

## **Letter in the Church Times on 12 November 2010**

To use the sort of language Gregory Cameron uses (letters, 5th November) in no way reassures us about the purpose of the Covenant. The problem for its supporters is that the arguments for it have never been persuasively made.

Those close to the process are, perhaps, unwilling to see its implications. The advertisement placed by Modern Church and Inclusive Church simply expresses those implications. We have not yet heard any arguments which undermine our view, which is set out in more detail on the Modern Church website.

Whatever the original intentions of the Covenant, it will undoubtedly be used to resist change and development in the Communion, and as an instrument of exclusion for those Provinces which wish to allow progress. To deny that this is the case makes an abrupt U-turn after six years of talk, by Primates and others, of "disciplining" the USA and other provinces if they take action not universally agreed.

Provinces – especially the Church of England, given its role in the Communion - will be required to move at the pace of the slowest province or face "relational consequences". The main supporters of the proposed Covenant are those who have been at the forefront of resisting greater inclusion; this is not an accident.

The Anglican Communion has four Instruments of Communion: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, the Primates' Meeting and the Anglican Consultative Council. After a fashion, they work. Why do we need a fifth?

Yours sincerely

Revd John Plant, Chair, Modern Church

Canon Giles Goddard, Chair, Inclusive Church