very difficult thing to do.

Nigel Williams: Adrian, how does it make you feel that people are calling for your resignation over the way you voted?

Adrian Vincent: I've had calls for my resignation and I've also had lots of messages of support. Here's one I received a couple of days ago saying, "Thank you so much for your courage in Synod, voting against the tide, for the people like me – lifelong Anglicans – who would ask only for proper provision that we might flourish".

There's a lot of hurt been caused by myself who voted in the way I have, because people were wanting women bishops, they thought now is the time. But then there's been a lot of relief for those traditionalists who feel that they can now have a chance to have proper provision, so that when in a few months time, in the next round of talks we're going to have to talk about a way forward, we can actually have a genuine way forward that both sides can agree with, and then we can move forward with women bishops after that.

Nigel Williams: Anne, it's very frustrating looking at this from the outside. Do you sense that frustration from congregations and non-churchgoers even?

Anne Martin: Frustration, anger, hurt, because there a lot of people that feel very hurt that what seemed to be the best compromise had been stopped. I think it's going to be difficult. I think that the people who say they accept women bishops but voted against because they say

that the provision is not good enough for those against, are going to have to think very hard as to whether they would have to think about abstaining if they are torn in two directions.

Nigel Williams: When the vote comes round again, will you be changing your votes either of you? Adrian first.

Adrian Vincent: I've always said that I will vote for women bishops legislation if it includes provisions which meets the spiritual needs of traditionalists.

Nigel Williams: Anne, how about you?

Anne Martin: Unless it makes it impossible for a diocesan bishop to be fully a diocesan bishop – which I think is unlikely – then yes of course I will vote in favour of women bishops, which is what the majority of the Church of England want.

Nigel Williams: Thank you both for joining us...

**12 October 2012 Forward in Faith National Assembly
Report from Forward in Faith North America, Bishop Keith Ackerman**

This is a (shortened) transcription by Adrian Vincent of the audio file, which at the time of writing (January 2013) is on the Forward in Faith website:

<http://www.forwardinfaith.com/news/na2012.html>

“Glory to Jesus Christ. It is a pleasure to see my brothers and sisters, I want to thank you very much for your encouragement in your ongoing love and fraternal care. [...]

Since 2008, Forward in Faith North America is technically speaking no longer a political organisation. The reason for that is that we were given the exit door. There was simply no more room in The Episcopal Church for traditional anglo-catholics. 1976 women were ordained as priests, that was 36 years ago. In 1989 women were ordained and consecrated as bishops, that was 23 years ago. [...] In just three and a half decades traditional anglo-catholics have had a status change though. We started out as a respected minority, then we became a recognised minority, then we became a welcomed minority, then we became a tolerated minority, then we became a marginalised minority, and then we became a persecuted minority. This is all capped off by the election of a female Presiding Bishop and then we became an extinguished minority. The reason being that she insists on doing all the consecrations of bishops, so no matter what one’s integrity may be in The Episcopal Church, a man being called to a bishop who is a traditionalist would be consecrated by the Presiding Bishop. I leave that with you.

I have now been a bishop for nearly twenty years, and over ten years I’ve been the President of Forward in Faith. Forward in Faith was an organisation in The Episcopal Church. Now it has virtually no Episcopalians left in it. [...] Now we are an organism, no longer an organisation, a type of new Oxford Movement, because all of our energies are shifted, we now have virtually no resolutions any longer, few people to fight, a new way of doing business and bringing people to Jesus Christ in the context of Christ’s one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church. This is not always easy for people because most of our existence has been fighting somebody, generally speaking the church, the ecclesial body of which we found ourselves members. So, instead of fighting *for* the faith in the entity; we are now released so that we might be able to *proclaim* the faith and to teach it and to spread that faith. [...]

