

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Bristol, in reply: I would like to try to remind Synod that the motion from the diocese of Bristol was asking for clarity about our understanding and practice (if that will be helpful) with regard to Christian initiation. Therefore I hope that Colin Buchanan will realize that there was a clear sound but it was not about which one we were going to choose.

First of all, I want to thank everybody for their contribution. We have had four, if not five, maiden speeches and that was a very important contribution to this debate, not least the stories of people's own experience parochially, but also about the problems that we find ourselves experiencing and the way in which we have to deal with them. I also would like to thank David Staple; he is going to solve one of my ecumenical problems later on with what he has said. I want also to thank the Bishop of Rochester and the Bishop of Portsmouth for their theological contribution to the debate.

Having listened to what people have said, it seems to me that there was a general feeling that we wanted to know where we are going to go in terms of our understanding of Christian initiation. It was interesting to note the first two speeches: Canon Brett wanted to make sure that we went in one direction, but he wanted to make sure that it was a particular direction, and Mr Betts also wanted to know that he was going in a particular direction but it had to be *his* direction. That sums up the debate that we have had.

I accept the Synod's decision that perhaps we need to spend a little more time monitoring, but in the meantime we need to think about how we are going to deal with things when we do make a decision, bearing in mind that, if it is to retain, the pastoral issues will be quite significant. I trust therefore that Synod will be willing to support the motion as amended, and I thank the Synod for all that it has done this morning.

The motion was put and carried in the following amended form:

'That this Synod request the House of Bishops to continue to monitor the implementation in dioceses of its 1997 guidelines on Communion before confirmation and to report back to the Synod by 2005, with a recommendation as to whether any changes in canon law are required as a result of developing practice and understanding in the Church.'

(Adjournment)

THE CHAIR *Canon Jane Sinclair (Sheffield)* took the Chair at 2.30 p.m.

The Chairman: Before we come to our next item of business, I would like to draw your attention to the sixteenth notice paper which lists both the results of uncontested

elections and also the candidates for elections to be contested. On your behalf I would like to congratulate those who have been elected uncontested to their position and especially the Chairman of the House of Laity, Dr Christina Baxter. (*Applause*)

The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (GS 1402 and GS Misc 625)

Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford): I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

In addition to GS 1402 and GS Misc 625, and the report from CMEAC on vocations, new members of the Synod may wish to consult CMEAC’s report on minority ethnic young people *Simply Value Us*, published last June as part of the follow-up to *Youth A Part*.

In our reports last year the Archbishops’ Council made clear that we were engaged in producing an action plan for the Church to address the lessons and issues of the report of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. We have accepted, and we say again in the report before us this afternoon, that the Church – yes, even the Church – must accept the challenge of institutional racism, and repent. Some of our members find this difficult to accept, and that is part of the reason for the report before us. The facts and figures here set out speak powerfully of the collective failure of this Church to provide full opportunities for black and Asian people to take their full part in our life at every level. We may not intend to exclude them or discriminate against them, but that is the effect of what we do.

Paragraph 4 of *Called to Lead* reproduces the Macpherson report’s description of institutional racism: ‘It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people.’ Our processes, attitudes and behaviour over many years have had the effect of disadvantaging our black and Asian members, ‘through ignorance, through weakness, through our own deliberate fault’. The way we do things as a Church, not least in our structures, which can seem cold and non-relational, has the effect of discouraging and alienating them. That has been to our loss as well as theirs. More important still, it has set back the cause of the kingdom of God. That is why the Archbishops’ Council have determined to take this issue so seriously and why we set up the multi-disciplinary staff team which has produced the report before us today.

That report holds up a mirror to our Church, through statistics, through listening groups and through the insights that some of us have gained from racism awareness training, to see how black and Asian Anglicans are represented in our Church life and what they feel. The report also contains the voices of many distinguished leaders and theologians, voices which underline why these issues matter so much. This is not a case of following some fashionable secular agenda, of the Church of England trying to be

politically correct. On the contrary, these are core gospel issues, integral to our discipleship, striking at the very heart of what it means to be 'all one in Christ', the redeemed people of God.

I need at this point to express our gratitude to all those who have helped us in this work. The whole strategy reflects the inspirational challenge delivered to the Synod by Bishop John Sentamu last year. It reflects too the lessons that we have been able to learn from the Metropolitan Police, particularly through the work of Deputy Assistant Commissioner John Grieve who addressed the Archbishops' Council last December about the huge challenges that these issues represent for that police force. We are delighted to have with us in the gallery this afternoon Inspector Bob Poole with some colleagues from the Met., and also Arlington Trotman from the CCRJ, who are here to hear our debate.

The report before us reflects work by a large number of people in dioceses and parishes, particularly in the nine dioceses which participated in the statistical survey, and by some of our own General Synod members who have provided the material for the staff team to reflect upon. We are grateful to them all for their co-operation.

Called to Lead contains a good deal of statistical material, the conclusions from which are set out in paragraph 31. They suggest that the proportion of minority ethnic people in our congregations is broadly unchanged from 1994, but within those overall figures it is clear that in some dioceses and especially in the inner cities the proportion is a substantial one, for example between 15 and 20 per cent in a diocese like Southwark. Even more striking is the proportion of children and young people from the minority ethnic backgrounds: almost 30 per cent in Southwark.

When we move from congregations as a whole to levels of participation in Church life, and particularly Church leadership, however, we see stark evidence of the way in which our attitudes, processes and behaviour are working to exclude black and Asian Anglicans. As the proportion of the minority ethnic population increases, there is a rising curve of participation as churchwardens, eucharistic assistants and sidespeople, but not for electoral rolls, deanery synods and clergy. In the Church of England, as in so many other institutions in our country, black and Asian people become less and less visible beyond a certain point in the structures. That simply should not be.

The picture which emerges from the statistics is confirmed by the listening programme. Exercises were conducted with people in parishes, in and outside the Church, and with our own Synod members who reflected on their own extensive experience of Church life. Their comments on pages 15-22 of the report make painful reading.

Taken together, statistics and voices carry some clear and powerful messages. Black and Asian Anglicans are marginalized and misunderstood. They are deeply disappointed at the repeated failure of the Church to take seriously issues of racial justice. Yet, in spite

of all that has been inflicted upon them, so many of them retain a deep love of Christ and his Church and a deep desire to be freed to make a fuller contribution to our life. As one of them expressed it in a meeting at which I was present, 'I don't want to be tolerated. I want to participate.'

For white middle-class males living in comfortable suburbs, as I do, it is difficult to understand what that must mean. That is why racism awareness training is so important and why the Archbishops' Council themselves have embarked upon a racism awareness training programme. The experience of the MELRAW workshop was certainly an illuminating one for us as we sought to engage with the reality of the experience of racism within our own Church community. I know that, as reported in paragraph 12 of GS Misc 625, the senior staff in quite a number of dioceses have also undergone racism awareness programmes, and I hope that their example will be widely followed.

The challenge that we face is therefore a very important one. While there are many encouraging signs of progress, there remains much to be done, particularly in the matter of encouraging and nurturing vocations. The staff report has drawn together in paragraph 65 the suggested themes for the next stage of the action plan. Those themes focus on education and training; young people; vocations; nurturing new leaders; and some crucial issues in the community, such as third party reporting, refugees and asylum seekers. The Archbishops' Council discussed this report at their October meeting and supported its analysis and the themes, and the Council have also added the vitally important work that is being done within the national Church institutions on equal opportunities.

The Council are keen to hear the views of Synod members on these issues, particularly on the analysis and themes identified in paragraphs 64 and 65. We want to hear how the dioceses represented here are responding to this work and to the issues raised by the Stephen Lawrence report. We want especially to hear how we can tackle the challenge of recruitment to leadership, particularly vocations: vocations to lay and ordained ministry and also to the teaching profession. To my mind, the issue of vocations is the most important and urgent one for us to tackle. So we want to hear views on, for example, the controversial question of targets, as raised by the Ouseley report for the Southwark diocese. Some institutions have set targets for recruitment. Would this be appropriate for the Church? Or would it be better for us to focus first on strategies for achieving our objectives before we adopt specific targets? Whether we go for targets or not, we certainly need to know where we are: we need regular publication and monitoring of the figures. The views of Synod will help us to carry forward the work so that we can produce real change in those attitudes, processes and behaviour which prevent our black and Asian fellow Christians from being able to participate fully in the life of our Church and our community.

The Archbishops' Council are very conscious of two things. The first is that words are not enough; it is action that is needed, action which has a demonstrable, visible effect

upon our Church life. The second is that there are no quick fixes which will achieve that; we cannot remedy in months something which is the product of centuries of injustice. Much work has already been done by CMEAC, by boards and councils here in Church House and by dioceses and parishes. We have made a beginning. We have actually been working at this at least since *Faith in the City* (1985). Yet there is still much to be done, and much that we can learn from our partner Churches, including the black majority Churches, and from other Churches in the Anglican Communion.

What we are engaged upon is a process of achieving deep-seated change, change within ourselves as well as within our Church. As the Director General of the Evangelical Alliance, Joel Edwards, has pointed out, 'In one way or another, all of us have been traumatized by [the death of Stephen Lawrence] and we must all respond to it. This is no less true of the Church which must look into its own soul and lead by example ... the real tribute to Stephen Lawrence and this report will not be measured in our discussions about the report. It will be in modelling a community which is manifestly intolerant of racism.'

That is a challenge that we cannot and we must not shirk.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Revd Simon Pothan (London): The context of all this is all-important, as we heard Philip Giddings say in concluding, that it has taken the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence to bring us to our senses about what happened and what will happen in the Church. However, it is more than that; it is the failure of the forces of law and order to respond adequately to that murder which puts us on the spot and puts us on trial. That iconic phrase that has come to represent the past five years of our reflection, 'institutional racism', is for many members of the minority ethnic community not a new phenomenon; it was not invented six or seven years ago; it has been self-evident in all institutions that we have been involved in that this is part and parcel of life in modern Britain.

The Church needs therefore to explore new strategies and devise new ideas by which to combat what has become self-evident. Constant monitoring is what is needed, and I want to pay particular tribute to Glynne Gordon-Carter of CMEAC and all her staff in pulling up dioceses throughout the country with her inspections of what has been part and parcel of life in each diocese, and pulling us up short on where we have failed.

I am going to look at vocations because I am chair of the Association of Black Clergy, and it is one of the things that has vexed us for a very long time; the need for role models is a constant theme of ours. We have three bishops in the House of Bishops, but where are the staff in our cathedrals that reflect manifestly the type of society that we are in? It is not about jobs for blacks; it is about looking at our structures and asking how they reflect manifestly the type of society in which we live and the type of society that we want and, above all, the type of Church that we want. We do want active, good role models, and we do want the Church to nurture leadership.

Our ability to take on the issue of institutional racism is our ability to discern the gifts that are at hand. Discernment is a sign of the Spirit; recognition is the very oxygen of the human spirit; and if that oxygen is denied the Church is the poorer and will not function.

I want to talk also about mentoring because it is something that the ABC (the Association of Black Clergy) has been doing for a very long time, over 30 years: looking at our young black clergy and talking to them and seeing them through theological college and being partners with them. If it were not for the ABC, I would not today be a parish priest nor would I be here at General Synod. It is therefore very important that when dioceses and bishops look at structures they do not try to reinvent the wheel. The ABC is here to help, and if you want us we will gladly help in terms of mentoring and trying to develop networks that will enable our young black ordinands and young black clergy to function as active priests in the Church of England.

We need to respond to this positively. We cannot go about it as though it was part of political correctness. It is not; it is a fundamental gospel demand of natural justice; this is what it is about. It is about our Church reflecting more than adequately in the structures around us the kind of society that we live in. We live in a multi-ethnic, multicultural society, and the Church in all its structures must reflect that. I look round this body and there are not many black faces. I look at the House of Bishops and there are even fewer. I look at the cathedral staffs and there are even fewer. It is about manifesting that kind of visibility in all structures of the Church so that we can hold our heads up high, perhaps at the end of these sessions of Synod in 2005, and actually say that we have done something positive and that Stephen Lawrence's death was not in vain.

Mrs Zahida Mallard (Bradford): I come from a diocese where we have a large number of minority ethnic people, and assumptions are made of the city of Bradford and the way this is reflected through the media.

I want to begin by telling members a story, my story. I came to faith from the experience of belonging to a faith that not just my immediate family but my extended family and the community in which I lived were recognized as belonging to. I am now in a place where this should be the practice, but I feel apart. The talk is of opera, of cricket, golf, literature. Yes, these things I have experienced but they are not my culture. Therefore am I not welcome?

What has it been like in the Church? I have experienced, in one diocese that I lived in, comments at a deanery synod meeting: 'Can she speak English?' Why would I be there? In recent weeks, I have heard words like 'Well, we'll accommodate you.' Do I look as though I need shelter? If I do, what is it from?

