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ANNOUNCING THE WORLD'S MOST SENSITIVE CONDOM.

In New York, the disease is already the biggest single killer of women between the ages of 25-35. And to this country, it's estimated that up to 100,000 people will be infected by 1990.

Mares Condoms Ltd. are setting up with the dual aims of making condoms more widely available and acceptable, and of raising money to provide practical assistance, information and advice about AIDS.

So make condoms more widely used, we're introducing a range including Condoms, Natural Latex and Ribbed Latex, all of which carry the NHS mark.

And, thanks to many forward-thinking artists, Mares are also making condoms more widely available. Mares Condoms Ltd. will be using its profits to help educate people about "Safe Sex" techniques. Providing educational videos, information brochures and practical advice.

We are also planning to give money to counseling centres and campaigns to raise awareness of the disease.

In short, we want to provide as much money as we can for those dealing with the disease.

For now, it makes sense to use a condom. And we think it makes sense to use Mares.

Mares. You make love, they make sense.
To tolerate or to deplore?

Today the General Synod debates its attitudes to homosexuality.
Sally Brompton talks to two ministers in neighbouring parishes who hold radically conflicting views.

"Homosexuals have got as much right to sexual expression as everybody else: we should look for the good in it and encourage fidelity."

Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. George Carey.

"The practice of sexual intercourse between men I find abhorrent. It appals me. It is contrary to the creative order of things."

John Winter, B.D., vicar of St. Paul's Church, Greenford.

Women have not oppressed all the time. The Constitution of the World Council of Churches states that 'oppression is the moral opposite of freedom. It is a hostile act which seeks to take away freedom by means of a system of power that is based on a false judgment of the right and wrong of individuals or groups.'

Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. George Carey.

"It is said that sexual freedom is a human right. But it is a right which must be exercised within the bounds of the law."

John Winter, B.D., vicar of St. Paul's Church, Greenford.
Time for the Church of England to re-affirm biblical morality

For years the General Synod of the Church of England has managed to sit on the fence over sexual morality in general and homosexuality in particular, however, I feel that I have greatly increased my personal popularity by putting up a private, personal action on the subject which requires a decision. Normally debated on these motions are locked into odd corners of the Synod's timetable. But at its first stage this one gained a large number of signatures which sent shock waves through the Establishment. Hence it is to be seriously discussed, with up to 18 hours allotted for it.

The motion favours ordination and homosexual practice are sinful in all circumstances and that Christian leaders are to be exemplary in sexual morality as a condition of being appointed to any ministry office. It also calls on the Church to show compassion to those who have fallen into these sins, offering forgiveness to the penitent and healing. With the motion's serious interest, it truly isn't on to avoid making a decision this time.

It would be seen as a spectacular failure by the Church, I have it via the gossip that some of the senior clergy think that either a Yes or a No vote would be a fiasco, but I am unable to say if this is the case. In any case, the Church will have to face the music and one of the bishops will have to be made to back down.

Tony Hilton on why the Synod should today pronounce homosexuality

"We must not be too quick to judge. The Bible teaches us that only God is judge of the holiness of the soul. Only the Lord can condemn the sinner, and no one else. The Bible clearly enjoins this practice. For example, in Romans 1, there is a list of moral abominations: "It is clear that those who engage in these practices will face God's judgment." In Second Corinthians 6:14-18, Paul exhorts believers to separate themselves from those who practice homosexual sin.

However, it is important to note that the Church has historically been divided on this issue. Some have supported condemnation, while others have advocated acceptance and pastoral care. In recent years, there has been a move towards greater acceptance and inclusion in many Anglican dioceses. This decision will have significant implications for future generations of Anglicans and will shape the Church's stance on issues of sexual orientation and gender identity.

The importance of this vote cannot be overstated. It is a critical moment for the Church of England, and it will determine the direction it will take in the years to come. As a Christian, I believe that this issue is deeply important, and I urge my fellow Christians to pray earnestly for wisdom and guidance as the Synod makes its decision.

I believe that the Church of England has an important role to play in society, and I hope that it will continue to be a force for good. However, this decision will have significant implications for the Church's ability to be a healing presence in the world, and I pray that it will be made with discernment and compassion.

Dr. John Stott
Plea to retailers on AIDS fight

BY RAYMOND SNODDY.

Ms ANITA RODDICK, managing director of the Body Shop, yesterday attacked some of her fellow retailers for failing to support the Virgin Healthcare Foundation, which plans to market inexpensive condoms and education for young people in the battle against AIDS.

Ms Roddick, a trustee of the foundation set up by Mr Richard Branson, chairman of the Virgin Group, said yesterday it had not been easy to persuade some retailers in areas such as fashion to stock Mates, the foundation's new condom.

Too many retailers, she said, had judged "profit lines and image more important than social responsibility." Marks and Spencer, for example, had said that sale of condoms was "not within their customer profile."

Ms Roddick said the aim of the campaign was to make condoms, particularly for the young people most at risk from AIDS, a completely unremarkable purchase.

Only three organisations had agreed to sell Mates condoms, priced on average at 15p compared with the current average price of 20p, without profit - Medicare, Virgin and the Body Shop.

A wide range of outlets, including more than 1,000 branches of Boots, Superdrug, W.H. Smith, Safeway and pubs, clubs, hotels and garages had agreed to stock Mates on a commercial basis.

The aim is to sell 70m condoms, manufactured by Ansell of the US, in the first year of the campaign. An estimated 120m-150m were sold last year in the UK and of that 96 per cent of the market is held by London International.

Mr John Jackson, chief executive of Mates Healthcare, the trading company set up by the foundation, believes Mates condoms will raise £3m in profit for its educational programme in the first year.

A £2m advertising campaign on television and the press will try to reduce the embarrassment in buying condoms. Although UK condom sales have risen by 20 per cent in the UK this year, that compares with a rise of 80 per cent in West Germany and 300 per cent in Japan.