But not without cost. The Episcopal Church and her wealthy solicitors are not terribly happy and they have expended an extraordinary amount of money. Pensions of priests have been frozen, life insurance lost, young priests with less than five years having paid into the pension have lost their pension. Many of our priests are now bi-vocational. But we count it as joy, because in many way’s we’ve been released for ministry, released to be able to plant churches and to be able to do the work of Jesus Christ. Three Forward in Faith dioceses who have left The Episcopal Church have been sued, in spite of the fact that every one of these three dioceses would have returned property gladly to those who wished to be in The Episcopal Church. Quite the contrary, the suing continues and the litigation goes on. Even in the weeks to come you will be hearing more information from the Diocese of Quincy which I was Diocesan for fifteen years, to the Diocese of Fort Worth. And there is a fourth diocese, the Diocese of Pittsburgh which has already lost their cases.

But Forward in Faith is the only organism in North America that has membership from virtually who call themselves anglo-catholics in North America, Central America and South

America. Forward in Faith no longer has a need to write many resolutions any longer. Our assemblies, thanks to much of your encouragement, are more like festivals of faith, with teaching, preaching, workshops, sung Offices, solemn High Mass, powerful singing. And we've lost very little leadership. Membership to the Ordinariat has been minimal, shifting has been somewhat minimal, and we attempt in every possible way to keep our communications open. What is left is a dedicated group that is now moving forward in faith, and it is moving us out of a legislative mode, out of a political mode which we had by necessity, into a prayerful, joyful, celebrational movement. We must keep our hands on the plough and move forward, looking back only to the words and encouragement of Christ's one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.

We have become a type of coalition, a type of organism that is doing all that it can to work with those who seek to be able to maintain orthodox Anglicanism. We work very intimately with: the Eastern Orthodox of a variety of jurisdictions; Lutherans who desire apostolic succession in the United States; other Anglicans; Anglican mission societies; the Reformed Episcopal Church; the Polish National Catholic Church; the Anglican Church in North America; and on and on we work diligently to be able to maintain levels of communication and levels of tested communion so that we might be able to do the work of Christ.

We have had to redefine who our enemies are. Our enemies are not so much other Christians, but rather in many ways we must be very intentional about the fact that Satan tries to put us on another track, in my opinion, to call each other enemies in the States instead of determining what the real problems are within the culture. Our enemy is secularism, narcissism, apathy, timidity, and to be quite honest with you Islam is become increasingly a problem in the United States and is become something that I'm afraid that all too often our eyes are kept off as we've looked so carefully in to discover the differences between Christians. Indeed even in the work that I'm doing right now I sometimes feel as if I'm engaged in ecumenical dialogue with fellow Anglicans. But then again, you have to understand, for a number of years it felt as if I'd really been involved in inter-faith dialogue in the House of Bishops in The Episcopal Church.

And so it is that the ways in which Satan tries to take us off track, occasionally means that we think that this war is natural. This battle isn't natural, this is supernatural, and he seeks that we not build any coalitions with faithful Christians, he seeks that we judge even those who are attempting to be faithful. [...] We must have the goal before us [...] but what we've also discovered, at least in the States, is at this point there is no ecclesiastical purity; we are in such a set of circumstances in this war, that we must pick the ambiguity with which we can live. I've found this in my numerous visits to Palestine, to the Holy Land, where I've discovered that the division of Christians there is really a scandal. It's quite tragic as we see strides that are being made, and the extinction of Christians in that country, its percentage being reduced to such a small minority that it has no united voice, and very rapidly what we are discovering in the Holy Land is that many of those churches which had been vital and critical to us are now nothing other than museums and shrines. May we learn from that experience. Had Christians determined ways in which they could have worked together in the Holy Land instead of battling one another, perhaps the situation might be different today.

And therefore beloved brothers and sisters in Christ, I share with you just a few thoughts about what's happening in our own country and I again defer to my beloved brothers and sisters in Christ for your wisdom, your prayers and your ongoing encouragement. May God bless you."

Meeting of the laity of the Guildford Diocese: 11 December 2012
Personal statement from Adrian Vincent, member of General Synod.

1.) Looking back – what went wrong?

The failure of the *Draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure* to achieve the required two-thirds majority in the General Synod House of Laity on 20 November 2012 has caused a great deal of shock, hurt and anger both within and outside the Church.

