



Martin Sewell

Christ Church Gravesend

email for dialogue martin.sewell@me.com

Last October, members of the Deaneries elected me to represent them on General Synod. I had stood on a platform which can be briefly summarised as transparency, accountability, and active representation of the urban North Kent Deaneries, where "being Church" is somewhat different from the areas of from which our representatives were previously drawn. I hope I still qualify as "new blood"!

Having "talked the talk", it is time for me to render account of my short term of stewardship on your behalf. I have attended three busy Synod sessions, I have joined no "grouping", and mostly voted with the majority on issues which were uncontroversial. I will begin by identifying issues where I exercised a different independent judgement. Even if you don't agree with me, on some of these, I hope to receive credit for independent nuanced thought and practising commitment to accountability.

The motion on the "bedroom tax/spare room subsidy" was good in parts but I abstained: it was overwhelmingly carried. I was completely behind calling on the Government to review many areas of manifest injustice and bad implementation - that was a "no-brainer". The text and surrounding rhetoric, however, implied immorality, with which I was less happy. If you are a trustee of public assets, you have a duty to maximise the benefits derived from them. Further, the community routinely compulsorily purchases houses (not least in North Kent) to build roads railways and airports. I could not see that asking people to downsize from a community owned asset was **always** inherently immoral, and suggesting it was wrong to ask folk to move from where they were well established, was a bit rich from a Church that routinely moves retired clergy out of their home areas! Immoral? Motes and beams anyone? An abstention does not obstruct, but marks a less than perfect analysis.

I caused a stir in the Climate Change debate, raising issues that nobody else seemed to have considered. As a former Green Party Secretary, I felt uniquely able to act as Devil's Advocate, to say what others feared to, and to disturb a degree of corporate complacency and self congratulation.

In a nutshell, I asked "What if it's not Green Energy TO help the poor" but Green Energy OR help the poor"? Like Bill Gates, I believe that right now, Green Energy cannot replace the carbon economy; the technology is not good enough and must be developed through research and development first. I likened our position to a trapeze artist: you don't let go from where you are safe, until you are confident that the next trapeze is reliably in position!

Most importantly, I pointed out that in the last 30 years, free trade and cheap energy (most recently bountiful low carbon shale gas) has enabled the growing world population to live longer, be better fed, be better educated, with fewer infant mortalities etc. Over those years, the percentage of a growing world population living in absolute poverty has fallen from 53% to 17%. Still too many, still much to be done, but no time to take risks with a model of world development that is working for the poor as never before. Asking the poor to make "bricks without straw" is wrong. Low energy costs bring jobs, educational advancement and prosperity. Green energy is not yet ready to carry that load.

I was the only one to point out that contrary to all computer models and predictions, global temperatures have not risen for 18 years. Having made my fair share of failed apocalyptic warnings I felt we had time to get the undoubtedly necessary transition to a low carbon economy right. We must prioritise science- not killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

So, I have occasionally been the grit in the oyster - but don't you need that irritant to develop pearls of wisdom? You won't elect me to "go with the flow".

I have, however, made other uncontroversial contributions. As a retired Child Protection lawyer I have actively engaged in the Safeguarding debates, explaining issues from experience, which many find difficult to discuss, and modestly improving drafting.

I think my best contribution was in securing an assurance from the Church Commissioners that in their discussions with the supermarkets, in which we are significant investors, they will raise a concern that a combination of extended Sunday Trading and Welfare Benefit Reform could prove toxic to the family life of the poor.

I come from a very inclusive Church where you will see a happily diverse congregation. Worshipping with three women priests, voting for women Bishops was no problem for me. Nevertheless, I welcomed the accommodation for those conscientiously unable to accept them. I will argue for a place for different views and churchmanship within our communion.

The issue of sexuality will return. My stance is nuanced: I opposed the re-definition of marriage. That does not stop me valuing gay relationships. I have voted to bless civil partnerships in my church if/when lawful. I am evaluating the concept of "Covenant Partnership" seeking a theologically valid way forward. With God all things are possible. I shall await the outcome of the shared conversations and seek a positive, pastorally sensitive outcome, with care, and a valued place for those disappointed.

I value each part of the Anglican Tradition. Having promised to get around the Diocese to talk about General Synod and get to know those I represent, I made a point of visiting Evangelical congregations and prioritising an early visit to one of our Forward in Faith churches; in each I have been warmly welcomed and learned of their faithful witness and service. Since elected I have visited 4 Deanery Synods and 5 congregations which is as much as I could manage given my Reader obligations. I have also secured Permission to Officiate in a French Congregation It's no bad thing to have people in General Synod with appreciation of the unique problems of the vast Diocese of Europe.

The next 5 years are important. We have just embarked upon a very important Reform and Renewal agenda to re-evangelise the nation. It is exciting, and can halt years of slow decline. The Church Commissioners are making available £100m for Church growth. Having two sons expert in digital marketing, I am particularly informed and interested in developing our social media outreach to the young. I have already started an initiative to seek £3 m of the Commissioners money for innovative social media outreach to a missing demographic. I'd like your support to make this happen. I will email details on request.

Preaching the Gospel to the next generation is my priority. I was recently in a highly successful US church. I asked their Pastor how we might build such a church: he relied "Passion for the Word, Passion for The Lord". He communicated that to his congregation, challenged them to be "All In" for Christ and they actively and faithfully responded. That vision of how we need to develop the Anglican Church will do for me. If my approach to representing Rochester Diocese appeals to you, I would appreciate a high priority vote.