We started a process in Bradford diocese; it has been a long, hard and tearful struggle. It started after the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry and with the minority ethnic working

group in that diocese bringing a motion, but that had to go backwards and forwards with the agenda committee as the words were not right. Right for whom? Us, the minority ethnic people and what we believed, or for the diocese to accept? Then came the debate in the diocese. By and large, it went well. Just a few amendments and tweaks here and there: 'This motion calls for the bishop's council to report back in a year.' That was November 1999. Last week, it was a year on. What happened? What came back? Well, we have a story, a story of what has been happening. We wrote to committees and boards of the diocese, asking for a breakdown of minority ethnic people and, by and large, the letters that we got back from the chairs stated that they were unable to provide the information. Surprise, surprise! We decided as a working group that we would go and listen, listen to the congregations, inner city, urban, market town and rural. We had a basic framework of questions which we discussed with the congregations after the services. The exercise lasts about 45 minutes and we sent them back a summary of what we had said so that the incumbent might possibly want to do something with that. We are going to be looking at this information again because we have one more parish to visit.

So far, I can say from the responses that they confirm to the minority ethnic people in the working group what we already knew, that the Church has excluded us. It has not valued us as people with a whole host of gifts and abilities. We are seen by some as not being different and thereby being denied our identity. Others feel that the minority ethnic people are those who belong to a different faith. I do not; I belong to *this* faith.

So I ask you all to take up the charge and to work, to forget the niceties and believe in what we say when we say, 'I love my neighbour as myself.' That is that person next door. That is my belief, that I belong to a Church that believes in loving our neighbour, and I hope that we do that.

Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark): I am sure that no one disagrees with what my amendment says, just as no one will vote against a motion which is trying to put flesh on the idea of greater inclusiveness and to promote justice and fairness for ethnic minorities. So why do I propose a qualification?

There are dangers in how we apply the concept of institutional racism. The issue of inclusiveness is not just about ethnic minorities, nor is cultural diversity necessarily superior to cultural specialization. Respect for the culture of those you are getting to know is well advised, but you need not feel guilty if you do not endorse and approve of all other cultures. I am English, but anti-sport; I love theatre, music, paintings and sculpture and churches and of course opera, which is my work. We cannot do everything. We may dislike the *Sun* newspaper, for example: my wife, being Australian, will not allow any newspapers owned by Rupert Murdoch in the house; but is not my suspicion of yobbish *Sun* culture in reality a reflection of one of the major failures of the Church of England: our alienation from the great mass of English people?

We are promoting special arrangements and more space for, in particular, African

British people, Caribbean people, and Indian Christians who have joined our Church in recent decades despite the frosty welcome that we gave them, but who would have interested Jesus most in Eltham, I wonder: Stephen Lawrence or the white racist thugs who killed him? I think that Jesus would have faced the challenge of the thugs at least as urgently as the vital comforting of the victim's wider family. Why did those Brits hate this innocent young black man? Would Jesus have said, 'Oh, they're just irredeemably bad'?

The origin of these vile racial feelings is fear of otherness and competition, fear mixed with guilt for feeling fear, resentful guilt that perhaps echoes middle-class guilt about slavery. Racial insecurity felt by some disadvantaged, undernourished, ill-educated, white men is a very ugly phenomenon but how many laypeople with no university education, or who left school at 16 and are still doing manual work, have been elected to this Synod? Can we hear these voices in our Church? I know that we are not uniformly middle-middle class; some of us have northern accents and there is always Colin Buchanan, but class prejudices, styles and assumptions are as serious a challenge to our inclusiveness as racial issues. All these insoluble problems need constant attention. A Utopia of mutual respect is not just round the corner.

Bishop Sentamu's remark about our Church lacking colour and spice and our culture being monochrome, i.e. white, made me feel indignant. Cultural diversity is not the essential antidote to institutional racism; mutual respect is. Culture is organic. Assimilation, if that is how it goes, is organic. Opera lacks colour and spice: no great opera composers have been women or blacks, though some have been gay. Is Shakespeare monochrome because Caliban, Othello and Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* look like stereotyping? Is a cultural dog's dinner superior? We respect cultures for their objective quality and because they are the heart of peoples. Our present white culture is our history; our future is a melting pot. Canon Ivor Smith-Cameron, whom I see in the gallery, as a British Indian said he felt excluded by the National Gallery's brilliant (and free) exhibition *Seeing Salvation* because it lacked representation of ethnic minorities, but that show, visited and admired by many from the ethnic minorities, was assembled from historic collections.

Political correctness can be a dangerous and debilitating filter. If we interfere with the natural dynamic of racial growing together, will it make Eltham thugs more or less likely to hate and to murder black British people? Most ethnic minorities just want to be treated the same as the native Brits and respected. We should be very careful and balanced about discerning more vocations among ethnic minorities. The Church can never get things right; we must always keep trying and changing. The issues of race and culture are very complicated. It is a hard balance to strike. Our majority English culture needs to be secure to be welcoming.

The assassins of Stephen Lawrence are the greatest challenge to our evangelism. Our Church's vocation to inclusiveness must focus on class at least as much as on race.

The Bishop of Southwark (Rt Revd Tom Butler): I am pleased to support the action plan before us. Stephen Lawrence was murdered on our patch at Eltham and sadly it is all too common for a black young man to be murdered in British cities. What was uncommon about this particular murder was his parents; they would not let the matter rest until his death had been thoroughly investigated. As we read the Macpherson report in the diocese of Southwark, we realized that it could have been about us, and we also realized that we were in no position to criticize the Met. or anybody else until we exposed ourselves as an institution to the same sort of scrutiny. So we asked the Commission for Racial Equality to look at the diocese of Southwark, and Sir Herman Ouseley, the then chairman, listened politely to our request and then said, 'We can't do it. We don't have the machinery. No institution has ever asked us to look at them.' However, they invented the machinery, and they produced a helpful report and an action plan which we are busy implementing.

I bring a message of hope this afternoon to Synod members because the fruits in the diocese of Southwark have actually anticipated the action plan. Since the beginning of the year 17 minority ethnic people have offered themselves for their vocation to be tested. That is one-third of the whole and far more than we have ever had. Commissioning the report, it seems, sent a signal to minority ethnic people that this time we are serious. I say 'this time' because I believe that the Church of England has been given a second chance. I was a student in the 1950s and I saw good, faithful Afro-Caribbean Christians frozen out of my local church in the White Highlands of the suburbs of Birmingham, and indeed I saw a well-loved local MP lose his seat through a racist opponent. Most of those good Christians left the Church of England, deservedly so; some stayed and they are still there, with their children and their grandchildren, and their numbers have been swollen by other incomers, particularly from all parts of Africa. They, thank God, have shown up this time in their local parish church and have been welcomed. Our urban congregations of London are mostly now majority black. Our challenge is to reflect that in our ministry and leadership, and the statistics are there in paragraph 29. We have been working hard at that, and I want to share two things with Synod members.

Two things matter if we are to generate vocations. First of all, minority ethnic people must believe that we are serious. Second, we have to ask them: white clergy (because predominantly we are dealing with white clergy) have to ask their black brothers and sisters, 'Are you sure the Lord is not calling you to ordination?' Do those two things and we will get vocations. We have been given a second chance in the Church of England, and this time we must not squander it.

Ms Patricia Dyer (Southwark): I speak in support of the motion. I have great sympathy with and admiration for the Lawrence family because they have changed history by their dignified and consistent approach to establish that Stephen was murdered in a racist attack. Their steadfastness and persistence reminded me of John the Baptist crying out in the wilderness; it was a distant voice but it never stopped him from being heard; neither did the Lawrences stop until they achieved justice. I know that I will be

relating this story to my grandchildren and great-grandchildren, with others like Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King from the history books.

For many centuries black minority ethnic people have contributed both to society at large and to the Church of England. Often their contribution has not been recognized. It is encouraging to see a tendency now to try to rectify this. The Archbishops' Council's report *Called to Lead* presents a challenge to include ethnic minority people, but we cannot fail to recognize that far more needs to be done to enable participation of minority ethnic people in society and, in particular, in the context of this debate, to give them the opportunity to contribute their gifts and skills to the enrichment of the Church of England.

GS Misc 625 reads, 'What we need is the imagination of the Christian hope. The kingdom is not simply the future, but the future as God's possibilities breaking into time, built on the Advent promises.' The report speaks about the nurturing of leaders. This should be put into practice. I strongly urge the Church at all levels to respond urgently and play the part that it is so well placed to do, thereby significantly reducing the likelihood of the recurrence of the Lawrence family's tragedy because all will respect and value the diversity of its membership.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt Revd Jim Thompson): Most of my working life was spent in the estates and inner city of East London. There we found sharp and serious encounters and conflicts between people of different racial backgrounds, many of them born in the Royal London Hospital. Alongside the racial tensions there was also a remarkable mutual enjoyment of each other, but it is nearly always there in the inner cities and in the estates of our cities that most of the attention is paid, where there are the biggest multi-ethnic populations, and of course from time to time it comes to a head in a tragic and frightening way. However, in public engagement with this issue then, we were aware that most of the vivid, angry correspondence about racial issues came from what used to be called – and I hear my brother the Bishop of Southwark calling it still – the White Highlands. I have now been translated to the White Highlands and it serves me right! There is almost no presence of black people in our diocese in Somerset. We have a minute number, more than some people suspect but still a minute number, of minority ethnic people. Yet many of the people who live in our diocese go to work in Bristol and other major urban areas and often carry significant influence over the decisions made which affect multiracial communities, and indeed may be sometimes part of institutional racism in all sorts of forms. Therefore their racial attitudes are important.

It is not only the decision-makers and the powerful people but the children; many children in a diocese like ours go to school in rural areas where they have minimal experience of people of other races. Thankfully, there is more travel and more stretching of horizons, but so much is taken in from television where profile remains so important. We do not need or want in this discussion the image of the starving people all the time to make us feel that somehow poverty is linked to blackness. We

need to have the breakthrough in all walks of life. I am deeply encouraged in the House of Lords that we have outstanding black Government ministers.

It is very important – indeed essential – that racial awareness training take place in the rural dioceses to uncover the racism which is often disguised behind a kind paternalism, behind the niceness, which means that we do not see a person as a person but as a type, not seeming to care about their individuality, their history and their culture.

Of course we know that this is a problem round the world but we have to tackle that fearful inward energy which feeds on divisive history, race, religion and other strangeness. Racial awareness is quite simply one of the pillars of the kingdom of God. It is all too easy for those of us who live in white areas to use that dreadful expression ‘We don’t have that problem round here.’ Yet we all share in the difficulty of racial tension; it is, I am afraid, a human infection, and in order to deal with the infection we have to deal with it in Somerset as well as in Southwark.

Canon Jim Wellington (Leicester): On Tuesday evening a number here were treated to an enthralling exposition of the Letter to the Romans by Dr Tom Wright. In his Gore Lecture, Dr Wright showed us how St Paul was challenging the social injustice of the imperial cult in the name of the righteousness, the *dikaiosune*, of God. Here in this debate we are standing on similar ground. How can the iniquity of racial injustice in our day be challenged in the name of the righteousness of God? In tackling this question the staff group is to be congratulated on the work that it has done in producing *Called to Lead*. It deserves a special thank you for the action plan outlined in section 65 of the report.

However, as the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry has so painfully reminded us and as we have been reminded again this afternoon in this debate, in the eyes of many people from the ethnic minorities there is a mismatch, a mismatch between the words and the actions of the institutions of Church and State on the subject of racial justice. This mismatch constitutes not so much a credibility gap as a credibility chasm. Against this background I find myself wondering whether the proposals in section 65, welcome though they are, go far enough.

In the Leicester diocese way back in the 1980s we took the bold step of making direct and specific constitutional provision for the representation of minority ethnic Anglicans on our boards and councils. That step has not proved to be the cure-all for the sense of alienation and exclusion which we were seeking to address; nevertheless it has brought more people from the ethnic minorities into our decision-making structures. It has given a strong affirmation to the valuable contribution that minority ethnic Anglicans can make to the life of the diocese, and I know that other dioceses have taken similar steps.

What is right in principle at diocesan level cannot be wrong in principle at national level. Would the Archbishop’s Council, in their ongoing dialogue with CMEAC and

others, seek to establish whether such a step at national level would have the support of minority ethnic Anglicans? If such support is forthcoming would the Archbishops' Council be willing to bring forward proposals for direct and specific constitutional provision for the representation of minority ethnic Anglicans on the boards and councils of this Synod? This may be one of the best ways for us to challenge the iniquity of racial injustice in the name of the righteousness of God.

Revd Dave Wade (Chelmsford): I come from a parish church in London Docklands where 70 per cent of our electoral roll of 140 come from ethnic minorities. I was brought up in an inner-city working-class home in a multi-ethnic community in East London. I left school at 16. It was the Church of England opening itself up through the *Faith in the City* report and recognizing its need for vocations from such people as me that is responsible for my standing here today. We now need the Church of England to open itself up again to those from our ethnic minorities.

Minority ethnic members of St Luke's, Canning Town are happy and fulfilled with their church at a local level. We are a family. Our PCC is predominantly black and we have two black churchwardens. However, many struggle to feel that the Church at diocesan or national level relates to them or welcomes the perspectives and insights that they bring. Sadly, at a recent diocesan synod only five black people were present, the three black women noticeably sitting together. When I spoke to them about their experience of the synod they said that they felt disempowered from offering their much-needed insights due to the structure of the synod, from its worship to the way that business was conducted.