Different explanations are given as to why 74 members of the House of Laity, including myself, voted against. The media assumes that it was pure sexism. However, given that half of those who voted against were women, including several campaigners for the ordination of women as bishops, that can't be the reason.

Within the Church there are two completely opposite explanations of what went wrong, depending on who you listen to. Take for example these two opposing examples:

Opposite accounts	
<p><i>Canon Andrew Dow, letter in The Church Times, 30 November 2012</i></p> <p>“When I first joined the General Synod in 1995, the then Bishop of Chester, the Rt Revd Michael Baughen, gave me a rule of thumb for approaching Synod motions and debates.”If you go for gold," he said (in other words, the most that you want, the very best as you see it), "you are likely to lose all. However, if you go for silver (not your ideal, but a step in the right direction), you are more likely to gain."</p> <p>Never has his dictum proved more true than in the result of last week's debate on women bishops. As I witnessed first hand over a long period, the supporters of women bishops pressed for their "gold" with a scorched-earth policy towards their opponents which voted down amendment after amendment that, if passed, could have enabled conservatives and traditionalists to come on board.</p> <p>[...] Their understandable distress is very sad for the Church; but ultimately it is they who are responsible.”</p>	<p><i>WATCH (Women and the Church) statement 4 December 2012</i> http://www.womenandthechurch.org/home</p> <p>“Years have been spent in trying to make legal provision that would satisfy those opposed.</p> <p>[...] The draft Measure represented the furthest possible compromise for those in favour. It was not enough for those opposed. After all these years of discussion, debate, and drafting it is clear that that there is no legal settlement that can be devised that will allow women to be bishops whilst satisfying the demands of those opposed.</p> <p>[...] It is now time to go for the simplest possible legislation - a single clause measure.</p> <p>[...] Those opposed do not want women bishops. They do not want resolution of the issue but to extend the decision-making process as long as possible. We cannot see how further conversation will result in any proposals that have not been tested and rejected before. They will simply prolong the process.”</p>

The above two accounts illustrate the two ends of the debate. Personally, I do not agree with Mr Dow that the proponents of the legislation had a “scorched-earth policy” towards traditionalists. Nor do I agree with WATCH (Women and the Church) that “there is no legal settlement that can be devised that will allow women to be bishops whilst satisfying the demands of those opposed.”

My own account of the history is as follows. In summarising I am inevitably picking out the points that I think are most significant, and consequently my view may not be objective, but I have provided footnote references to the documents themselves so that you can read the source material for yourself and form your own judgment.

November 2004: The report of the Bishop of Rochester’s working group, “Women Bishops in the Church of England?” was published¹ (I was the minute taker for that working group). Chapter 5 set out the theological arguments for and against the ordination of women to the episcopate.

February 2006: the General Synod debated a report from the Bishop of Guildford’s working group² (I was the minute taker), which set out proposals that would enable the ordination of women as bishops, whilst providing for those who in theological conscience could not receive that ministry. The provisions would be “transferred episcopal arrangements” (TEA), whereby a parish could ask to receive ministry from a male bishop. That male bishop would be provided with certain episcopal functions that would be transferred to them from the woman diocesan bishop by operation of law. It was essential that the provision of the male bishop was via *transfer* rather than *delegation*. This is because if you are a conservative evangelical who believes in biblical male headship, or an anglo-catholic who believes in apostolic succession and sacramental assurance, then a male bishop who is a *delegate* of a woman bishop cannot meet your theological needs.

The General Synod voted that:

“an approach along the lines of ‘transferred episcopal arrangements’, expressed in a Measure with an associated code of practice, merits further exploration as a basis for proceeding in a way that will maintain the highest possible degree of communion in the Church of England.”³

The voting was 348 in favour and 1 against.⁴

July 2006 General Synod passed the motion that “...admitting women to the episcopate in the Church of England is consonant with the faith of the Church” and endorsed “Resolution 111.2 of the Lambeth Conference 1998 “that those who dissent from, as well as those who assent to the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate are both loyal Anglicans””⁵

¹ Church House Publishing, GS 1557, ISBN 071514037X. The report can be downloaded from the CofE website: <http://www.churchofengland.org/media/38523/gs1557.pdf>

² <http://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2006/01/pr0606.aspx>

³ General Synod Report of Proceedings, February 2006, Volume 37 No. 1. page 268.