Yet the British Medical Association estimates that by 1991 more than 100,000 people in Britain may be infected by HIV, the AIDS virus, and 10,000 will have died.
Phone service on AIDS today

By Mark-Bennock

A new telephone service giving information on AIDS begins operation in Dublin today. AIDS Helpline will provide callers with information on how to avoid the virus, and will also refer people in need of treatment for drug addiction or other problems to the relevant specialist services.

The service has been set up by "AIDS Action Alliance", an independent group set up to provide information and education about the disease. Among the organisations affiliated to this group are the Irish Association of Social Workers, the Union of Students in Ireland, the Well Woman Centre, Gay Health Action and trade unions.

The phone service will be staffed by 12 volunteers who have previously worked on telephone information services. It will operate initially on Sundays from 3 to 6 p.m., and on Mondays from 7 to 10 p.m. A spokeswoman for AIDS Action Alliance said yesterday that it would be the only "independent, non-directive, non-judgmental and unbiased" information service available. The telephone number is 397888.
CONFIDENTIAL AIDS

When doctors become patients they are entitled to patients' rights to confidentiality of condition and treatment. But a doctor's overriding duty is to his own patients. So what of doctors who have Aids? Is his right to confidentiality as a patient paramount? Or do his patients have a right to know of his condition. As the law stands, their patients have no right to know.

That has been established by a High Court judgment imposing a permanent injunction, which a fine, forbidding the publication of a News of the World report of two doctors with Aids continuing to treat patients. The case was brought against the newspaper by a regional health authority on the grounds that the information had been obtained by a breach of confidential records by a hospital employee. Mr Justice Rose's judgment was that public interest in the information, and the freedom of the press were "substantially outweighed" by confidentiality and loyalty generally and "with particular reference to Aids patients' hospital records".

Whatever the claims of confidentiality, it is doubtful whether the judge would have reached the same conclusion had he been convinced of a serious risk of the doctors passing on the illness to patients. The case seemed to turn on the majority medical opinion that the risk was not big — although a haematologist said in evidence that there was a serious risk to some patients from Aids carriers.

Sir Donald Acheson, the Government's chief medical officer, summarized the prevailing medical view when he said the risk was "slightly more than negligible". "Negligible" means some risk but one so slight as to be disregarded. "Slightly more than negligible" can fairly be taken to mean a very small risk which cannot be disregarded entirely. If so, is it a risk that patients would willingly take if they were aware of it?

Sir Donald conceded there was some risk by agreeing with the British Medical Association that major operations should not be performed by Aids-infected surgeons because the disease is blood-borne, or passed on by other body fluids, and not "air-borne" as most infectious conditions are.

The disease which perhaps compares most closely with Aids, in the sense that it too is blood-borne, is hepatitis B. Here the official guidance, issued in 1981, is that NHS staff found to be carriers should not be barred from work, but should have expert advice about how to avoid passing it on by using gloves and various other hygienic procedures.

The ultimate protection is the doctor's ethical obligation not to expose the patient to harm. Only if it is found that a surgeon has passed an infection on during his work is it recommended that he should stop surgery. For one patient at least, it is by then too late. With many diseases that does not so much matter. But Aids is irreversible and fatal. The resolution passed at the British Medical Association's conference, to allow doctors to test their patients for Aids without their consent, showed the doctors' concern about the risk to themselves. This was overruled by the BMA leaders on the grounds that it would breach the doctrine of the patient's "implied consent" to normal medical tests when that patient routinely consults a doctor. The same kind of misplaced sensitivity is being shown now.

Probably few patients would feel comfortable with the idea of being treated by a doctor, dentist or nurse with Aids. Their misgivings are rebutted by medical opinion. But patients know that medical opinions change, that little is known about this disease, that what is orthodoxy to one generation of doctors can be error to the next. They know enough to have a reasonable wish not to have any sort of internal treatment by a doctor who might suffer from the disease and who might happen to have a cut hand. Sir Gerard Vaughan, the former Conservative Minister for Health, said yesterday that he would not like to have any wound of his dressed by a doctor with Aids.

The risk may be very small. But in so grave a matter the patient ought to have the information with which to make up his own mind. The Government and the medical profession should discuss what patients' rights should now be. They should certainly not be secondary to a theoretical concern not to seem prejudiced.
Branson joins Aids fight with Mates

By Thomson Prentice, Science Correspondent

Mr Richard Branson, chairman of the Virgin group, launched an £8 million campaign yesterday to promote condoms everywhere from supermarkets to youth clubs as part of the fight against Aids.

A series of television commercials for the group’s brand of condoms, Mates, began on independent television last night.

They are to be adapted by the BBC as public information announcements, without using the brand name.

"It isn’t for television to take one moral view or another but we do have an obligation to play a role in public health education."

"The most effective way of helping to stop the spread of the disease is through the use of condoms."

Mr Branson moved into the condom market after the Government rejected his suggestion this year that the male sheath should be distributed freely as an anti-Aids measure.

"The single most important health care issue we face is Aids."

Mr Branson said: "All the Virgin group’s profits from condom sales will go to the Virgin Healthcare Foundation, set up by Mr Branson to raise £5 million within the next year for Aids educational projects."

"The condoms will be supplied by supermarkets, record stores and in vending machines in public houses, clubs, colleges and sports centres."
Branson unveils £5m drive urging use of condoms

RICHARD BRANSON recruited showbusiness stars, medical experts and industrial leaders yesterday to launch Mates, the competitively-priced condoms which he hopes will help stop the spread of Aids.

At a Press conference in London, Mr Branson, head of the Virgin entertainment group, unveiled a £5m, 12-month publicity and marketing campaign to try to destroy the stigma surrounding the use of condoms. He said: "Wearing a condom is like giving up sugar in your tea: you won't like it for a few days but after that you won't notice the difference. The distinction is that it could save your life."

The British Medical Association estimates that by 1991, 10,000 people will have died from Aids in the UK, with about 100,000 being identified as carriers of the virus.

Mr Branson, 37, who has two young children, disclosed that he has pledged £5m of his own money to underwrite the project.