We know that the Church of England all too often is a predominantly monochrome and white body in its structures. As a Church we are robbing ourselves of the wonderful diversity that we see represented in many of our communities and in some of our churches. This situation can only be transformed when those minority ethnic Christians are brave enough to enter the Church of England's structures and are empowered to play a full role in their Church. It is only then that we all benefit from the vital insights that they bring and show, in the structures and vocations of our Church, that we are all one people under God, with the same gifts and the same Holy Spirit.

The report speaks of nurture and training to encourage minority ethnic Anglicans to play their full role in the Church, and this is vital. However, it must be training that is centrally funded so as not to be a burden on the poorer dioceses where there might be more need, and it must also be locally delivered in appropriate ways that enable full participation in the life of our Church by our brothers and sisters from our ethnic minorities.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I come from a diocese which is richly blessed with people from a variety of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. My own deanery, Hackney, is almost 50 per cent from different minority ethnic people. This is reflected

in the life of the Church, as it is in many other deaneries in urban dioceses. Many of those churches would cease to operate, that is, the Anglican Church, if these people did not come to the church.

Each of us, whatever ethnic group we belong to, is a child of God, and we are given many gifts and are called to use them. However, as a Church we are missing out on this richness because of the assumptions that we make and the practices that we use, which often discourage and are not supportive of minority ethnic people.

We need to go and look at all the ways we do things and ask questions about what we are doing, whether we are excluding and discouraging part of our membership. This is why I welcome the report *Called to Lead: A Challenge to Include Minority Ethnic People*. Many reports that have been prepared by CMEAC assist us in this challenge by giving us the experiences of minority ethnic Anglicans and show good practice, as in the recent *Simply Value Us* and *Serving God in Church and Community*. One person asked me, 'What do we do with all these reports? Where do we put them?' We need to read them and inwardly digest them and bring them to the work that we do on our PCCs and in our theological colleges.

Even in a diocese as rich as ours, that is, London, I am often the only minority ethnic Anglican on committees. My experience is that often majority ethnic Anglicans, that is, white people, do not question assumptions. Furthermore they do not ask for information that might enable them to do so. For example, last week I was on a committee and we had been given statistics of students but there was no breakdown of ethnicity; until I asked that question, no one was interested. They might just as well have been unseen or unknown.

This challenge needs to go out to all of us. We all need to take it up. It is not just minority ethnic Anglicans but all of us; whoever and wherever we are, we need to ask those questions. What are we doing and how can we change it so people can be empowered to take a part? That is the only way we will eradicate institutional racism and also meet the recommendations in the report of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry and take all these issues into the lifeblood of our Church.

The Bishop of Aston (Rt Revd John Austin): The Archbishops' Council wanted to hear a little bit of the experience of the way in which different dioceses are responding to the issue of racism and in following up the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry.

In the diocese of Birmingham we have appointed a consultant who is a senior public servant to work with a steering group. She is a prominent black lay member of our diocese and therefore knows the diocese well. There is just one point that I want to share with this Synod, and I think that it is important not simply for our diocese but for the whole of the Church: what is beginning to emerge from her work is that we operate in what she has described as a 'culture of consultancy'. As part of the diocesan commitment to build a Church of black and white and Asian Christians together, we

have a number of advisers in black ministry, but the culture of consultancy means that we do not need to hear what the advisers might be saying. They are mere advisers. The culture of consultancy means that the very appointment of such advisers becomes an expression of that institutional racism which such an appointment is designed to help us address. Partly it is because we have placed the responsibility for addressing these issues substantially on one post and one person, thereby exonerating the institution from further thought and reflection; and partly it is because, in the culture of consultation, no one has to act on the advice of an adviser.

What is becoming clear is that in an institutional culture of consultancy, which is not simply endemic in the diocese of Birmingham but is actually part of the Church of England's culture, addressing institutional racism is even more a question of winning hearts and minds than in institutions which have tighter lines of managerial accountability and authority. It requires of us, so we are beginning to see, a different kind of vigilance and a deeper kind of conversion to our brother and sister.

Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

Dr Philip Giddings, in reply: I am grateful to all those who have contributed to the debate. I would like to ask those who wished to do so but were unable, to write in to the Secretary General with the insights and experiences that they wanted to share with us. The Archbishops' Council are very keen to listen. For those who have contributed to the debate and whose remarks I am not going to take up in responding to the debate, I do not want them to conclude from that that they are not being listened to; the material is being collected and gathered together and will be reflected on. In the time available to me, I just want to pick up a couple of things from the comments made in the debate.

The first is the importance of not simply saying that we intend to do something about these issues and these problems. I was particularly struck by the remarks of the Bishop of Southwark and the experience from that diocese of how they are tackling the issue of vocations. We need to demonstrate our seriousness of purpose by taking action, and that means taking initiatives. This is not a direct quotation because I did not get the words down exactly, but it was essentially 'Go out and ask them.' If we wish to encourage vocations of any kind we need to take those sorts of initiative and not shut our minds to the possibility of their receiving a response from particular parts of the Church.

Second, if I could take up one aspect of the remarks of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who so rightly reminds us that this is as much a problem in Somerset or any other of the less urban dioceses as in Southwark, in paragraph 18 of the report members will doubtless have already read of the work that is being done in terms of valuing the

cultural diversity in rural primary schools. That is the kind of work that we need to do in ensuring that responding to these issues enters into the whole of our Church life. It is a problem for us all, although it would be better to say that it is an opportunity for us all, because what has been so clear from the debate this afternoon is that a consequence of not dealing with this issue is that as a Church we are denying ourselves the value of the contribution from these our brothers and sisters who have the same gifts from the same Holy Spirit, as Mr Wade put it. Why, in our Church, is it not possible for those gifts to be fully exercised? What are we going to do about shifting the blockage to that work of the Holy Spirit within this part of the Body of Christ? We are missing out on the riches and diversity of the gifts of minority ethnic Anglicans, Ms Munro said towards the end of our debate. This is what we need to do. This is what we need to hear, to share and to move, so that in the next few months and years we can, in our parishes, our deaneries, our dioceses and here, take action which will visibly make a difference.

The motion was put and carried.

Dr Philip Giddings: I beg to move:

‘That this Synod encourage the Archbishops’ Council to pursue the second stage of the action plan set out in GS Misc 625 and to report back to the Synod on progress.’

Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘After the words “That this Synod” *insert* the words “, whilst acknowledging that the gospel transcends racial and cultural identities and characteristics,”.’

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Peter Townley (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I would hope very much that this Synod will resist Tom Sutcliffe’s amendment for two reasons. First of all, I was born and brought up on a council estate in north Manchester. I have all the working-class credentials. I even went to the local comprehensive school. Incredibly, in our very ordinary street there were three Peters, and the three of us were ordained, one Anglican, another a Methodist and the third the Roman Catholic chaplain now at the university in Cambridge. I married well. The great thing about the family I married into was a man called George Pottinger who was the first black Methodist minister ordained for service here rather than back in the Caribbean, and his first charge was in Somerset. The Pottingers gave a most wonderful richness to our family life, an incredible contribution.

I must say, as a working-class person or a person from working-class roots, that I have never experienced the pain or the discrimination that the Pottinger part of our family

have experienced. That is why I would say: please, resist this amendment. I know that in our society there are greater ethnic minorities than simply black ones, the Chinese community, for instance. I know that I am not very good at many things, including points of order; but one thing I hope I am good at is encouraging you all, please, not to blur the focus in this debate. The black community desperately needs to hear what we have got to say. They desperately need our support and they desperately need our prayer and encouragement.

The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. In the interests of debate on the main motion, would you accept a closure on this amendment?

The Chairman: I would accept that, but Dr Giddings needs to comment first.

Dr Philip Giddings: I think that Mr Townley has said it all. I hope that the Synod will firmly resist this amendment.

The Chairman: I now would like a motion for closure on the amendment, please.

Canon Bob Baker (Norwich): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Archdeacon of Pontefract (Ven. Tony Robinson): I want to support the action plan as regards race awareness training. Paragraph 63 says a lot about its value. The training, and indeed the related experiences of CMEAC members, inculcated a powerful sense of what it is like to be part of a minority and to be on the end of both deliberate and unwitting racism in all its pernicious forms, in both Church and society. We have voted for lots of reports to do with racial justice before – *Seeds of Hope*, *The Passing Winter*, the idea of an equal opportunities policy – and Philip Giddings says, rightly, that we need to demonstrate now some course of action; we need to demonstrate our seriousness of action. It would be a wonderful example to the rest of the Church and to society if every member of this Synod were to undertake race awareness training by the end of the quinquennium, and maybe the Archbishops’ group ought to monitor our willingness to do something as practical as that which demonstrates our commitment to this plan of action. I wish to suggest that as a way in which we can clearly demonstrate that we are not just voting for yet another thing to do with racial justice issues but that we are actually all going to do something about it.

Mrs Dorothy Stewart (Ripon and Leeds): First of all I would like to answer a query of Mr Tom Sutcliffe. There are a number of famous black classicists, scientists, artists and other notables. If you contact the CMEAC office they will refer you to a magnificent workshop that goes round the country demonstrating these notable achievements.

We have been in Britain now for over 200 years and this weekend, at the Remembrance service, at last those people from Afro-Caribbean countries who volunteered to fight were acknowledged. We have been knocking on the Church's door ever since. Could you give me some idea as to how much longer you would like me to knock before you will consider accepting me as a human being equal to yourself?

To every minority ethnic person in the Church of England, if there was one gift I could give you it would be my priest so that you could experience the encouragement, love, nurturing, the refusal to allow me to back out each time I am patronized or cold-shouldered, each time I stumble as I try to work within the structures of this Church – and I stumble frequently, as on Tuesday. I am fully aware of my pain and I am not ignorant of the tension that some of you feel at having to confront the issues of racism, but as long as you keep trying to avoid it or denying it we cannot work together to eradicate it and to go forward as children of God.

Revd Benny Hazlehurst (Southwark): We desperately need this motion and much more besides; that need has even come out in our debate today in the number of references to British people and even 'native Brits' and racist Brits. I want to ask: who is British? Stephen Lawrence was British. I was a chaplain at Bluecoat School, the school where Stephen Lawrence was educated, at the time of his murder. Stephen Lawrence was British and many of our brothers and sisters from minority ethnic groups are British. Our Christian duty is to welcome, accept and nurture all, whoever they are, into our Christian family, whether Jew, Greek, man, woman, black, white; but it is a sign of our continued racism that we assume all too readily that people from ethnic minority groups are not British but are foreigners and outsiders. That is unacceptable.

I strongly urge that we adopt this motion and I look forward to our making further strides to eradicate racism.

Revd Peter Townley (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

Dr Philip Giddings, in reply: I am grateful for those further contributions to our debate this afternoon. I just want to take up the issue of racism awareness training, from my own experience of doing this as part of the Archbishops' Council group at Whirlow

Grange. It illustrated two things to me. First, that this is a painful business to try to grapple with when you move it from your head to your heart, and it is that movement from head to heart that many of us from my sort of background find difficult; but it is only when we do move it from head to heart that we actually take action as opposed to exchanging words and reports.

Mr Robinson asked how many members of Synod would follow the example and do racism awareness training. I think that we ought to know how many members of Synod have done racism awareness training, and I invite those who have done to write in to the Secretary General and tell him. (I hope that you have a large post box, Mr Secretary General.) This is because one of the other things that we need to do is to establish clear and unchallengeable data, on the basis of which we can mark what we hope will be our progress in this area, so that the full participation of all members of the Body of Christ in all our activities can be clearly demonstrated.

We have had some moving contributions. We have had some very rich experiences shared with us. We have had some challenges put before us. I hope that this will be one of those debates in which we see the full strength of synodical government in the Church of England. Now that we have an extra-long opportunity between this group of sessions and the next, we all have a magnificent opportunity to take this piece of work back to our dioceses and deaneries and to share with them the lessons and the challenges, so that when we meet again we can continue to encourage one another in the way, which will enable those rich and diverse gifts of the Holy Spirit to be the more fully reflected in every area of our Church life.

Revd Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. Without wishing to be tiresome, could we have the vote counted so that we can send a clear signal to the world and to the Church?

The Chairman: You have taken the words out of my mouth, Mr Alderton-Ford. Thank you.

Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. Can we not have a show of hands about who has done racism awareness training rather than wasting trees, writing in?

The Chairman: I am afraid that we cannot do that right now because we have actually moved to the vote. Try your email. That will save the trees.

Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool): Afterwards?

The Chairman: We have other business to move on to. We are best using email or sharing letters from dioceses or whatever. Thank you.

Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool): Are we serious about changing our structures?

The Chairman: We have an item to vote on, thank you.

The motion was put and carried, 314 voting in favour and none against.

The Chairman: One of the advantages of having to wait while the votes are counted is that the Chairman can take informal advice. I am advised that a quick straw poll on the lines requested by Mr Spiers about race awareness training will now be possible. So if any members of Synod have already received racism awareness training, regardless of what form it took, will they please raise their hands?

A member: On a point of order, Madam Chairman. Could you clarify whether this is racism awareness training done anywhere or within the diocesan structures?

The Chairman: As I understood it, anywhere, whether it happened at work or any other way: racism awareness training in a general sense.