⁴ General Synod Report of Proceedings, February 2006, Volume 37 No. 1. page 308.

⁵ <http://www.churchofengland.org/our-views/women-bishops.aspx>

July 2008: the General Synod was presented with a range of options to give a steer to the legislative drafting group. The debate was structured such that the starting point of the motion was a statutory code of practice (whereby the provision would be by *delegation*), to which 10 different amendments to test the mind of Synod would be offered, from no provision at all, through statutory transfer (TEA) in the middle, up to a third province at the far end, and variations in between. With all that choice splitting the vote it is no surprise that no single option to increase provision secured a majority. Consequently, the Bishop of Guildford's transferred episcopal arrangements proposal was taken no further.⁶

July 2010: the draft legislation was debated by the Synod. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, aware that the provisions via *delegation* were inadequate for traditionalists, proposed an amendment that would mean that the provision for traditionalists would be via "*coordinate jurisdiction*". This should meet the needs of traditionalist parishes because the male bishop serving traditionalists would be at the same level as the female diocesan bishop. It should also meet the needs of those who wanted to be sure that women bishops had no loss of authority, because no functions would be transferred from the woman bishop, it would simply be two bishops working jointly together with overlapping authority.

216 voted in favour of the Archbishops' amendment, 191 voted against:

Bishops: 25 for, 15 against.

Clergy: 85 for, 90 against, 5 abstentions.

Laity: 106 in favour, 86 against, 4 abstentions.

However, because the amendment needed a majority in each House (it only needed a simple majority, not two-thirds, because it was not final approval debate), and was 5 votes short in the clergy, the amendment was lost.⁷

September 2010-2011: the draft legislation was referred to the dioceses. Dioceses were not permitted to amend the legislation but could only vote for or against it. Inevitably for many it became in reality a vote for or against women bishops. 42 out of 44 dioceses voted in favour. However, of the 42 dioceses who voted in favour, 11 dioceses also passed following motions, most calling for the draft legislation to be amended in a similar manner to that proposed in the Archbishops' amendment.⁸

February 2012: the General Synod debated the need for the House of Bishops to amend the legislation to better provide for the needs of traditionalists. The difficulty was that any

⁶General Synod Report of Proceedings, February 2008, Volume 39 No. 2. pages 350-362.

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/40991/ropjuly2008.pdf>

⁷General Synod Report of Proceedings, July 2010, page 168.

[http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1155179/july%202010%20consolidated%20with%20index%20\(with%20full%20bookmarks\).pdf](http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1155179/july%202010%20consolidated%20with%20index%20(with%20full%20bookmarks).pdf)

⁸Report by the Business Committee on the Reference to the Dioceses, GS 1847,

[http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1379450/gs%201847%20\(women%20bishops%20-%20business%20committee%20report\).pdf](http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1379450/gs%201847%20(women%20bishops%20-%20business%20committee%20report).pdf)

In the Guildford Diocesan Synod meeting of 25 June 2011 the following motion calling for "amendments to the draft...Measure to ensure that those unable on theological grounds to accept the ministry of women bishops are able to receive Episcopal oversight with a bishop with authority (i.e. ordinary jurisdiction) conferred by the Measure rather than by delegation from a Diocesan Bishop" 40 voted in favour, 54 against and 3 abstained.

<http://www.adrianvincent.org.uk/25%20june%202011%20report%20of%20guildford%20diocesan%20synod%20women%20bishops%20debate.html>

substantial amendment would mean the legislation having to go back to the dioceses, and further delay. Synod were careful to vote that any amendment should not be ‘substantial’.⁹

July 2012: Between February and July, the House of Bishops made an amendment to clause 5(1)c of the draft legislation, that gave a little more provision for traditionalists, but not so much as to be deemed ‘substantial’. The text of the amendment said that the Code of Practice, to be drawn up to accompany the legislation, should give guidance on:

"the selection of male bishops or male priests the exercise of ministry by whom is consistent with the theological convictions as to the consecration and ordination of women on grounds of which parochial church councils have issued Letters of Request under Section 3."