The publicity campaign, aimed specifically at the young, but also at all sexually active age groups, will entail the distribution of educational video films for sixth-formers and also a series of six one-minute television commercials to be broadcast on both BBC and ITV, starting last night.

Sales of 30 million Mates condoms started yesterday, not only at chemists but also at a wide variety of stores, clubs, newsagents, grocery shops, student unions and hotels, over the counter and from a new batch of 30,000 vending machines around the UK. The project is being run by a new charity, the Virgin Healthcare Foundation. Mr Branson emphasised that it would channel 100 per cent of any profits directly back to its Aids education programme and other health-related charities.

The four trustees of the foundation are to be Mr Branson, its founder; Michael Grade, the BBC's director of television programmes; John Jackson, former chairman of the cosmetics company Cheseborough-Pond's, and Anita Roddick, founder and managing director of the Body Shop beauty care chain.

The foundation's 25 patrons include Professor Roy Anderson, epidemiologist at the Imperial College of Science and Technology, London; Dr Alan Maryon Davis, senior medical adviser at the Health Education Authority, and Dr Peter Emerson, formerly Dean of Westminster Medical School.

Sir Ralph Halpern, chairman of the Burton Group, Simon Hornby, chairman of W.H. Smith & Son, and the journalists Penny Junor and Claire Rayner, are also patrons.

Eloise John, Peter Gabriel, Genesis, Phil Collins, Roger Taylor of Queen, Feargal Sharkey, Sandie Shaw, Lulu and the composer Andrew Lloyd Webber have all agreed to become patrons.

Other celebrities expressing support for the project include Roger Waters, of Pink Floyd, and Mick Jagger.
Synod urges fidelity as best way to fight AIDS

From Robert Nowell
"The only safe way of preventing the spread of this disease in our society is through fidelity," the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Robert Runcie, told the Church of England General Synod yesterday when it debated AIDS and the Church's response to this threat.

At the conclusion of the debate, the synod welcomed the concern reflected in Government initiatives and urged all members of the Church of England to respond with compassion and understanding to all those affected by AIDS. It also affirmed the Church's traditional teaching on chastity and fidelity in personal relationships, but what precisely this means was left to today's debate on a private members motion from the Rev. Tony Higton calling on the synod to reaffirm the biblical standard that "fornication, adultery and homosexual acts are sinful in all circumstances."

Introducing the debate, the Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. John Yates, said the Church was called to emphasise as strongly and loudly and often as it could that adherence to the Church's teaching on chastity and fidelity would halt the spread of AIDS through sexual intercourse. "The challenge to the Churches is to find ways of doing that positively and attractively, rather than negatively and judgmentally," he added.

Dr. Runcie stressed that the price of divorcing the physical pleasure of sex from its moral commitment was "very high". "If you try to live on a limited liability basis, you limit your ability to love at all" he said.

Hence the Church upheld the idea of Christian marriage, lifelong, exclusive and faithful, as the only setting in which human sexuality could be responsibly and fully enjoyed.

Our business is not to frighten people into good behaviour but to enable them to see human beings, both themselves and others, as children of God whose bodies are sacred, not disposable sex aids, and whose happiness lies in the sharing of a whole life, not in mere encounters in bed.

Earlier, the archbishop warned against a witch-hunt. "One of the first things human beings do when they are frightened is always to look for someone to blame," he said. He thought this was based on bad theology. Disease was no respecter of virtue, and Christians must have better ways of dealing with fear.

A lay member of the synod, Mr. Timothy Royle, from the Gloucester diocese, offered a foretaste of today's debate when he described AIDS as a manifestation of the misuse of the human body and stressed that homosexual acts were contrary to nature. He claimed that AIDS had been brought about by the practice in Africa of indulging in both vaginal and anal intercourse.

THE British millionaire, Mr. Richard Branson, and Mr. Bob Geldof, who yesterday launched a £5 million campaign to promote the use of condoms to combat AIDS.

They started a drive for a range of condoms called "Matex", in the hope that greater use of the contraceptive will help stop the spread of the disease.

The British Medical Association estimates that by 1991 some 10,000 people in the UK will have died from AIDS, with around 100,000 being identified as carriers of the virus.

The number of those affected is said to be doubling every 10 months, with 624 already dead.

The World Health Organisation predicts that 50 million people will be infected within the next five years. — (PA wirepicture).
Church of England Leaders clash over debate on homosexuality

AIDS Protesters

The Church is to face homosexuals with compassion rather than confrontation.

Yesterday a group of AIDS protesters held its first demonstration at Church House, London, with the slogan "AIDS ACTION NOW!". The protesters, who call themselves "Project AIDS", handed out leaflets to passers-by and distributed a leaflet which read: "AIDS IS NOT AN EPIDEMIC - IT'S A MOVE TO STOP A DEBATE ON GAY CLEIRGY BID"

Syndr rejecls
AIDS plea by Runcie

The AIDS crisis should not be turned into a witch-hunt, but into a challenge to stop people using their bodies as "disposable sex aids", the Archbishop of Canterbury said yesterday.

Dr. Robert Runcie was speaking during the first of two major sex-related debates at the Church of England General Synod at Westminster.

The Synod unanimously backed a motion on AIDS which affirmed the church's traditional teaching "on chastity and fidelity in personal relationships", but urged all church members to respond with compassion and understanding to those affected by the disease.

It welcomed the concern reflected in AIDS initiatives by the government and other bodies and agreed there should be continuing advice within the Church on the theological, moral and pastoral issues involved.

Dr. Runcie said yesterday: "Our business is not to frighten people into good behaviour, but to enable them to see human beings, both themselves and others, as children of God whose bodies are sacred, not disposable sex aids, and whose happiness lies in the sharing of a whole life, not in mere encounters in bed".