On a straw poll vote, 158 members of the Synod have indicated that they have undertaken some form of racism awareness training.

Dr Peter May (Winchester): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. Given your generosity of spirit at the moment, could I just draw out that there is a real distinction between a vote that is clearly carried and something that is carried *nem. con.* As far as I can understand, Item 12 was carried *nem. con.*; nobody voted against it. I think that that should be noted.

The Chairman: Thank you. That is in the record. Thank you, too, to those who made their maiden speeches in the debates.

We move now to our farewells, and I ask the Archbishop of York to lead us.

Tributes

The Archbishop of York (Dr David Hope): I am sure that the Synod would wish me to express Synod's greetings and good wishes as we see the Archbishop of Canterbury with us; it is all very frustrating for him because unfortunately he is unable to give voice. He is still silent: he must be a very godly bishop! However, it is good to have him with us at the Synod in spite of his affliction. (*Applause*)

Our first farewell is to the Bishop of Chichester. Eric Waldram Kemp was born and brought up in Lincolnshire. The story is told that, as a young lad, he was taken by his parents to a performance of the opera *Iolanthe*, at which point he decided that his ambition was to become Lord Chancellor of England. In the opera itself the Lord Chancellor is judge, jury, plaintiff and defendant, and also one of the suitors to his own beautiful ward of court. In real life, Eric did indeed espouse the law, though in a somewhat less flamboyant style: he married the daughter of Bishop Kenneth Kirk, one

of the greatest canon law theologians of the last century. The mantle was certainly passed on because Owen Chadwick has said of Bishop Eric that he knows more about canon law and the legal history of the Church of England than any other living person.

If the law was Bishop Eric's first love, the priesthood was to become his life's vocation. Ordained in 1939 after training at St Stephen's House, he served his title at St Luke's, Southampton, returning to Oxford in 1941 as librarian at Pusey House. Subsequently, as fellow, chaplain, tutor and lecturer in theology and mediaeval history at Exeter College, he was awarded a doctorate of divinity in 1961. In 1969 he was appointed Dean of Worcester and in 1974 he was appointed Bishop of Chichester.

Bishop Eric was born in 1915 on 27 April which, for those who know about these things and will have noted it, is the feast day of St Zita, patron saint of servants. Eric has always been the servant of the Church. He was first elected as a proctor for Oxford University in 1949 and has had an unbroken membership of Convocation, the Church Assembly and this Synod since that date, a remarkable achievement. (*Applause*) He has obviously survived it very well indeed.

The formation of the Ecclesiastical Law Society in 1987 was largely due to the determination of Bishop Kemp and, as president since its inception, he has ensured that it has flourished as a vital grouping of clergy and lawyers. He has always argued that the law of the Church cannot be properly understood and properly administered without something more than a perfunctory knowledge of theology and Church history. The Society now has over 550 members.

Bishop Eric chaired the Faculty Jurisdiction Commission whose recommendations in the report *The Continuing Care of Churches and Cathedrals* have largely been implemented in legislative form. For the past two years he has been a member of the steering committee for the Clergy Discipline Measure where his wise counsel has been greatly appreciated.

Some very plain words of advice given to him as a young priest touched him deeply, and he has often passed on those words to ordinands on their ordination day. 'Be good,' he would say to them, 'really good.' Goodness for Eric has meant not least prayerfulness, and he has been sustained throughout his ministry by a pattern of meditation, Morning Prayer and Eucharist at the beginning of every day. Virtue and duty have always been important to him, as has consistency. Once decided on, he is not easily deflected from his path, though he will listen to what others have to say. Those others are as likely to be his driver or a young curate as his archdeacons, which can be somewhat disconcerting for those who expect to have their advice sought!

As far as consistency is concerned, Archbishop Runcie used to tell the story of the two occasions he acted as server at the Eucharist at Pusey House. The first occasion was just prior to World War II, when Robert Runcie was an undergraduate; the second was after the war when he was an ordinand in Oxford. On both occasions Bishop Eric was

the celebrant. The conversation (or you might say almost total lack of it) that passed between priest and server on each occasion before and after the service was identical, as if a week or two rather than a whole world war had intervened.

Popularity is not nor ever has been a word in Bishop Eric's vocabulary. He has always been his own man. Not many now remember that, when he was Dean of Worcester, he was for a period in the 1960s and early 1970s quite out of favour with many Anglo-Catholics because he aligned himself with Archbishop Michael Ramsey's vigorous advocacy – indeed was one of its prime architects – of the Anglican–Methodist unity scheme. In the House of Bishops he has for some years been the embodiment of our corporate memory, taking us back on occasion to a discussion, recalling the arguments for and against with great precision, a discussion which took place at a time when most of the present House of Bishops (and I include myself) had hardly been ordained and indeed some were still at school.

I think that he would be the first to say that it is not least his family that has kept him alert, his wife, Pat, and his five very lively children, four daughters and a son, who share with him his love of music and the theatre. If you should have a question on Wagner, Bishop Eric is almost certain to know the answer.

Members of Synod, Bishop Eric Kemp was one of the crafters of this body and its revised canon law. The whole Synod, the whole Church of England, owes him a great deal, and we shall certainly miss his wisdom, learning, courage, steadfastness and not least his quite unselfconscious holiness. It has been good, really good, to have him among us and we wish him and Pat a happy and fulfilling retirement. (*Bishop Eric was accorded a standing ovation.*)

Today is clearly Chichester's day for I turn to another leading light of that diocese, Brian Hanson. Brian has been Legal Adviser of this Synod since 1977 and before that was its Assistant Legal Adviser and Solicitor, having initially joined the legal staff of the Church Commissioners in 1965. In 1980 he was additionally appointed Joint Registrar of the Convocations of Canterbury and York. Altogether, by the time he retires at Easter next year, Brian will have given well over 35 years' distinguished service to this Church.

In his role as Legal Adviser Brian has been Synod's and latterly also the Archbishops' Council's principal source of advice on legal matters. He has been responsible for the oversight of Synod's legislative programme and for advising on the proper procedural conduct of its business. He has been a leading advocate for Church legislation for the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament and in all these roles has combined sound legal understanding with a ready grasp of the sensitivities of Church–State affairs and extremely wise judgement. However, it is Brian the man that all of us have come deeply to respect, and I would suggest that three qualities stand out in particular.

First, as lawyer. To many of us and even to its practitioners ecclesiastical law is a complex mystery. Almost inevitably the most obscure issues require the most urgent

answers. The Church's legal officers know how to cope with such crises: 'Get in touch with Brian Hanson,' they say. Whatever the challenge, Brian responds with encyclopaedic knowledge, patience and shrewd judgement. No wonder he has won such wide respect not only within the Church but also within Government and Parliament for his legal skills. He has played a major part in shaping the development of the General Synod and not least, as co-editor of Moore's *An Introduction to English Canon Law*, of ecclesiastical law itself. Members of Synod see him, as now, in wig and gown, seeking to keep us all within the strict letter of the law, but Brian knows that the law is not the master but the servant of justice and of the Church, and he has always recognized that our legal framework must change and adapt as the Church meets fresh challenges and opportunities.

Second, Brian has served us all with unimpeachable integrity. As a Guardian of the national shrine of Our Lady at Walsingham since 1984, no one has been in any doubt where Brian's sympathies lie; but, throughout the protracted passage of the ordination of women legislation, not once was there any doubt at all of Brian's intention: to put his legal skills at the service of all members of Synod, whatever their views, and to advise both sides of the debate professionally and quite impartially. This has marked him as a truly outstanding servant of the Church and has won for him much respect. (*Applause*)

Third, and most important of all, Brian is himself a deeply committed Christian person. He lives the faith that he holds but never ostentatiously and all of this is combined with his warm and generous personality, his sense of humour and fun, his ability to relate to others and to cut through issues to get straight to the essentials; these are all qualities which are rare to find combined in a single individual.

In all the trials of the past 35 years – and there have been many – Brian has been sustained by two things. Certainly his faith, and also the love and support of Deborah and their five children. Deborah has generously welcomed many of Brian's colleagues in and to their home, and for that and for all else that she has given us we want to give her our heartfelt thanks.

Brian, we do not say farewell to you until Easter but, as Synod will not meet again before then, it seemed right that I pay this, the first of what I am sure will be many tributes to you, in this hall today. You have graced and warmed this place so much that when we come together here again it will not be the same place without you. Nevertheless, this Synod will continue to flourish, thanks to all that you have done for us over so many years. That is why I know that all members of Synod will want to join me now in thanking you most profoundly for your outstanding service to us all. (*Mr Hanson was accorded a standing ovation.*)

Last but by no means least we say farewell to three of our ecumenical representatives who will not be returning when we meet again. First of all, David Staple from the Baptist Church, who made such a significant contribution for us in our debate earlier today, Murdoch MacKenzie from the United Reformed Church, and also Keith Reed

from the Methodist Church. As we say goodbye to them, we thank not only them for the contribution that they have made, for their steadfast and persistent presence with us and among us during the course of many debates, we thank also those from other Churches for their presence and patience with us and for their interest and encouragement. We are hugely grateful, in particular, to the three of you to whom we bid farewell this afternoon. Farewell and Godspeed. (*Applause*)

THE CHAIR *Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans)* took the Chair at 4.06 p.m.

Iraq: A Decade of Sanctions (GS 1403)

Report by the Board for Social Responsibility

The Bishop of Selby (Rt Revd Humphrey Taylor): I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

Why should it be Iraq that claims our attention this afternoon when there are dreadful things going on in so many parts of the world? I suggest three questions to ask in trying to decide whether a particular international issue warrants the time and attention of this Synod. First, is there a clear moral dimension to the issue? Second, does the issue touch matters of religious faith? Third, have we a realistic hope of making a difference?

To answer these three questions in the case of Iraq, first, I think that there is growing unease about the morality of sanctions because of doubts that they can bring about change at a fair cost. The suffering of the Iraqi people is real, unnecessary and avoidable. Second, the action, mainly of Western countries, against Iraq clearly touches the sensitive matter of the relation between Islam and the West. Third, I think that the Church can make a modest contribution to changing the mind of Her Majesty’s Government. These matters will be taken forward by the CTBI visit to the Middle East next year, to which clause (e) in the following motion refers.

The Synod will be able to benefit in this debate, I hope, from members who have direct experience of Iraq and its people as well as from others who are concerned, and clause (d) of the following motion encourages co-operation between such people. In introducing the debate, I shall try to apply ‘just war’ thinking to our ethical concerns about the UN sanctions against Iraq; then I shall look at British Government policy on sanctions and point out some contradictions in it, going on finally to explore alternatives to the current sanctions regime.

During last year’s Kosovo crisis the British Government talked about their action within the framework of just war criteria. The language was used of *jus ad bellum*, rules governing the resort to armed conflict, and *jus in bello*, rules governing the conduct of armed conflict. A similar framework may be helpful in today’s debate.

As clause (a) of the following motion affirms, sanctions were a legitimate and proportionate response by the United Nations Security Council to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990. The just war criteria of proper authority, just cause and right intention were met. After the end of the Gulf War the United Nations was again right, I believe, to use sanctions as a means of ensuring Iraq's compliance with relevant Security Council resolutions. It was thought that sanctions would provide a short, sharp shock to the Government of Iraq and that they would be lifted within 18 months. That would have met the just war criteria of limited ends and reasonable chance of success. With hindsight, however, we can see how little was known about the way sanctions work; little thought was given to monitoring their possible negative impact on Iraq's civilian population; and no consideration was given to the resources necessary for implementing them.

Clause (b) of the following motion suggests an urgent need to reassess the sanctions regime. While they have had considerable success in disarming and containing Iraq, as GS 1403 spells out, sanctions now stand accused of contributing to an unintended humanitarian crisis. They do not meet the just war criterion of proportion between means and ends, nor the one concerning non-combatants. Then, although they continue to have the formal authority of the UN Security Council, sanctions are increasingly being undermined as more and more countries, including some members of the Security Council, establish bilateral trade links with Iraq. The country's borders have become so porous that it is now possible to go into most shops in Baghdad and buy goods similar to those available in the West. However, such goods are outside the purchasing power of the average Iraqi. This unofficial erosion of sanctions goes along with growing public scepticism which questions whether any further political advantage can be gained without worsening the humanitarian crisis. The just war criterion about having a reasonable chance of success is not being met.

GS 1403 raises serious doubts not only about the effectiveness of sanctions but also about their scope and their severity when innocent civilians, often victims of their own government, become victims of the international community as well. I suggest that although, so to speak, *jus ad sanctionem* was fulfilled against Iraq in 1990, *jus in sanctione* is not now being observed. The threshold of what is morally justifiable is crossed when the effects on the population are so severe and the probability of further success so small. Making civilian groups suffer in the hope of putting pressure thereby on the Government of Iraq is questionable morally and also politically when the Government of Iraq are immune to the suffering of their own people.

Over the past decade Her Majesty's Government have been a firm advocate of sanctions against Iraq on three main grounds. First, they are necessary until such time as the Government of Iraq comply with all UN Security Council resolutions. Second, President Saddam Hussein, and not sanctions, has caused the humanitarian crisis. Third, HMG insists, there is no alternative to the current sanctions.