In the General Synod debate in July, some argued that this new clause to help traditionalists amounted to too much provision for them. There was particular objection to the phrase “theological convictions”, because some felt that it would put in legislation official recognition of the theological views of traditionalists. They therefore called for the debate to be adjourned so as to ask the House of Bishops to remove that provision. However, the Revd Simon Killwick, leader of the Catholic Group in General Synod, said in his speech:

“What the bishops have done is just enough to ensure that the Measure passes. Adjourn it, send it back, take the amendments out and Synod would guarantee that it will not pass.”¹⁰

Nevertheless, the adjournment motion was passed and the House of Bishops invited people to write in with their suggestions on what do with that clause. The submission from WATCH said that the provision should be removed. They wrote, "we remain unconvinced by the Jeremiahs who inform us that, without this clause, the legislation cannot achieve the required majorities in General Synod."¹¹

November 2012: The House of Bishops, as requested, replaced the 5(1)c with a weaker clause, which removed the reference to the “theological convictions” of traditionalists. The motion “That the Measure entitled *Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure* be finally approved.” was lost, because it did not achieve a two-thirds majority in the House of Laity.¹²

Bishops	44 ayes	3 noes	2 abstentions
Clergy	148 ayes	45 noes	0 abstentions
Laity	132 ayes	74 noes	0 abstentions

⁹ General Synod, Business Done, February 2010, pages 12-13.

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1403798/consolidated%20bd%20feb%202012.pdf>

¹⁰ General Synod Report of Proceedings, July 2012, page 233.

[http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1527142/july%202012%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1527142/july%202012%20(2).pdf)

¹¹ <http://thinkinganglicans.org.uk/uploads/watch-gsmisc1033.html>

¹² General Synod, Business Done, November 2012, page 4.

<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1589265/consolidated%20bd%20nov%202012.pdf>

2.) Looking forward – two options

Option A – fight it out

For each side to wait for the 2015 General Synod elections and try and get more members of their view elected. I have heard that WATCH are confident that they can make gains. I have also heard that large conservative evangelical churches, who previously took little interest in General Synod have been encouraged by the November vote and are expecting to increase the number of their representatives in 2015.

My own view is that there is no guarantee that new elections will result in a different composition of General Synod. The percentage of the Church who hold traditionalist theological views has remained largely unchanged since the ordination of women to the priesthood 20 years ago (in 1992 just under a third of the House of Laity voted against). A 2012 survey conducted by Christian Research of church members found that 31% either disagree with the ordination of women to the episcopate, or disagree with the ordination of women as bishops when there is not a consensus among all other Churches. 75% of respondents affirmed that those opposed to women bishops were “faithful Anglicans who should not be forced out of the C of E”.¹³ It is by no means certain that in 2015 even with a new House of Laity, that more than 66% of them would vote for legislation that does not sufficiently provide for traditionalists.

Option B – the main parties to talk outside of the Synod process, determined to reach a mutually acceptable provision

This is not as hard as it sounds. The fact that in 2006, 348 voted in favour and 1 against the Bishop of Guildford’s proposal for ‘transferred episcopal arrangements’ indicates that a way forward that the main parties can agree on is possible. It will require the leaders of the main groups (e.g. WATCH, Forward in Faith, Reform) to move away from lobbying and trying to win by pressure of votes; and instead to enter talks seriously determined to reach an agreement, even though it will mean painful compromise.

On 15 June 2012, The Church Times published a letter from the Revd Simon Killwick:

“I and two senior colleagues from the Catholic Group in General Synod attended a one-day meeting last December with mediators at the Centre for Reconciliation in Coventry, together with senior conservative Evangelicals, and representatives of

¹³ The Church Times, 20 June 2012. Full results on pages 24-26 of November 2012 issue of ‘New Directions’ <http://www.forwardinfaith.com/news/new-directions-archive.html>
1,080 people answered the survey (Q.1a), 88.3% were members of the Church of England (see Q.1b), 90.4% were lay people (Q.18).