AIDS created fear and one of the first things people did when they were frightened was to look for someone to blame, said Dr. Runcie.
Gays, the clergy, and the Church's duty to the nation

by Paul Johnson

The truth is that the bishops are terrified of being thought redundant. They are too scared of the threat of the far more serious accusations of negating their moral duty. They prefer the advocacy of Mr. Thatcher's Christian values to the liberal-progressive media. This selective curiosity has done a great deal to construct the image of the Church.

Obnoxious

The British people are appalled by the persecution of gays. The Metropolitan Synod of the Church of England is now considering the possibility of introducing a resolution which would make it legally impossible for the Church to condone or support the persecution of gays. The resolutions would be presented to the 1988 Synod in the House of Bishops. This has been called a "serious error" by the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is clear that the Church of England is becoming more permissive in its attitude to homosexuality.

The Church has become more permissive in its attitudes towards sexual minorities, and this has been welcomed by many. However, there is still a great deal of work to be done. The Church should be seen as a beacon of hope and understanding for all those who feel excluded and rejected by society.
Synod damns Aids witch-hunters

By Walter Schwarz
Religious Affairs
Correspondent

"The right response to Aids victims is compassion and help, the Church of England decided yesterday when the general synod overwhelmingly approved a report which said the disease could not be seen as God's judgment."

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, said: "A characteristic symptom of a plague throughout history is a witch-hunt; I believe we have seen something of this with the Aids plague. I believe it is based on bad theology."

He was referring to the traditionalists who wanted homosexual acts to be condemned and blamed for the spread of Aids. Some of these distributed leaflets outside Church House as the tense debate began.

An officially-supported motion approved by the synod urged all Church members to "respond with compassion and understanding to all those affected by Aids."

The result was a victory for liberal attitudes, and for skillful synod management which kept the Aids issue and the homosexuality issue apart.

Members who wanted more robust condemnation of what one called the sleep-around society won only one amendment to the motion.

The amendment withdrew the Church's proposed welcome for the Government's Aids campaign, saying only that it welcomed "the concern reflected."

Moving this amendment, the Rev Gavin Reid of Guildford who objected to the Government's slogan said: "History may show that the development of a sleep-around society has done more harm morally and psychologically than Aids has done physically."

The moralisers will have their main chance today when their champion, the Rev Tony Higon of Essex, will move a motion condemning licentiousness in general and homosexuality in particular.

The debate began tensely as a member proposed scrapping today's discussion on Mr Higon's motion because the debate would be "damaging to the whole Church" after press publicity on homosexuals in the Church. Other members thought Mr Higon's motion on morality should logically be debated before the Aids issue. But the Bishop of Gloucester, the Rt Rev John Yates, moving the official motion on Aids, said the Church should give out a clear signal of reassurance, support and hope in the context of Aids.

An amendment seeking to reaffirm Church teachings on chastity in the context of Aids received only a handful of votes.

Dr Runcie, who has expressed sympathy for stable homosexual relationships, said that "even if we think people have brought their troubles on their own heads, to say 'I told you so, you should never have got yourself in this mess' is about as far from Christianity as any utterance could be."

He added: "For more outspoken recognition of homosexual relationships was made by the Rev Johnson of St Botolph's Church, Aldgate, where the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement is based. Mr Johnson said: "If we want to avoid promiscuity, one vitally important way is to encourage gay people to make deep, long-lasting friendships — not out of fear but out of love."

Aids sufferers' feelings of alienation was "the fault of society, not the disease," he said. "Many of us believe the Church to be largely responsible for society's present views. God forgive us for that."

Leader comment, page 14; Pictures, page 7 and back.

Two thoughts for the Synod

It has never seemed to us that the leader column of a newspaper is the natural channel for detailed pronouncements on moral theology. The General Synod of the Church of England, however, is itself a secular institution which does not encode decisions, taken by majority vote, about what is theologically sound and what is not. Its decisions create a climate of opinion and redound through the rest of the secular world. Today the Synod is asked to decide, in effect, whether it is possible to be both a homosexual and a Christian. The Rev Tony Higon believes it is not and in particular that homosexuals should not be admitted to the priesthood. He said on the Radio 4 programme, Sunday, that in an extreme case where persuasion failed, he would have to refuse a homosexual the sacraments. This opinion will no doubt be wholeheartedly endorsed by a majority of those political and other leaders of public opinion who call on the churches to give moral leadership because they assume before asking that they know the direction the leadership will take. In our untutored view it would be healthy for the Synod to spring a surprise.

Two points need briefly to be made in support of that hope. One is that every individual should be free to seek, though not at others' expense, whatever fulfillment is possible within the limits of his or her predetermined nature. Thus the Church of England's Board of Social Responsibility, discussing homosexuality eight years ago, said: "There are circumstances in which individuals may justifyly choose to enter into a homosexual relationship with the hope of enjoying a companionship and physical expression of sexual love similar to that found in marriage." It balanced this finding (for it was, after all, a committee) by warning against a collapse into hollowness in which the "permanence and exclusiveness" of sexual relations became questions of mere passing convenience. In today's cultural terms — it is hard to speak in specific determinants — the Board seemed to have thought that it was only well. Secondly Jesus, though slow to condemn individuals, was quick to condemn those who would undertake the condemnation for him. ("Let him who is without sin cast the first stone") Gethsemane. John Bowker, Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Mr Higon's most prominent opponent, says that this is as in other controversies much of the Church's thinking, delineated by St Paul, was socially conditioned. He cites evidence for homosexual unions in the early Christian church which were elaborately and publicly blessed. Only his peers can weigh that evidence. But falsity of the modern Pauline dispensation can remember that the greatest of gifts is charity.
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Church to rule on ‘gay’ clergy
By Clifford Longley
Religious Affairs Correspondent

The General Synod meets today to decide whether to resolve homosexuality in the Church of England, being held for the first time an official discussion that homosexuality was not an issue considered a bar to ordination.

That came after a set piece debate in Aids, which was forwarded away from making any moral judgment on homosexuals, before today's decision.

The diocese will strengthen its hand of tolerance by including a new article for a clear ruling that practising homosexuals are unqualified for ordination, or asylum in the church.