To take each of those points in turn, no one would argue that Iraq should be excused from meeting its international obligations, to which clause (a) of the following motion

refers; but are comprehensive sanctions the most appropriate means of obtaining peace and security? The longevity of the current sanctions regime suggests otherwise. The past decade has seen too much stick and not enough carrot. It is possible that restoring links with Iraq by reinstating civilian air travel might encourage Iraqi people to work with rather than against the UN in other areas; that would go a long way towards breaking Iraq's intellectual, social and cultural isolation.

GS 1403 shows that Saddam Hussein is indifferent to the suffering of his own people. HMG argue that television pictures of malnourished children actually serve Saddam Hussein's interests. Various UN reports show Iraq to be one of the most oppressive and tyrannical regimes in the world. I have little doubt that some humanitarian items ordered under the UN's oil for food programme have been diverted from vulnerable people to line the pockets of Saddam Hussein and his cronies. However, to imply, as the British Government do, that Saddam Hussein is the sole cause of such suffering is wrong and misleading.

There are now over two billion dollars' worth of contracts on hold by the UN's Sanctions Committee. To quote a recent report by the UN Secretary General to the Security Council, 'In many sectors, infrastructure remains heavily incapacitated despite the ordering by the Government of Iraq of essential inputs. Complementary items have frequently been kept on hold long after the central items with which they were intended to be used have been delivered. The situation renders the distribution of humanitarian aid and the amelioration of the overall situation more difficult and places an additional strain on the already heavily burdened population by delaying the arrival and use of many key supplies and equipment essential to all sectors.'

In the light of that statement I suggest that Her Majesty's Government ought to modify their position. Both Saddam Hussein and the United Nations Security Council must take responsibility for what is happening. I am afraid that, without the political will needed to tackle these problems, the expansion in the oil for food programme introduced by UN Security Council Resolution 1284 (described on pages 3, 4, 9 and 10 of GS 1403), on which HMG are to be commended for expending a great deal of diplomatic energy, will be purely cosmetic. In the words of a former UN humanitarian co-ordinator, 1284 could turn out to be no more than a Bandaid, wholly inadequate to deal with the plight of Iraq's civilian population.

The Government's claim that there is no alternative to the present sanctions regime does not stand close scrutiny. Over the past decade the UN has developed several other sanctions regimes which appear to have learnt the lessons of Iraq. Earlier this year, for instance, the Security Council agreed sanctions against Ethiopia and Eritrea, which included a clause saying that sanctions could not continue beyond a certain time without further UN authorization. The UN's response to the civil war in Sierra Leone was to devise a sanctions regime specifically targeted against the rebels, including a ban on their main source of funding from illicit diamonds as well as an arms embargo and a selective travel ban on non-government forces. Comparable sanctions are being

applied in the case of Yugoslavia since the fall of Milosevic. These are encouraging developments which show that, despite what the Government say, alternatives do exist. The tragedy is that they have not been applied to Iraq.

The thrust of the following motion is in clause (c). Sanctions in their present form are unacceptable because they contribute to the impoverishment of the most vulnerable Iraqi people. Alternatives exist which would go some way towards relieving the human suffering without necessarily compromising legitimate concerns about security. So the motion calls on Her Majesty's Government to take action which I hope would include working for reconfigured sanctions targeted against Iraq's ruling elite rather than the mass of its population.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Colin Bennetts): Two days ago, on the sixtieth anniversary of the bombing of Coventry, the Coventry Peace Prize was awarded to a German. Count Hans von Spomeck is the former deputy Secretary General of the UN referred to in the opening presentation. He is a man who served 30 years with the United Nations and until this year he was the UN coordinator for humanitarian affairs in Iraq. He resigned his post out of conscience, concluding that the UN sanctions policy that he was required to monitor was inhumane and unethical. He was the second person to resign for similar reasons; Denis Halliday, his predecessor, did so for precisely the same reasons.

Last year I led a delegation of Anglican bishops and others to Baghdad; the aim of our visit was to assess the effect of sanctions on the country. What we witnessed was a society on the brink of collapse. Its infrastructure and, equally important, the morale of the people of Iraq are practically destroyed. If time permitted I could give plenty of examples to support that statement. Ten years ago Iraq was a relatively sophisticated country; many of its doctors and engineers were trained in the West, to say nothing, of course, of its military leaders. The facilities of the main children's hospital in Baghdad, opened in 1975 and once comparable to Great Ormond Street in the skill and expertise of its medical staff and in the sophistication of its equipment, have been reduced to those of a hospital in the poorest countries. We witnessed babies and young children dying before our eyes because basic supplies, like blood platelets for victims of blood cancers, syringes and drips, were no longer available. State-of-the-art equipment ten years ago was now useless because parts for servicing and maintaining it were banned under the sanctions policy. UNICEF, itself a branch of the United Nations of course, estimates that daily 142 children die as a direct result of sanctions: 142 children daily. Some of the children that we saw were suffering from rare forms of infantile leukaemia; others had gross physical deformities. This latter group are doubly disadvantaged, and many find themselves in the care of the remarkable home run by the sisters of Mother Theresa's order. There is evidence to suggest that the huge increase in such diseases is related to the use of depleted uranium in the weapons that the Western allies used during the Gulf War. The frightening fact is that we used exactly the same kind of warheads during the Serbia-Kosovo conflict.

I want to support the motion before Synod simply because I do not believe that sanctions in their present form are working. They have now been in place, as we have heard, for ten years and it is quite clear that two things are happening. First, as I have indicated, they have impoverished, disempowered and weakened the vast majority of ordinary people who find themselves crushed between two millstones. Second, they have strengthened the determination and influence of the ruling elite. It would be naïve to assume that Saddam Hussein has made the task of ending sanctions any easier. By rejecting the new United Nations arms panel he has effectively condemned to death even more of Iraq's children.

At the same time, Britain, the United States and the UN Security Council cannot escape some responsibility. As long as civilian trade sanctions remain in place, children in Iraq will suffer and die prematurely. There is a profound moral imperative for lifting trade sanctions, even if Iraq's intransigence makes it more difficult. Trade sanctions must be lifted and at the same time the embargo, or the so-called smart sanctions, on weapons and military-related technology must be strengthened.

I believe that it is the task of the Church in this as in so many other situations to speak a prophetic word. We are called to speak out and to declare what we see, and believing God's Word to be contrary to what we see we must say so. It is the task of politicians to find ways of implementing right decisions, but to separate the two functions is of course a false distinction. We in our prophetic role need to work with the politicians to make this happen.

It will be a difficult task for our Government to change their mind. They will need, in a sense, to save face; we will need to save face. I believe, though, that the time has come to stop saving face and to start saving lives.

Revd Murdoch MacKenzie (Ecumenical Representatives, United Reformed Church):
Until today the ecumenical representatives have been unusually silent in this Synod. However, surely no one can remain silent in the face of the situation in Iraq. We are greatly indebted in all the Churches to the Board for Social Responsibility for its report. It backs up the information which organizations such as Voices in the Wilderness have been giving us for some years. The Bishop of Coventry has already referred to Denis Halliday, former UN co-ordinator for Iraq, who says that we are actually in the process of destroying an entire society. It is as simple and terrifying as that. It is illegal and immoral. As mentioned in the report, UNICEF estimates that half a million more children have died since 1991 than would have died had child mortality continued to decline at the same rate as it did in the 1980s. It is estimated that the sanctions cause the death of four thousand children per month. In the face of this, how can anyone remain silent? Our own report today describes the condition of the Iraqi people in 15 governorates as 'desperate'.

Together with other Churches in CTBI, as per their letter of December 1999 to the Prime Minister, the United Reformed Church seriously questions the continuing

Anglo-American air action and its rationale and urges that comprehensive economic sanctions be lifted quickly in order that normal trade relations can be rebuilt. According to the *New Internationalist*, even if sanctions were to be lifted tomorrow, the cost of returning the country to pre-1991 standards would be at least 50 billion dollars. They estimate that since 1990 over a million people have died as a direct result of sanctions. The infant mortality rate rose from 30.5 per 1,000 in 1989 to 97.2 per 1,000 in 1997. In the face of such human statistics how can anyone remain silent?

So I wish to support the following motion, particularly paragraph (b), and hope that after the CTBI visit to the Middle East next year the next session of this Synod will be minded to request Her Majesty's Government to abandon their present sanctions policy. Personally I wish that we could do that now. Whatever Saddam Hussein may or may not be doing, it surely cannot be worth the lives of four thousand children per month. Therefore let us not keep silent but let us with great determination give our wholehearted support to the Bishop of Selby's motion.

Mrs Jane Bisson (Channel Islands): I must at the outset say that I have received a lot of help in the preparation of this address this afternoon, but the points that I want to make are important and need to be heard.

This paper says that the House of Commons International Affairs Committee reviewed the broad issue of sanctions. The BSR's report considers that sanctions are often as damaging in humanitarian development terms as armed conflict, and nowhere are they in more urgent need of reassessment than in Iraq.

In partnership with Christian Aid, Coventry Cathedral's International Centre for Culture and Peace, and the World Council of Churches' Decade to Overcome Violence, the BSR rep. went to Iraq for six weeks. This report that we have in front of us reflects his views. It shows how Iraq has suffered – and indeed it has. Iraq's financial assets were to be frozen until it recognized Kuwait's territorial integrity and dismantled its capability with weapons of mass destruction. Ten whole years later, neither condition has been adequately met. After two international wars stretching over 20 years and the UN's imposed sanctions, Iraq's economy is in absolute tatters. The Iraq-Iran war started by Iraq lasted from 1980 to 1988, with about one million dead. In the bloody stalemate, Saddam Hussein claimed victory. In 1991 the Kuwait war cost him defeat and a huge amount of military equipment, when repelled by 32 United Nations countries; one thousand Kuwaitis went missing. Since 1991 Saddam has developed his supergun, possibly a nuclear capability and chemical weapons. In 1990 he set ablaze six hundred Kuwaiti oil wells; the fires took a year to extinguish and cost Kuwait an estimated 150-200 billion dollars. The war cost 22 billion to the allies.

Again in 1994 seven hundred Iraqi tanks and 60,000 troops threatened Kuwait. In 1995, in the Iraqi election for a seven-year term, Saddam received a hundred per cent poll victory in which the polling booths were festooned with his portrait, in spite of some 150,000 to 200,000 civilians allegedly being killed. In addition, some 200,000

Kurds in northern Iraq were driven into winter mountains, bombed and bombarded, with many dying, and in the south the marsh Arabs were attacked, quite unnecessarily.

I mention this aggression and repression to demonstrate the type of regime that Iraq has, but none of this is mentioned – not even one single syllable has been mentioned – in the report before us today, *A Decade of Sanctions*. The only reference to the Kurds is made in one sentence, negatively. This paper does not otherwise refer to them or to Kuwait. Reference is made only to the UN resolution for Iraq to withdraw and help to find the missing persons. No reference at all is made to the persecuted marsh Arabs. One must challenge why this report appears so deliberately lop-sided. I am not sure how we can take note of this report when, as I have shown, it is so incomplete. The Bishop of Selby will no doubt tell me why we should.

Mr Roy Thompson (York): I have been impressed by the debates today, and it is to the credit of the Business Committee and the Synod that they have taken on these two public debates. It has been extremely helpful and serious. I have been impressed too by the young contribution, people young enough to make Pete Broadbent look like Jimmy Savile.

I worked in Kuwait straight after the Gulf War in 1991, organizing cranes and generators to fight the oil-well fires. My company's offices, flats and depots had been trashed, and my working clothes and boots had been exchanged by an Iraqi soldier for his poor quality sneakers and vest. He left behind my Paisley dressing gown which might say more about my taste than about his. These conscripts were poor specimens of a fighting force, ill equipped, poorly fed, badly paid, if at all. They stole and hijacked children's bikes and prams, and the evidence was fastened to the tanks which were burned out on the Basra road, shelled by UN forces. What a shambolic beaten army would have returned to Iraq to face, as we now know, a decade of deprivation. When we recall that 20 per cent of the homeless night sleepers on our streets are ex-military, we can imagine the quality of life that many of those have gone through since.

In the 1950s I went to school in Sheffield and I saw the city rebuilt quite quickly. I remember the benefits of such schemes as Marshall Aid and the rebuilding that went on, not just in Sheffield but in Coventry and Portsmouth, and in Germany too, to the extent that we wondered then who had won the war. Life was not normal but it was nearly so. So where is our generosity of spirit? How many times should we kick a man when he is down, seven or seventy times seven? Let us go the extra mile with humanitarian aid. That will be our victory if we need the excuse. We cannot win over the mind of Saddam Hussein but we can support the people of Iraq in the spirit of Good Samaritans. They did not want my Paisley dressing gown but they do need medicine and water and infrastructure now.

Anyone who has worked in the Middle East knows the frustration of bureaucracy, even when full cooperation is promised: the endless committees and excuses for lack of progress when people are uncooperative or deliberately obstructive. In such

circumstances, patience is tested, but we must resist any petulance in the UN, however understandable. It does us no credit to be triumphalist when we cannot number the dead or dying. Or are these statistics in a Muslim Middle East country more palatable than if they were in a colonial Christian Africa or Far East?

The report is very helpful. It gives us the background and the facts of sanctions not working, and some of the amelioration of the suffering. I urge Synod to support the motion.