Q. 9, "Having carefully considered the issue as best you can, which of the following statements most closely match your opinion? I would like to see the consecration of female bishops in the Church of England... As soon as possible (47.6%); Within the next 5-10 years (21.5%); When a consensus is reached amongst all other churches (15.4%); Never (15.5%)"

Q.10, "Please indicate which of the following most closely represents your view. I believe that those opposed to the ordination of women..."

Have no business being in the Church of England any longer (1.6%); Have had adequate time to get used to the idea (16.4%); Are faithful Anglicans who should not be forced out of the Church of England because they cannot accept women bishops as a matter of conscience (44.3%); Should be enabled to stay in the Church of England by means of some form of provision which meets their position of conscience (30.6%); Should have the right to veto the introduction of women bishops (7.2%)."

WATCH. It was a useful meeting, and a further meeting was planned for January this year. Unfortunately, WATCH later decided not to participate in any further meetings, stating that they preferred to follow the processes of the General Synod instead; so the January meeting was cancelled. The problem is that the General Synod itself is too big and unwieldy for the kinds of conversation that lead to reconciliation; members end up talking at each other, with prepared speeches, rather than to each other in genuine dialogue.”

On 22 June, The Church Times published the reply from Professor Anthony Berry and Christine McMullen:

“We were there as individual members, not as representatives of WATCH...As the broader synodical process concerning women bishops had been in motion for more than five years, it seemed best to the WATCH conveners that we should await the outcome of that process...Unlike Canon Killwick, we see the synodical processes of conversations and debates as carrying reconciliation”

The November Synod vote has demonstrated that the synodical process has not resulted in reconciliation. It is time for the groups to re-start their talks.

The Church Times editorial of 30 November 2012 stated:

“It is too soon to know what a solution might look like; but we can describe how the solvers might appear. First, the traditionalists and conservative Evangelicals need to think seriously about backing the sort of provision that they might realistically expect in the present climate. Second, the supporters of women bishops ought not to be satisfied with engineering a few more votes here or there. [...] theological conversation is essential (as once attempted by the Rochester group), covering such issues as sacramental assurance and biblical views of gender, and simple justice, with an awareness of the social and cultural influences at play. Too many discussions of late have failed to rise above the level of politics; so there is little wonder that hearts have hardened. Theology need not be slow, although it does require a depth of engagement that we have failed to see in recent months. The worst thing that could happen now is for the opposing sides to retire to lick their wounds, vowing to fight harder in the next elections.”

When I stood for election to General Synod in October 2010, my election address stated:

“I will encourage people to move beyond campaigning from their own ‘camp’ and instead to seek a deeper appreciation of the views of those with whom they disagree. We need to respect other people’s theological integrity. Only then will we find a way to introduce the ordination of women to the episcopate without splitting the Church.”¹⁴

In my speech in the November 2012 Synod debate I said:

“The first step will be for the leaders of WATCH, Forward in Faith and Reform to meet with a mediator and ecclesiastical law expert, such as Mark Hill QC, to agree a scheme together that the three of them can live with. When our three lobby groups recommend that scheme, and it comes to Synod, the voting will be far more than a

¹⁴ <http://www.adrianvincent.org.uk/electionaddress.html>

two-thirds majority, and the Church will be able to ordain women as bishops on the basis of some genuine unity.”¹⁵

If/when legislation comes back to Synod that meets the theological needs of traditionalists, I will vote in favour, as will many others who voted against in November, and a two-thirds majority will not be a problem.

Enclosures:

Printouts from my website. Before each Synod meeting I put on my website the issues coming up at General Synod, I say what my voting intentions are and invite people to send me their views. After Synod I publish what happened, how I voted and why.

15

<http://www.adrianvincent.org.uk/Adrian%20Vincent%2020%20Nov%202012%20General%20Synod%20speech%20women%20bishops%20as%20delivered.pdf>