In the following debate, the other was expressed as a resolution of the annual report of the Advisory Council for the Church Missionary Society. The Gossip was asked whether it was correct, as claimed in the Church Times, that the report did not make implications as conditions for ordination.

The chairman of the council, the Bishop of Bristol, the

Synod debate

Sr Rev Barry Rogers, challenged the word "promiscuous," attributed to Canon Timothy Pagett, secretary of the council, in the article.

The key aspect for debate today, was on the appeal to observe that "heterosexuality, and homophobia and heterophobia are equal in all situations."

"It is not the leaders are required to be exemplary in all aspects, or morally," as a condition of appointments.

The debate on Aids, which preceded the debate between Canon Ash and the Bishop of Bristol was sparked by a different ambiguity over the Church's attitude.

As one point, an amendment was moved referring to "heterosexuality, and homophobia and heterophobia are equal in all situations."

The Bishop of Bristol was asked whether the report corresponded with suggestions to the Archbishop of Canterbury's emphasis on faithfulness and fidelity in the Church's response to Aids.

Faithfulness was the true way of preventing the spread of the disease, the Bishop argued. If Aids is the physical pleasure of sex can be divorced from its moral commitment. If you try to love on a limited fidelity basis, you limit your ability to love at all.

Yesterday's debate was on a report and resolution which urged all members of the Church of England to observe "with compassion and understanding" to 2: those affected by Aids, to those affected by mental health problems, and to people with sexual or marital circumstances with the Church's approval.
No sex, please... we're Christians.
GENERAL SYNOD

Plea on compassion for Aids victims

A motion urging all members of the Church of England to work in a more united manner with compassion and cooperation with those directly and indirectly affected by the disease, was carried unopposed last week by the General Synod of the Church of England at York Minster.

The motion was moved by the Bishop of Norwich, the Rt Revd Theodora Barlow, and seconded by the Bishop of London, the Rt Revd John Sentamu. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, with eight other bishops taking their seats for the first time in the House of Bishops of the General Synod, expressed the view that "we need to find ways of combating the disease that are compassionate and caring, and that will help those suffering from Aids.

The Bishop of Norwich began his speech by saying that the church's traditional teaching of charity and hospitality in preparation for the coming of the Messiah could help people suffering from Aids. "We need to be working with the poor and the vulnerable, with the sick and the dying, with the homeless and the helpless, in the sharing of a whole life, free, to consider ways in which the church can help and support the work of those who are working for the alleviation of poverty and suffering, whatever the cause, in the name of Christ," he said.

The Bishop of London added that the church's tradition of hospitality should be both a means of supporting those who are sick and a means of providing a place of welcome and support for those who are suffering. "We must not be afraid to speak out against the unjust discrimination and poverty that contribute to the spread of the disease," he said.

The Archbishop of Canterbury echoed these sentiments, saying that "we need to find ways of combating the disease that are compassionate and caring, and that will help those suffering from Aids."

The Archdeacon of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, with eight other bishops taking their seats for the first time in the House of Bishops of the General Synod, expressed the view that "we need to find ways of combating the disease that are compassionate and caring, and that will help those suffering from Aids.

The motion was carried unopposed, and the church was urged to work together in a more united manner with compassion and cooperation with those directly and indirectly affected by the disease.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, with eight other bishops taking their seats for the first time in the House of Bishops of the General Synod, expressed the view that "we need to find ways of combating the disease that are compassionate and caring, and that will help those suffering from Aids."

The Archdeacon of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, with eight other bishops taking their seats for the first time in the House of Bishops of the General Synod, expressed the view that "we need to find ways of combating the disease that are compassionate and caring, and that will help those suffering from Aids."

The motion was carried unopposed, and the church was urged to work together in a more united manner with compassion and cooperation with those directly and indirectly affected by the disease.
Runcie defines Christian ‘safe sex’

By Andrew Brown

Religious Affairs Correspondent

The Church of England’s General Synod yesterday defined ‘safe sex’ as any form of sexual activity that is considered an act of love and commitment by all partners involved. The definition was reached after a heated debate over the issue of sex and marriage, with some bishops expressing concerns about the impact of modern sexual practices on the integrity of the church.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams, said the definition was an attempt to reflect the diversity of sexual practices within the church while maintaining the moral standards of traditional marriage. He added that the definition was not intended to promote any particular lifestyle but to ensure that the church remained relevant in a changing society.

The definition was welcomed by some members of the Synod, who said it was a step towards a more inclusive and accepting church. However, others expressed concerns about the potential impact on the moral teachings of the church, with some calling for a more explicit statement on the traditional values of marriage and sex.

The definition was based on the principle that all forms of sexual activity should be conducted in a context of mutual consent and respect, and that any activities that cause harm or exploitation should be avoided. The definition was seen as a way of affirming the church’s commitment to the principles of love and commitment, while recognizing the complexity and diversity of sexual practices within society.

The definition was supported by a majority of the Synod, with only a small number of bishops expressing reservations about the definition. The Archbishop of Canterbury said the definition was an attempt to reflect the changing nature of society and to ensure that the church remained relevant to the needs of its members.
Warning against AIDS witch-hunt

11 November 1987

Cork Examiner
Why doctors with Aids are a danger

by Dr Thomas Stuttaford

Press reports of Mr Justice Rose's judgment in X v Y, in which he decided that doctors who suffer from Aids should be allowed to practise, suggest that the court will dwell on the problems of whether the HIV virus could be transmitted via an infected doctor's blood to an unsuspecting patient and the very obvious possible hazards of internal examination.

However, the reports suggest that the court missed perhaps the most important point of all: that the Aids virus has a predilection for attacking the brain, 60 per cent of Aids cases have symptoms of dementia when the disease is first diagnosed. This raises the question whether the opinion of a doctor suffering from Aids is likely to do justice to himself, his profession and the patient.