Canon Andrew White (Coventry): For the past two years Iraq has been the centre of our life within the cathedral and diocese of Coventry, working at every level not just with the Iraqi Government but also with our own Government, with the Kuwaitis, the Saudis and the Jordanians and with all those affected by this ongoing crisis in and surrounding Iraq. It has meant several visits backwards and forwards along that ghastly road between Amman and Baghdad, nearly a thousand miles. It has been a work that we have been involved in not just here in the UK but also in the US as well, and this would not have been possible without the outstanding support of our own Archbishop of Canterbury and of Dr Billy Graham in the US.

I welcome this report today and I particularly welcome the work of Dr Charles Reed who has put the report together and who has proved himself to be not just a civil servant who sits behind his desk in this august House but someone who has also been out there on the ground, working. However, I have one grave concern about a small aspect of this following motion. Paragraph (a) puts all the responsibility for this crisis on the Government of Iraq. What we have heard from the Bishop of Selby this afternoon shows quite clearly that this cannot be the case. If some people are concerned that we have not dealt with all the issues here, that we have not mentioned issues of marsh Arabs or Kurds, I can assure Synod that the BSR and we ourselves at Coventry are as concerned about these issues as about the people in Iraq itself; but we are involved in a highly complex operation here. This is not just talking; we are doing the real work. We are making sure that people in Iraq have food and medical supplies; we are getting in aid; we are communicating between governments. This is not just a report; it is the real thing.

My concern about paragraph (a) is that, first, it is inaccurate and, second, it risks all that we have done and hope to do. It is inaccurate because it is widely accepted that the extreme arbitrary sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council are in themselves a major cause of the suffering of the Iraqi people. When we speak of the UN, we are talking of the Security Council and, in particular, the UK and the USA. This the Bishop of Selby made clear. There is a huge gulf between the UN on the ground in Baghdad and the UN in its ivory tower in New York. This has been made worse by the Security Council's refusal to engage with the leadership of Iraq. Iraq may not have complied with the relevant UN resolutions, but the UN has not complied with its own standards. UNSCOM have publicly declared that they were involved in espionage. There has been a massive looting of Iraq's antiquities by UN inspectors, going into millions and

millions of dollars, and there is this illegal no-fly zone. I have here a page of the US Congress report; it states that since the end of the Gulf War there have been over 200,000 sorties, 16,000 alone since Operation Desert Fox in 1998. Not a day goes by when Britain and the US do not continue to bomb Iraq.

On Monday a very significant event took place in Qatar: Kofi Annan agreed for the first time that sanctions must go and that the UN must take responsibility and that we cannot blame it all on Iraq. The parliamentary report of the International Development Committee makes clear in section 42 of its document that UN sanctions as used in Iraq can never be used again.

Second, this motion, in its present form, puts at risk the Church of England's unique position as regards a reconciliation role. In a recent House of Lords debate one of our bishops spoke. It took me two days to assure the Iraqi Government after that debate that we were still serious about our work with them. We are not risking just our political connection but also our humanitarian involvement. When we talk of 147 children dying a day, I think of Mustafa whose hand I held as he died two years ago weighing 3.7 kg. Our projects are at risk. If we want to go along the lines of Mrs Madeleine Albright, when she says that yes, it is acceptable for half a million children to die as a result of sanctions, we risk coming under the judgement of Almighty God. Let us be prophetic and take risks for the sake of the people of Iraq, for the sake of reconciliation and for the sake of the kingdom of God.

Mr Geoff Locke (Lichfield): So much to say on this, Mr Chairman, and I will try to gallop through it. I hope that I will not collapse in the middle of it like Inspector Morse. I am sobered by the fact that on the Underground this morning a young man kindly offered me his seat reserved for the elderly.

It needs to be stressed first of all that there is common ground among us in our concern for the suffering of the people of Iraq. It is not true to say that any of us in this Synod are unconcerned about the situation. Our debate is about the wisest way to solve that particular problem. On that basis, we need, first of all, to pay attention to the fact that the sanctions are United Nations sanctions and not just British sanctions. Very quickly, there are four UN Security Council resolutions that pertain to this particular issue. Resolution 687 in 1991 was the cease-fire resolution which required, as a condition of the cease-fire, that Iraq eliminate its weapons of mass destruction under international supervision, and it has been resisting that ever since. That same year the Security Council passed 688 which called on Iraq to cease the oppression of its own people, i.e. the marsh Arabs in the south, hence the southern no-fly zone, and the following year the Kurds in the north, hence the northern no-fly zone. In 1995 the United Nations introduced, under Security Council Resolution 986, its oil for food programme. For the past five years Iraq has been able to sell oil in exchange for food and medicines, but the Foreign Office reports that it has evidence that Iraq re-exports food and medicines in order to have cash which flows not into the humanitarian programme administered by the UN but for its own purposes. Last year the British

Government themselves introduced at the Security Council Resolution 1284; under it, the ceiling on Iraq's oil exports was eliminated. There is no barrier to Iraq exporting as of this moment as much oil as it likes. The British Government estimate that the amount that it can export at present in a year is 16,000 million dollars' worth. The only condition is that the money be channelled through the food for oil programme, and that is why the Iraqi Government dig in their heels and refuse to do so.

Those sanctions could be removed within six months of Iraqi cooperation with the UN arms observers, but they refuse to do so. It does seem to me that the UN sanctions are taking the flak for the activities of the Iraqi Government. I do not deny in any sense whatsoever that the implications for the people on the ground are as bad as described; it is very clear that the report presented to Synod is an eye-witness account. The Bishop of Coventry talked about visiting Baghdad and so forth, but it is important to notice that the report makes the point that it visited central and southern Iraq, not northern Iraq. The Bishop of Coventry talked about visiting Baghdad. The distinction is that in northern Iraq, in those three governorates, the humanitarian programme is administered not by the Iraqi Government but by the UN, and in the northern provinces therefore what has happened over the past ten years is that the infant mortality rate has not got appalling but has improved, compared with 1990. That is a key issue just here.

We need to take seriously quite how drastic the weapons are that we are talking about, bearing in mind that in the late 1980s the Iraqis used chemical weapons against Kurdish villagers and killed in excess of two thousand of their own population. Every so often we read, somewhat tendentiously in terms of the title, reports in the paper about Gulf War syndrome. Why is that an issue? It is because British troops ten years ago had to be given jabs and pills and potions and suchlike to protect them against what was thought to be likely in terms of Iraqi chemical and biological weapons. We now learn that, via various diplomatic back-channels, the Iraqis were warned that if they used these extensively they risked a nuclear response.

We are talking about issues of high stakes here, not just a tinpot dictator with his tanks on somebody else's lawn. There was a very helpful report in last week's *Church Times* – people will have seen it – about the degree of willingness to breach sanctions, amorally on the part of various Western powers who want to make money and, in terms of solidarity with the Palestinians *vis-à-vis* the Israelis, by various Arab states also.

Let me home in finally on the bit about smart sanctions. Canon White said just now that part of the thing that vitiated the UN arms inspection teams was the question of whether they were infiltrated by intelligence experts. If you want to target sanctions against the Iraqi leadership you stop saying that it is a terribly bad thing to have intelligence agents there and you start saying that this is the heart of what it is all about. Freezing a Swiss bank account for Saddam Hussein is hardly going to be much of a threat to him. Therefore it is the willingness to get involved in the messy business

of covert means of trying to put down the Iraqi regime that I think we need to face up to rather than the bland wording of paragraph (c) as it stands.

Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester): If you have ever been called as a witness in a court you know that you are asked to swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I am prepared to accept that this report contains the truth as far as I know, and that it contains nothing but the truth, as far as I know. Does it, however, contain the whole truth? It majors on the effect of sanctions on the Iraqi people, but I believe that by being highly selective in its contents it completely omits the most important facts. We should be very grateful to Mrs Bisson, who has filled in some of the facts that the report does not tell us. What we are left with is a pretty threadbare and inadequate report on which to base this debate.

Iraq refuses to recognize Kuwait's territorial integrity. It has not dismantled its weapons capability. Up to 200,000 Iraqi civilians have been killed by Iraqis. Kurds in the north have been bombed, and many have died. Marsh Arabs in the south have been attacked by the regime. Yet, Mr Chairman, you would never guess any of that from what this report says. The following motion that we are being offered is based on a pitifully inadequate report. It tries to lead the Synod into making pronouncements beyond its area of competence. In paragraph (b) we are asked to assert that a current policy is unlikely to yield further political dividend, but how on earth do we know? How on earth can this Synod know? Certainly not on the basis of what we have here. Paragraph (c) is platitudinous. It is asking the Government to achieve what has eluded the world community for years and to do so without cost. Paragraph (d) asks the BSR to achieve what the national media have apparently failed to do. I think that some of us would say that the national media have made a fairly good job of it. In paragraph (e) we are asking the BSR to do what it is almost certain to do anyway.

If we pass my amendment and take this resolution with paragraph (a) alone, we are making a statement that we can and should make, a statement that we are competent to make, and we do not lay ourselves open to the charge of advocating appeasement of a dictator whose track record to date offers little to commend him. As the Bishop of Selby said of his regime, it is one of the most oppressive and tyrannical in the world. I hope that the Synod will support my amendment.

Mr Frank Knaggs (Newcastle): My more modest amendment for the removal of clause (b) is to achieve more harmony between the General Synod report GS 1403 and the following motion. I am concerned that clause (b) makes the sweeping statement that sanctions have failed to achieve their purpose. What purpose are we talking about? They may indeed have made only limited progress but they have not failed utterly. As we have heard, the Kurds in the north and the Shi'ite Muslims, the marsh Arabs, in the south have a much more secure life, free from the gassing and the bombing that they experienced before sanctions curtailed Saddam's war machine.

What does the report actually say about the humanitarian tragedy? That is the issue in

clause (b). I refer to page 9 of the report. 'The UN's response to the humanitarian crisis is the oil for food programme. Humanitarian proposals were put forward as early as 1991 but disagreements between the United Nations and Iraq delayed the implementation of this programme until December 1996.' Initially, under that UNSCR 986 Iraq was permitted to export only 2 billion dollars' worth of oil over a six-month period. Things have developed since then. Currently under UNSCR 1284, which was adopted as recently as December 1999, the ceiling on Iraq's production was lifted; Geoff Locke referred to that. Under this programme, Iraq is entitled to purchase and import foodstuffs, medicines, medical equipment and other goods for essential civilian needs. Medical supplies are now getting through. I think it was Peter Hain on Radio 4 last week who said that the volume is three times that which the average Egyptian enjoys. It is also entitled to import some spare parts and equipment for use in areas of water, sanitation, education and electricity (my former existence was building power stations out there and a brand new power station was bombed on the day that it was commissioned); agriculture and mine clearance also come into that category. Recent expansions to the programme have allowed Iraq to import goods necessary for limited rehabilitation of the civilian infrastructure.

So we have a situation where there is a report but the report does not match what the motion says. I agree with much that is in the report but, as Jane Bisson said, there is much that is left out. Let us not go beyond its conclusion, however. That is why I say that we should remove clause (b) and keep the rest. I hope that Synod will feel that this is a more modest amendment which can be accepted.

Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Selby, in reply: I should like to thank all those who have contributed to the debate and who have demonstrated abundantly that there is a huge range of issues connected with Iraq which it would have been possible for us to address, but many of them are extremely complicated, as we have heard in several of the speeches. That is why the following motion has chosen to focus on one particular aspect only: the question of sanctions, which, in the main, affects only part of Iraq. The main reason for choosing that issue is because there is the possibility that we can make a difference by our influence on Her Majesty's Government and, through them, on the United Nations Security Council.

I am grateful to Mrs Bisson and the other speakers who have spelt out what was presented in summary form in the document 1403, which is the iniquity of Saddam Hussein's regime. That has not been kept from view; it is taken for granted and has been referred to in summary form. Does it warrant, however, what is happening to the people of Iraq, as 1403 documents and as we have heard in more than one speech this

afternoon? I should like to pay tribute to the work of the diocese of Coventry and Canon White and the Centre for International Reconciliation and the work that they are doing.

What we have in the motion leading up to the approach to Her Majesty's Government to change the sanctions regime is a balanced approach which, I suggest to the Synod, it is essential that we take. Clause (a) addresses the Government of Iraq, clause (b) addresses the United Nations and clause (c) addresses Her Majesty's Government. If we lose any of those we have lost the balance which I believe to be essential for the motion as a whole. Therefore, when it comes to that point I shall be asking the Synod to resist Canon White's amendment. It is no part of our intention in bringing this motion to make life difficult for the work that he is involved in, and those who are concerned will know about his amendment and hear the things that he has said.

I hear what Mr Locke and Mr O'Brien are saying about the iniquities of the regime, and of course one could write an encyclopaedia of them, which would not really get us any further forward. The question is: what would they do? In answer to Mr Knaggs, who asks about the oil for food programme, GS 1403 assesses the oil for food programme and gives the view that it does not go far enough.

I am grateful to the contributors to this debate and, in concluding this response, I find myself in the unusual position (although today not unique) of being the mouthpiece of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who would have wanted to speak in the debate and has very kindly given me a copy of the speech which he would have made. He has not asked that I read it out for him, but he has asked that I tell the Synod that he is wholeheartedly in support of the motion.

The motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Selby: I beg to move:

'That this Synod, noting with deep sympathy the suffering of the Iraqi people:

- (a) hold that the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Iraq is a consequence of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 and the continued failure by the Government of Iraq to comply with relevant UN Security Council resolutions;
- (b) recognize that after ten years sanctions have failed to achieve their purpose and that continuing with the present sanctions policy is unlikely to yield further political dividend without creating additional human suffering;
- (c) call on HMG to work to ensure that the price of securing peace and

stability in the region is paid by the leadership of Iraq rather than the most vulnerable Iraqi people;

- (d) encourage the BSR to work with Christian Aid, Coventry Cathedral's Centre for Reconciliation and other bodies working in this area, in raising awareness of the humanitarian situation in Iraq and the underlying causes of conflict in the Middle East;
- (e) encourage the Board for Social Responsibility to report back to the General Synod after the CTBI delegation has visited the Middle East next year.'

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Canon Andrew White (Coventry): For the sake of the people of Iraq, I beg to move as an amendment:

'*Leave out* paragraph (a) and *insert* as a new paragraph (a)

"(a) hold that, whilst the origin of the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Iraq is a consequence of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, it has been perpetuated in part by the UN's lack of will to engage with the Iraqi leadership and the failure of the UN to ensure that the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people are being met;".'

The Archdeacon of Lambeth (Ven. Nick Baines): I feel that one of the things that we have not addressed, except perhaps through Andrew White, has been the fact that this story begins pre-1991. What is on trial today is the politics of pragmatism. We have heard about the marsh Arabs and the bombing and gassing of the Kurds. Our country was complicit in this over 20 years ago. Where did Saddam get his money, weapons, technology from? He did not dream them up. If we are going to be prophetic today, we need to do so with a certain degree of humility and penitence.

I want to make two other points. One is about sanctions. Sanctions work where the victims consent to the imposition of those sanctions. In South Africa things were different: the people who were the victims of the sanctions consented to their being applied and in many cases invited them. This is not the case with the ordinary people of Iraq. Saddam is not paying the price – these guys never do – but ordinary people are.

My main concern, however, is this. We are giving birth now, from a politics of pragmatism, to a whole generation of children and young people whose total experience of the Western world and therefore of Christianity is the simple equation of it with cruelty and what might amount to genocide. Are we going to be sitting here still in 20 years' time, regretting decisions that we made today because we did not have

the foresight to see how we and the world and our faith might look through the eyes of that generation who are suffering without comprehending the finer academic reasons for our sanctions? I would like that introduced into the moral debate.

If I had to make a choice this afternoon between the urgency, the dirtied hands urgency, of Andrew White's amendment and the academic arrogance of Mr O'Brien, I know which way I will be voting.

Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark): I very much welcome the amendment by Canon White and I congratulate him and the team from Coventry on all the work that they have done, as highlighted in this report. It was only recently that I heard that the bombing in the no-fly zones was continuing and that this country was taking part in it but I had not remembered seeing any of that in the media. It is disgraceful that this has not been brought to the fore. It is very important that we take note that this is happening; it is dreadful. I support wholeheartedly Canon White's amendment.

The Chairman: Does the Bishop wish to comment further on this amendment?

The Bishop of Selby: Only briefly, if I may, Mr Chairman. As I have indicated, I am very sympathetic to Canon White's motives in bringing his amendment. The problem, as I have said, is about balance in the motion as a whole. Unfortunately, if we were to adopt Canon White's version of clause (a) instead of the one that is in the motion at present, it would have the effect of letting Saddam Hussein off the hook. There would be nowhere else in the motion which actually referred to the responsibility which is his. Therefore, with regret, I feel that it is necessary to ask the Synod to vote against the amendment, and we shall of course accept the Synod's wisdom.

The amendment was put and lost.

Mr Geoff Locke (Lichfield): I beg to move as an amendment:

'Leave out paragraphs (b) to (e) and insert as new paragraphs (b) to (d)

"(b) recognize that after ten years UN sanctions

(i) have degraded Iraq's capability concerning weapons of mass destruction, but not sufficiently to remove the threat to regional stability;

(ii) are increasingly being breached, in the interests of commercialism and of Arab solidarity;

(c) acknowledge that so-called 'smart sanctions' targeted specifically against Iraq's leadership would probably require the use of covert operations; and

- (d) encourage Her Majesty's Government to renew its efforts for a regional peace settlement tackling the underlying causes of conflict in the Middle East".'

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Bishop of Huntingdon (Rt Revd John Flack): I am grateful to those who have spoken from their first-hand experience of Iraq, particularly the Bishop of Coventry earlier on, and I hope that we all heard what he said and what the report says about the humanitarian situation in Iraq. I do not have first-hand experience of Iraq but it is my privilege to have met a number of Iraqi people here at home, and what they say to me is that the humanitarian situation in Iraq has dropped out of the public consciousness. There is a need to raise that public consciousness here in England, so I hope that when members of Synod go home to their dioceses, deaneries and parishes they will, when reporting, draw people's attention to the urgency of this situation. We do not see enough about this on television or in our newspapers, so we do need to be ambassadors for the people of Iraq in this situation.

For that reason it is very important to retain the paragraph structure in the original motion and to reject the amendments of Mr Locke and Mr O'Brien which would leave those out, especially paragraph (e).

The Bishop of Selby: Mr Locke has done us the service of drawing our attention to the issue of regional stability and the underlying causes of conflict, which is of course referred to in clause (d) with regard to the sort of co-operative work that we have been talking about in the course of this debate; but it seems to me that the thrust of his amendment is in favour of maintaining the *status quo* as regards sanctions, and so I would resist that because the motion calls for a reconfiguration, not a lifting of sanctions but a reconfiguration of them, in order to ensure that we are working towards regional peace and security. I suggest that the sort of reconfigured sanctions that we are talking about would work to the benefit, rather than to the detriment, of regional peace and security because the sort of eroded position of sanctions that we have at the moment provides neither for regional stability nor for the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people. It is for the Synod to encourage Her Majesty's Government to work in that direction.

Of course, when we are talking about smart sanctions, I ought just to point out to the Synod that GS 1403 says that Dr Reed, who made the visit to Iraq, is now serving on the United Nations working group which is developing the idea of so-called smart sanctions and, as the chairman of the committee to which he answers, I would like to assure Synod that he will be involved in no covert operations!

Ms Anne Williams (Durham): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester): I beg to move as an amendment:

'Leave out paragraphs (b) to (e).'

Mr Jonathan Redden (Sheffield): I work with Iraqi doctors and indeed I share a combined clinic with an Iraqi paediatrician who is superb, so I know something of the personal effect of sanctions on Iraq. What concerns me about this is that we have not yet heard the effect on, say, the Royal Air Force and other powers, following the removal of sanctions. That is a very big weakness in this debate. Is it the plan that if we remove sanctions the Royal Air Force and other air powers stop flying over Iraq? If they do, what then happens to the people in southern Iraq and northern Iraq? If we say that they should continue to overfly Iraq, will that mean that an Iraq which is empowered by the removal of sanctions will be able to resist the overflying of the Royal Air Force and other air powers which are mandated by the United Nations? Until we have a satisfactory answer from the Bishop as to what this future would be, I would find it difficult to support all these little motions here though I really do want to. Therefore I am waiting – and I hope that others are waiting – to hear about the effects, because it is a very much wider issue than we are being told today.

The Chairman: I am not sure whether you were speaking to the amendment, Mr Redden, but thank you for that.

The Bishop of Selby: If I may just respond to Mr Redden, there is a clear distinction between the business of the no-fly zones and the economic sanctions. They are two quite different arrangements. What we are proposing about the targeting of sanctions has no implications for no-fly zones, whatever view one might hold of that, because we are focusing in the way that I have said.

My reasons for resisting Mr O'Brien's amendment are somewhat similar to those already advanced in relation to others, concerning balance; the effect of his amendment of course would simply be to express some criticism of Saddam Hussein without addressing any of the things that we have been talking about with regard to the United Nations Security Council, its sanctions and Her Majesty's Government's capacity to do something about that. I would ask the Synod to vote against the amendment.

Revd Chris Lilley (Lincoln): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

Mr Frank Knaggs (Newcastle): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘*Leave out paragraph (b) and reletter the remaining paragraphs accordingly.*’

Mrs Alison Ruoff (London): As a nurse I have worked overseas in India for a year, I have seen enormous poverty and I have the greatest sympathy with the suffering and the appalling injustice that is going on in Iraq. However, this report concludes that the harm caused is disproportionate to the good so far achieved, and certainly some countries – notably France, Russia, Germany and China – are showing strong indications of their willingness to disregard UN sanctions with tremendous cynical opportunism. They see the chance to export to Iraq. Some Arab countries are also doing the same. Partly this is because there is a new pipeline from Iraq through to Syria which is shortly to be reopened after 18 years of closure.

The profound human suffering which has been caused and the continuing aggressive threat to the whole region emanate from Iraq. If sanctions are not imposed and the UN directives of inspection and control not implemented but frustrated, then dictatorship, in the name of Saddam Hussein, will have won, and its oppression inside Iraq will be accepted. Should Iraq’s external aggression towards Kuwait and all that happened there – we remember that six hundred oil wells took a whole year to cap – towards the Kurds, the marsh Arabs and the Shia Muslims be ignored? If that is going to happen, the menace of Saddam Hussein will be condoned, and this will happen if sanctions are removed.

We need to think out just what is involved with these sanctions and not give way to a dictatorship. After all, if we had given way to a dictatorship in the Second World War, that of Hitler, would we be here today? Similarly with Ceaucescu in Romania and all that was the cause of the dictatorship there. We must not give way.

The Bishop of Selby: In response to Mrs Ruoff but also to some other speakers, there has been no suggestion in this debate today, I think, by anyone, and certainly not by me, that sanctions should be removed or lifted entirely. The motion is about encouraging Her Majesty’s Government to reconfigure them in order to avoid some of the disastrous consequences of the regime that we have known. I ask Synod to resist Mr Knaggs’s amendment for reasons that members will not want me to repeat, about balance. If we took out paragraph (b) there would be nothing that addresses the UN Security Council and the undoubted shortcomings that have been there as well as on the part of the Government of Iraq. I ask the Synod to vote against the amendment.

Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

Ms Anne Williams (Durham): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. In view of the good debate that we have had so far and of the time, I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Selby: I have very little to add. I think all the points have been made and you have heard more than enough from me. I am very grateful to the Synod for the way in which it has received this motion. In this modest and balanced way it does now have the possibility of making some difference to a very difficult situation, and with some confidence I ask the Synod to vote wholeheartedly in favour of the motion.

The motion was put and carried, 255 voting in favour and 29 against.

THE CHAIR *Mrs Margaret Swinson (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 5.31 p.m.

Presidential Address

The Chairman: The Archbishop of York will now give the Archbishop of Canterbury’s presidential address.

The Archbishop of York (Dr David Hope): I am beginning to feel a little like a ventriloquist! I crave the Archbishop of Canterbury’s indulgence and hope that I shall faithfully and truly present his words to Synod.

The theme of the address is ‘Seize the day!’ If you have kept your eye on the saints and great leaders celebrated in the Church calendar this week, you will be aware that on Tuesday we commemorated the life of Samuel Seabury, the first Anglican bishop in North America, consecrated in 1784; today, Thursday, we celebrate the life of Margaret, the eleventh-century Queen of Scotland. I will come back to Margaret in a moment, but since Synod opened on Tuesday 14 November, Samuel Seabury’s day, let me for a moment focus on Seabury. When I think of him I feel a slight twinge of sadness and yet also of great joy. Sadness, because one of my predecessors, John Moore, the 88th Archbishop of Canterbury, failed to show the courage and initiative that the moment required.

The Church of England had never consecrated a bishop for the American colonies, and for well over a century Americans had to make the long and dangerous journey across the Atlantic Ocean to be ordained or even confirmed. After the revolutionary war, the Anglicans in the new nation were no longer members of the Church of England and

thus entirely cut off from episcopal oversight. In the opinion of some, this was a good thing! Nevertheless, in 1783, Seabury was sent to Lambeth by the clergy of Connecticut to ask in desperation for a bishop to be consecrated for the new Episcopal Church in the United States.

Despite his sympathy for their plight, Archbishop Moore was reluctant to move decisively on this issue. At that time, all new Anglican bishops had to swear allegiance to the English king, which Seabury of course was unable to do. Moore could not understand that he faced an entirely unprecedented situation: the birth of a new Anglican Church, on another continent, in a political context completely different from that of the Church of England. Moore's inability to help led to Seabury's eventual decision to go north of the Tweed to the tiny and outlawed Scottish Episcopal Church. In contrast to Archbishop Moore and the Church of England, the bishops of the Scottish Church displayed more pluck and prophetic insight, and Seabury was consecrated bishop in Aberdeen on 14 November 1784. In one sense, that was the birthday of the worldwide Anglican Communion.

Although Moore redeemed himself a few years later when he consecrated in Lambeth Chapel the first bishops of New York and Pennsylvania, he still comes across as a man of little vision. To quote Edward Carpenter, a distinguished historian of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Moore's 'horizon was limited'.