In most doctors' view the danger of someone with a degree of dementia practising is a greater risk to the community than the possibility that he might transmit the HIV virus to an individual patient, catastrophic as this would be. It seems inconsistent for the BMA and the General Medical Council to set up an elaborate system to prevent a doctor suffering from alcoholism from practising, presumably because his judgement is unreliable, but to take no similar steps to prevent those doctors who catch a disease of which dementia forms such a prominent part from taking life and death decisions.

Mr Justice Rose's judgment shows that he has a touching faith in the powers of counselling, but if he met patients who continue to catch NSU (non-specific urethritis) and gonorrhoea when HIV positive, his reliance on it would be shaken. The apparent assumption that doctors would not behave as other men is flattering but misplaced, and nobody could rely on adequate standards of practice and hygiene once a doctor became demented.

There are differences between senile dementia - the hazards of which officialdom is trying to reduce by encouraging early retirement - and of alcoholic dementia and the dementia of Aids, but on the whole it seems to be less dangerous to be treated by an elderly doctor, or one who drinks too much, than by one suffering from Aids dementia.

Alcoholics are usually aware when they have drunk too much, but even if a drunken doctor is called to deal with an emergency, patients and relatives notice it and react accordingly. A doctor with Aids will show no outward easily recognizable sign. The patient he is treating will not realize that the opinion he is being offered is flawed and will therefore take no steps to ameliorate the danger.

The present teaching seems to be based on the belief that once an Aids patient has dementia he will die fairly rapidly and therefore, if there was any danger, it would be for only a short time; but research in America suggests that changes occur in an Aids patient's intellect before it is readily noticed either by the patient or other people. Judgement is therefore impaired before signs of dementia are apparent.

Doctors, whether in general or hospital practice, are not dealing with people with normal resistance to infection, but with patients whose resistance has already been lowered by disease, injury, blood loss or the stress associated with psychiatric disease. And, by the very nature of their work, they spend a disproportionate amount of time with the very old and the very young, groups particularly vulnerable to infection.

As to whether the immune system of a doctor with Aids would have been compromised, he/she is likely to have fallen prey to a wide variety of diseases. TB is common in Aids patients, as is thrush, cyto-megalovirus, one of the viruses which can damage the unborn child, and perhaps most common of all, a wide variety of gastro-intestinal infections which, as they cause diarrhoea might easily spread.

A doctor who is obsessively clean and exceedingly careful might be safe working with patients while suffering from these conditions, but it is extremely unlikely that a doctor in other circumstances would want to continue to practise if he or she realized there was a risk, however small, of giving a newborn baby or a frail elderly patient gastro-enteritis, or worse. Once his judgement, and with it the will to maintain meticulous levels of cleanliness, have been undermined by dementia, a doctor with Aids would be unlikely to continue to maintain standards necessary to protect the patient.

Doctors exist for patients, not patients for doctors. Many doctors therefore question if it is ethically right for any patient anywhere to be put at risk, however small the risk might be, to boost the morale of a sick doctor, however much sympathy is felt for him. Physicians working in general medicine are unlikely to have chosen their branch of the profession unless they had even more tolerance and sympathy for human frailty than that found in most doctors. These qualities may make them good vaneeraphes, but not necessarily the ideal advisers for politicians, the Civil Service, or even High Court judges, who are expected to maintain public health standards.

Two years ago a minister with Aids retired after confused performances at question time. Is the Department of Health expecting lower standards from doctors than politicians?
The General Synod

Move to oust gay Christians fails

Clergy behaviour was a matter "best left to their fathers in God within the present terms of the law", the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, declared yesterday as the General Synod of the Church of England rejected a move to cast out homosexuals.

He said criticism might be right in thinking the Church had been "too silent about the sin" in their efforts not to turn away sinners.

"We can only plead that Jesus incurred criticism on just the same grounds. I believe we should try to follow his example however difficult it may be — and, as we learn from St Paul, we know that we are in no position to cast stones."

Church House was packed, with almost all the Synod's 554 members present for debate on the Rev Tony Higton's motion stating "fornication, adultery and homosexual acts" to be sinful in all circumstances. It called for Christian leaders to be "exemplary in morality, including sexual morality" as a condition of office.

"Scripture describes all homosexual acts as evil, as does the Bible" and the Church must adopt a firm line, Mr Higton told a minority who wanted to encourage homosexuals to shun promiscuity and form "good, godly personal relationships," he said.

But both Dr Runcie and The Bishop of London, the Rt Rev Graham Leonard, warned against the judgemenental nature of Mr Higton's motion and after a three-hour debate the Synod compromised on an amendment proclaiming only that fornication, adultery and homosexual genital acts "fall short of the ideal of sexual intercourse as an act of total commitment in marriage."

Passed by 308 votes to 19, the amendment was moved by The Bishop of Chester, the Rt Rev Michael Baughen, who said many genuine homosexuals orientated people did live for the Lord without genital acts, often with great courage. They gave much love and support to the Church's life.

But the bishop's amendment made no reference to discipline, and an attempt by the Rev David Holloway to introduce it resulted in the closest vote of the debate and split between liberals and churchmen. Mr Holloway wanted to add: "That if a bishop, priest or

By Stephen Goodwin

motion's hidden agenda was to "finally knock homosexuals into the gutter". It again heaped abuse on a minority group who had suffered enough at the Church's hands.

Mr Johnson of St Batholph, Aldgate, London, where the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement has its office, asked: "Why cannot we accept the fact that homosexuals will by their nature want to form sexual relationships and will need positive guidance from us as they do?"

Dr Runcie, supporting the bishop of Chester's amendment, told the Synod he could not accept the extreme claims that homosexual unions were simply alternative lifestyles to Christian marriage.

"I do not deny, and cannot, that homosexual acts are condemned in the biblical and Christian tradition. It is our duty to teach the Christian idea to our children and not to confuse them with options."

"But while there are both homosexual and heterosexual people whose conduct is undisciplined, self-centred, and out of control, questions arise over our response to homosexuals who are seeking to behave responsibly towards others, people who are not sleeping around, not molesting children, not breaking up other people's marriages and friendships."

"In the face of much cruel prejudice I want to insist that to be homosexual by nature is to be a full human being," Dr Runcie said. They ought to listen to what homosexuals said about their situation. Nothing would be solved by the Church of England being "railroaded" down this or that lobby route.

The Bishop of Chester said he hoped his amendment would provide the Synod with a way of affirming Biblical and traditional principles.

The Synod adjourned after amendments tabled by "The Synod affirms that the Biblical and traditional teaching on morality and fidelity in personal relationships is a response to, and expression of, God's law for each of us, and in particular affirms\n
1. That sexual intercourse is an act of sexual communion, which belongs properly within a permanent married relationship.
2. That frankness and integrity are at the heart of this idea, and the absence of corruption and the absence of compromise.
3. That homosexual genital acts are forbidden by this history and are, likewise, to be not only cut out but the exercise of companionship.
4. That all Christians are called to be exemplary in all spheres of morality, including sexual morality, and that bishops of the Church of England are particularly exhorted to emulate Christian leaders."

Passed by 308 votes to 19, the amendment was moved by The Bishop of Chester, the Rt Rev Michael Baughen, who said many genuine homosexuals orientated people did live for the Lord without genital acts, often with great courage. They gave much love and support to the Church's life.

But the bishop's amendment made no reference to discipline, and an attempt by the Rev David Holloway to introduce it resulted in the closest vote of the debate and split between liberals and churchmen. Mr Holloway wanted to add: "That if a bishop, priest or..."
Church of England rules homosexuality sinful but won’t throw out the sinners

SCANDAL OF GAY VICARS

By Steve Doig, Home Affairs Correspondent

The Church of England, faced with evidence from one of its own ministers about increasing ‘gay’ activity among clergy, ruled yesterday that homosexuality is sinful.

But it refused to expel any of the ‘priesthood who indulge in that sin.

This classic fudge, after an intense debate at the General Synod, the Church’s Parliament, left both gay and anti-gay groups claiming victory over an issue which is increasingly splitting the Anglican movement.

The sensation of the debate was a dossier of evidence produced by the Rev. Dr. Gagan, the Rev. Rodolfo, the Rev. John who brought the issue before the Synod. He said homosexuality was widespread among Church of England clergy and must be driven out, and he said:

‘Rumours circulated because we sing in our Anglican theological college that students from another college were instructed by staff to visit. At one point, a student, student was instructed by different people. At another college, a student member: the reports of a professor were called in by a colleague.

A reverend who was a doctor homosezual used his church for the sake of convention, public. Bacon, gay and lesbian. We ask for the sack of the buildings and the śwież of the synod in the church’s lecture series. We call on the synod for a decision. We have been appointed in another place.

Condemned

One priest pursued a layman who was suspected of activities and violent with another and who said it in his words to female of his story.

Another priest was accused of acting with a layman at a Sunday school. He was asked in a new college and convicted of a false statement, but escaped with a warning.

The story of a young Church was told: its great discovery was the great discovery of homophobia.

Turn to Page 2, Col. 6
Gay parsons are given reprieve

A RECTOR’S call to oust practicing homosexuals from the clergy was rejected decisively by the Church of England general synod yesterday, when they voted for a bishop’s amendment to the wording.

The complex series of votes came at the end of a three-hour debate on the sexual morality issue, concentrating mainly on reported growing numbers of homosexuals among the clergy.

The scale of the vote — 388 to 174 — in favour of the amendment by the Bishop of Chester, Right Rev. Michael Baughen — surprised many observers at the synod, who had expected a more bitter and divisive debate.

"Many of us expected the gay lobby within the church — after all, they have claimed that one in three clergymen is now homosexual — would have been able to attract more votes," said one.

The original motion from Rev. Tony Higton of Essex, called for a return to Biblical standard of sexual morality, with sex only permissible between man and wife.

Pornography, adultery and homosexual acts were sinful in all circumstances, and clergymen's jobs should be conditional on upholding exemplary morality, his motion declared.

The synod voted for this motion by 403 to 3, with 13 abstentions, but that was after it had been effectively rewritten by the successful amendment from the Bishop of Chester.

The Bishop had talked of "chastity and fidelity in personal relationships", adding that sexual intercourse was an act "of total commitment which belongs properly within a permanent married relationship".

His further affirmation "that homosexual genital acts also fell short of this ideal", was amended by an addition successfully moved by Rev. P. R. Forster, of Durham and Newcastle Universities, saying: "such acts "are likewise to be met by a call to repentance and the exercise of compassion."
Synod condemns homosexual acts but not homosexuals

From Robert Nowell, in London

The Church of England’s General Synod yesterday voted decisively in condemnation of homosexual activities. It avoided both the censorious rigour of the original motion put forward by the Rev Tony Higton, Rector of Hawkhurst, Essex, and the permissiveness of an amendment defecting the views of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement, which found only 46 votes in its favour and 325 against.

By 388 to 19, it adopted the amendment put forward by the Bishop of Chester, Dr Michael Baughen, and when this was voted on as the substantive motion, it was passed by 463 votes to eight with 13 abstentions.

The synod thus affirms that the Biblical and traditional teachings on chastity and fidelity in personal relationships was a response to, and expression of, God’s love for each one of us; that “sexual intercourse is an act of total commitment which belongs properly within a permanent married relationship;” that fornication and adultery were sins against this ideal, to be met by a call to repentance and the exercise of compassion; and that homosexual genital acts also fell short of this ideal and were to be dealt with in the same way.

But the synod did not see itself as sanctioning any kind of witch-hunt, even though the immediate reaction of members of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement was to see its vote as providing theological justification for “queer-bashing.” Indeed, Mr Higton himself, repudiated any such idea and said he was against the rejection or persecution of anyone. What he wanted was Godly discipline which upheld the teaching of scripture.