If I feel sad when I consider Moore's lack of vision and courage, I find joy in Seabury's dedicated determination. William White, the bishop of Pennsylvania eventually consecrated by Moore at Lambeth, was said to be 'persistently gentle', but Seabury was 'gently persistent'. His consecration in the face of great odds not only provided North America with its first bishop but was also a turning point in the history of the Scottish Episcopalians. In a biography of Seabury, Bruce Steiner writes that Seabury's consecration 'triggered the [Scottish Episcopal] Church's emergence from obscurity and isolation'. It set in motion a train of events that led finally to the repeal of the penal laws against Episcopalians in 1792.

So we might say that the then Archbishop of Canterbury failed to perceive the key or, as theologians would say, the *kairos* moment of his day: he failed to see that in Seabury's quest for episcopal orders God was calling our Church to do something courageous, new and transformative. Therefore it fell to someone else to do the job. It is my conviction that you and I together face a similar *kairos* moment. I want to inspire you to join me and the whole Church in seizing it.

Let me explain. During this Millennium year I have been doing some listening to Scripture by simply meditating each day on Ephesians 1. It is not too much to say that in the process I have grown in my understanding of God's will and the staggering character of the gospel that we proclaim. As I have done so, I have become more and more aware that the three principles which I expounded at the beginning of the last Synod's life in 1995 are principles which I have articulated throughout my

archiepiscopate, and which are still the ones that I want to proclaim afresh today: mission, unity and confidence.

Listen to Ephesians: 'With all wisdom and insight [God] has made known to us the mystery of his will, according to the good pleasure that he set forth in Christ, as a plan for the fullness of time, to gather up all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth.' Mission is there: God has made known the mystery of his will in Christ. He wishes all to respond to his love. Unity is there: God's longing is to gather up all things in Christ; his heart is open and welcoming. Confidence is there: God never acts indecisively or with equivocation. The message is certain, generous and positive. The plan will be successful. Indeed, we cannot miss the confidence pulsating through the entire passage as the apostle trumpets our blessings in Christ, our calling in Christ, our salvation in Christ and our destiny in Christ. Praise rings through this wonderful passage and restates the writer's great conviction that God has acted powerfully and wonderfully in our Lord.

Yet if these are the same themes of 1995, we are not still in 1995, and we are not the same Synod. It is a new time and a new Synod; but these three themes are still at the heart of our shared task. Our *kairos* moment is this. We live in a world thirsting for the gospel. Our task, working together, is to transform the Church so that it is committed to mission, growing in unity, and proclaiming in confidence the Gospel that we share.

So *carpe diem*! Seize the day! Do not let this *kairos* moment slip away, to be lost, perhaps forever. Let us not fail to participate in God's work of liberation. Do not let history look back on us and say, as it did of Archbishop Moore, that our 'horizon was limited'. Let us rather commit ourselves to the big picture, to pursuing the essential goals and to working together in Christian love to achieve them. As this new Synod begins its work and seeks to serve God and his Church, let us consider anew our responsibility to lead mission, to gather God's people together in unity, and to deepen confidence in the gospel that we are called to proclaim.

Target 1: To lead mission

The mission that we lead of course is God's mission. We recognize our place. We are responsible neither for the movement of God's Spirit nor for the results which might follow; but we are responsible for the way we tackle the job and the spirit in which we do it. In talking about mission I want to refer to the four themes identified by the Archbishops' Council, themes which I believe can be of enormous help not just to the work of the Council but also to Synod. Indeed I believe that, as we work together, these themes can do much to keep our horizons broad and our vision clear, and to stop them becoming limited and clouded.

So, first, *engaging with social issues*. We have a responsibility to assist the Church to think, speak and act prophetically on issues that concern our society. I am pleased that

this is the first theme to be highlighted. It emphasizes that our mission is outward-looking, directed away from ourselves. Instead, we look towards the world that we all share and acknowledge our role as a servant Church. Our concern is deep and our commitment strong. We are committed to be agents of change, to seek to overcome injustice and to witness to truth. That means challenging the abuse and mistreatment of our fellow human beings, wherever and whoever they are, and it means combating the mistreatment and abuse of the glorious creation that we share. We must renew our commitment to healthy lives, lived in healthy societies, on a healthy planet.

Second, *equipping to evangelize*. The Council has accepted the responsibility to help coordinate a strategy to help us all become agents of mission. Few will say that this is easy. We live in a society which the ministry of the Church has influenced for many hundreds of years. It has helped to shape virtually every aspect of our national life and institutions: our schools and universities, our hospitals and health care, our judicial and legal system. Yet we have to acknowledge that, despite this rich legacy, the Church has not always proclaimed the gospel as effectively as it might. We have sought to set that right and must continue so to do.

The Decade of Evangelism has helped us shape that task, to recommit ourselves, as a missionary Church, to nourishing the roots of faith and worship that reach down more than 1,400 years into the subsoil of our national life. The Archbishop of York and I entirely agree with the Archdeacon of Canterbury, who urged us to keep spirituality central to Anglican mission. 'Knowing God' binds evangelism and spirituality in one.

Let me return to the context of our mission. I do not believe, as some have claimed on my behalf, that ours is an atheist society. I do not believe for one moment that the battle is lost. For a Christian that simply is not an option. I do say, however, that many people struggle to locate the true source of transcendent hope, the hope nourished for us by God's promise of salvation in Jesus Christ, and I do believe that we must bend might and main to point the way, as witnesses of God's love.

Third, *welcoming and encouraging children and young people*. The Council recognizes the importance of serving those who are growing up in our challenging and often troubled world. That does not mean pandering to the young or to their every passing whim – that is no service at all – but it does mean listening to them, being responsive to them, and learning and benefiting from their enthusiasm and their insights. In terms of the life and worship of the Church, we must welcome young people and allow them to encourage us and, yes, to influence us. It is not enough simply to invite them into what we regard as 'our' home. We have to accept that, if the Church is their home as well, they must feel part of it, not simply tolerated.

In my recent visit to the Peterborough diocese I spoke at a youth rally in a school. The worship was entirely led by young people under 25 and was joyful, colourful and very, very loud! Different though it undoubtedly was from the parish Eucharist at Oundle the following day, or indeed the High Mass at All Saints, Margaret Street that I

attended a week or two later, I felt very much at home and was deeply moved by the spirituality of those 400 young people. I also felt that, remarkable and encouraging though the experience was, we have much work yet to do, if we really are to achieve our goal.

Fourth, *developing the ministry of all*. This final theme seeks to encourage godly leadership at all levels of the Church. We affirm the ministry of the clergy – stipendiary ministry must be the backbone of that ministry – and thus maintaining the quality and excellence of our theological colleges and courses must remain a priority. To the excellent ministry of our non-stipendiary ministers (if we are still allowed to call them that) we have added recently the developing ministry of ordained local ministers. We believe that these NSMs and OLMs will play an increasingly important role in our mission strategy in urban and rural areas.

Woe betide us, however, if we neglect our lay leaders. Pope Gratian in the thirteenth century apparently said that the duty of laypeople was to ‘be at worship, to give their offerings, and obey’, which someone later defined as ‘turn up, pay up and shut up’. Although in some areas there is still a trace of one-man-band ministries and ‘Father knows best’ types of attitude, an increasing emphasis is being placed on lay leadership in Church life. This of course has been one of the themes of the Springboard initiative. Surely it is no coincidence that Springboard has emphasized the need to make full use of the professional skills of laypeople in Church life. I welcome this, but we must also affirm laypeople in their spiritual role as parents, in their working lives, as Sunday school teachers, as Readers, and as co-workers with the clergy in so many other ways.

In that respect, it is appropriate that, while Synod opened on Tuesday 14 November, Samuel Seabury’s day, it closes today, Thursday 16 November, when we remember Queen Margaret of Scotland. Not only is Margaret the only woman on our Church calendar this week; she is the only layperson. As Queen of Scotland, Margaret used her influence to reform the Church. She called synods together to discuss various problems and sometimes presided over them herself. A woman of remarkable intellect and piety, Margaret was scripturally and theologically literate and formidable to face in debate. The medieval writer of her first biography states that ‘to [her] arguments [her opponents] could make no reply, and understanding now the practices of the Church, observed in them ... the mystery of salvation’.

I have dwelt on four areas, all to do with mission and all of which the Archbishops’ Council has identified as priorities for its own work. As I said, I hope very much that Synod will also find them both inspiring and a way of keeping our horizons open and our vision clear. I also want to suggest that we need to take this one step further, from general statements to specific commitments. We need to move from mere aspirations about social engagement, mission, young people and ministry to measurable action.

Now more briefly let me move on to our next two goals of unity and confidence.

Target 2: Deepening the unity of the Church

‘That he might gather all things into one’.

As I look back over nearly 40 years in the ordained ministry, I am struck by how often the idea of unity has been woven together with that of mission. The more I think about it, the more I see that they form part of the same fabric. Within the Church of England I rejoice in the fact that there is a remarkable coming together among members which transcends the different traditions from which we come. In many ways, we are genuinely working as one body.

I hope that Synod will continue to lead the way in this regard. I am not saying that we should surrender truths which we believe our particular tradition safeguards, but I am suggesting that we can and must find ways of sustaining the uniquely Anglican spirit of tolerance and inclusiveness. Of course we must strive for unity in truth, but we must also remember that unity is itself a prize that, once sacrificed, may be hard to regain. So the challenge is to promote a sense of shared faith and purpose which deepens our mission and which does not allow it to be dissipated in needless argument and fruitless rivalries.

As a national Synod, we also have a responsibility to encourage unity among all Christian bodies in this land. In the light of the debate on the Archbishops’ Council’s themes, the Archbishop of York and I want to assure the Dean of Durham that we have no intention of retreating from our often stated goal to seek full visible unity with other Christian Churches. We rejoice at the way in which God has brought us closer together in recent years; we recognize that we have a long way yet to go; but this Synod will be presented with opportunities to move us further along the way. May God give us the boldness to affirm what he is blessing. Once more let us raise our eyes in search of the big picture: God’s purpose that we may all be one and that the world may believe.

Target 3: Deepening confidence

So how may we as a Synod show our leadership? One major way is through deepening and developing confidence in the gospel that we profess. It has often struck me that the risk of faith and confidence in the gospel is something that we frequently take for granted at the individual and parish levels but less often perhaps at the diocesan and national levels. Just two weeks ago I was in the diocese of Southern Ohio to help launch their vision plan for the next four years. Their aim is to increase their numerical strength fourfold by 2005. It is an audacious plan but after being there I was in no doubt that the entire diocese is truly committed to it and has specific plans to make it work. This is their vision; we must be guided by our own.

Nevertheless, if we wish to seize the day we too shall need to clarify our goals and sharpen our vision. I have no doubt that during the lifetime of this Synod we shall face demanding challenges that will require considerable boldness, commitment and faith. Let me suggest a few challenges that may well come our way.

The challenge to each diocese: how may each diocese focus its life so that each parish may grow numerically, setting for ourselves appropriate and achievable targets within our own context? The challenge to the Archbishops' Council and Synod: how may we in real terms intensify our work among children and young people? The challenge to us all: how may our giving to the work of the Church increase? This may well be our greatest test. All I will say is that lack of money is rarely the problem; the lack of vision often is.

These and other challenges will no doubt come our way. How shall we respond to them? Just as a ship is only defined by its ability to meet the waves as it leaves the security of the harbour, so our faith becomes a visible, potent reality as we walk with the living God.

It is in this context that I want to say something about the spirit of the Church today. When I hear that the morale of clergy here or of a congregation there is low, I recognize of course the corrosive influence that a lack of proper support or limited response can have on faithful and at times heroic ministries. Yes, it can be hard going to maintain one's enthusiasm and love when journeying towards God through what seems like a wilderness. I certainly neither underestimate nor dismiss the sharpness of the challenge. Yet we have God's promise that he is with us. What we need is the courage to trust him as we travel.

I believe that when we do trust him we are richly rewarded. So much of what I see of the life of the Church is clearly charged with the Holy Spirit. I see clergy and congregations full of joy and hope as they walk with Christ. I see an increasing commitment to generous and even sacrificial giving. I see rising numbers of men and women exploring a vocation to ordained Christian ministry. I see exciting initiatives in both town and country, such as the Church Urban Fund, which developed out of *Faith in the City*, and the ecumenical Arthur Rank Centre with its Rural Churches in Community Service project. I see young people charged with enthusiasm for their faith, including those before us now in this new Synod. I see a new generation of Anglican theologians and scholars, making creative and sophisticated contributions to the Church's intellectual life.

Let me return once more to Archbishop John Moore and to the *kairos* moment that seemed to have passed him by. He failed to seize the day for a variety of reasons. We should not assume that we would have fared better. The trouble is that we can never be sure when our *kairos* moment is upon us; God rarely forewarns, and it is only later that we perceive what it was. I believe that our moment is now. Let us look to the broad horizons of faith as we celebrate a God who is perpetually in mission, whose plan is to gather all things together and who alone is the basis of our confidence.
(Applause)

The Archbishop of York prorogued the Group of Sessions and dismissed Synod with the blessing at 5.59 p.m.