The synod, however, was not so keen on such Godly discipline being spelled out. An amendment from Dr Baughen’s ally, the Rev David Holloway, would have called for “appropriate discipline” among the clergy in cases of sexual immorality. But this was narrowly defeated, with a majority of the bishops and clergy against it and only a majority of the laity supporting it.

The Bishop of Chester stated that, biologically, homosexual genital acts were always a lie, a deception, but went on to show his sympathy for homosexuals. “While having no sympathy whatsoever with the flagrant promotion of homosexual lifestyles, which draws many into its activities who are not oriented that way,” he said, “we must recognise the enormous pressures of sexual urges in those who are genuinely and strongly homosexually orientated, not by their own action.

“They cannot choose marriage or to sin in adultery. If they ‘burn’ as St Paul puts it, they cannot marry.” But Dr Baughen emphasised that, in the light of the New Testament call to holiness, “heterosexual promiscuity or the promotion of homosexual genital acts and even so-called homosexual marriages are not only a worldly falling short, but contrary to and incompatible with the grace and holiness of God.”

By contrast, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Robert Runcie, seemed to take a gentler line. He could not accept the extreme claim that homosexual unions were simply alternative lifestyles to Christian marriage. “But,” he said, “while there are both homosexual and heterosexual people whose conduct is undisciplined, self-centred and out of control, questions arise over our response to homosexuals who are seeking to behave responsibly towards other people, who are not sleeping around, not molesting children, not breaking up other people’s marriages and friendships.

“In the face of much cruel prejudice, I want to insist that to be homosexual by nature is to be a full human being, that they have human rights like the rest of us. We need to listen to what such homosexuals say about their situation.”
Compromise on homosexual clergy

By Andrew Brown, Religious Affairs Correspondent

at the end of each speech as fast as other Synod members started to applaud, must have had on many members innocent of these practices the same repellent effect as the propaganda of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement earlier.

Mr Holloway denounced the "web of suspicion and rumour" which had led to "charges of homosexual mafia" in the church "even in high places". In case we had failed to get the message about this web of suspicion and rumour, he went on to say that "too many of us have first-hand knowledge of what is being alleged".

Those who listened to his speech could only gain second-hand knowledge; he alleged, for instance, that there exists an Anglican training college where candidates for ordination are interviewed with their wives, girlfriends, or boyfriends, according to taste. He said he knew of a large comprehensive in which the sixth form had been lectured on gender by a homosexual who announced he was living with an Anglican priest whose bishop fully approved of their relationship.

Mr Elgington offered our imaginations the spectacle of a theological college, so spectacularly sodematic that students from other colleges were forbidden to visit for fear of being propositioned two or three times a day. The bishops seemed to remain unmoved by such stories. But if even half are true there cannot be a bishop in the church who is not aware of the existence of homosexual clergy and who has not had to deal with the resulting problems. They tend to believe that they deal with them pretty well as things are.

The real flight of the day was over Mr Holloway's amendment to the Bishop of Chester's amendment, which exhorted bishops to discipline appropriately the affected clergy. This suggested objective or public criteria by which "appropriate discipline" might be judged, and was clearly unacceptable to the bishops, most of whom voted against it. But a considerable number, among them both archbishops and the Bishops of Oxford and Durham, abstained.

Synod report, page 6
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Needles for AIDS

ACUPUNCTURE has proven effective in treating AIDS sufferers, a US doctor told an international seminar in Beijing on natural medicine, the New China News Agency reported. Dr Mike Smith was quoted as saying that acupuncture provided long-term prevention and protection from AIDS and lowered the incidence of relapses. — (AFP)
Moderate homosexuality motion wins big majority

By John French

The General Synod of the Church of England debated the question of homosexuality with the result of a 70-40 majority on the motion. The Synod was meeting for the first time since the appointment of the new Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Rev. George Carey, and the first time since the appointment of a young woman as a diocesan bishop.

The motion was introduced by Dr. Richard Chartres, the Bishop of London, and it was supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Rev. John Sentamu, and the Bishop of Manchester, the Most Rev. Dr. James Jones.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his opening address, said that the Church of England should be a place where all people feel welcome and valued. He said that the Church should not be afraid of change and that it should be open to new ideas and ways of thinking.

Dr. Chartres, in his speech, said that the Church should be open to all people and that it should not discriminate against anyone. He said that the Church should be a place where people of all sexual orientations feel welcome.

The Bishop of Manchester, in his speech, said that the Church should be a place where people of all sexual orientations feel welcome and that it should not discriminate against anyone.

The Bishop of London, in his speech, said that the Church should be a place where people of all sexual orientations feel welcome and that it should not discriminate against anyone.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his closing address, said that the Church should be open to all people and that it should not discriminate against anyone. He said that the Church should be a place where people of all sexual orientations feel welcome.

The motion was passed by a large majority and was welcomed by the Church of England.
Synod takes soft line on gays

BY Walter Smyth, Religious Affairs Correspondent

The Church of England's provincial body has taken a soft line on homosexuals, saying that the Church should not discriminate against them in its activities.

The General Synod, which is made up of bishops and representatives from each diocese, voted to endorse the statement by the Bishop of Chester, who said that the Church should not discriminate against homosexuals in its activities, including sexual activity, and that the Church should not be made to discriminate against them.

The Bishop of Chester, who is also a member of the Synod, said that the Church should be seen as a place where all are welcome, regardless of sexual orientation.

The Synod took a similar line when it came to the use of the Church's buildings for religious services, saying that the Church should not discriminate against homosexuals in its activities.

Bishop's statement, page 8

My personal (and personal) statement is that we should not discriminate against homosexuals in any way, shape, or form.

Bishops are told to be sensitive in all matters of sexuality, including sexual morality, and that the Church should not be made to discriminate against them.

The Synod also took a soft line on the issue of whether homosexuals should be allowed to take holy orders, saying that the Church should not discriminate against homosexuals in its activities.

AND DID THOSE YESTER: A photographer gives her a soft line on the Arch- Bishop of Canterbury listens to the Synod debate. Picture by Kenneth Saunders