



ELEPHANTS IN THE LIVING ROOM

Website: elephantsinthelivingroom.com



FR. TONY FLANNERY

PEOPLE OF CONSCIENCE
IBEW UNION HALL
DETROIT, MI
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2014

Introduction

Fr. Tom Lumpkin

A few years ago Pope Francis came out with an apostolic exhortation called, *The Joy of the Gospel*. Essentially, it's a document about evangelization. It's a positive document. He states that the core message of evangelization is the message enfolded in Jesus Christ. And the core ethical value is mercy. Francis was critical of two things as obstacles to evangelization: one was the cultural challenges caused mainly by economic structures and systems; but the other thing he was critical of was the [resent practices] of clergy, particularly the hierarchy. He criticized individual practices and the lack of spirituality; and he criticized present day Church structures that need to be reformed; for example, the Church has put administrative concerns over pastoral concerns.

Tony Flannery is exhibit A of what Pope Francis is talking about. His ministry for many, many years has been missions and retreats and evangelizing. And I know from reading about him and from what I have heard about him. He was led by the spirit of Vatican II; and he always spent time listening to the people he was involved with; and he proclaimed the core message that Francis is talking about. Again, on the other hand, as part of that ministry, he pointed out certain Church structures and official understandings that appear to be contrary to the spirit of the gospel. Notably, he dared to presume that - I hope I am saying this accurately - that Jesus may not have had in mind the priesthood that we have today; (Laughter) or that we would have ordained into the priesthood what we have today.

And as part of his efforts to speak about Church reform, he was instrumental in founding the Association of Irish priests, and to give the Irish priests a voice of their own independent of the bishops. And as part of his efforts to speak about church reform, he was instrumental in founding the Association of Irish priests, and to give the Irish priests a form of independence.

Then, being instrumental in that and publicly questioning some of the current teachings and structures of the church drew the attention of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith. There were a series of exchanges of letters in which he was expected to clarify his statements; and, eventually, it wasn't satisfactory to the CDF; and he was old to sign a statement that contained articles that he could not in conscience agree to. And so, the Congregation of the Doctrine of Faith basically, through his superiors, suspended him from ministry.

It's a very sobering story of what's happened to him; and at the same time, you will have an inspiring witness, a spirit led response, and - I would say for myself - that also his story is a kind of profound mystery of the twists and turns of vocational calling. Fr. Tony Flannery!



People of Conscience

Fr. Tony Flannery

Good afternoon. I was going to go down in front; but I think, maybe, I will stand up here, because I will have a better view of you; and I'll see if any of you fall asleep. (laughter) It's lovely to be here, Tom. And I am a Redemptorist; and the founder was St. Alphonsus Liguori; and they say about him - he was an Italian in the 18th century, - whenever anybody prays to him, he will say, "Would that half of it were true." (laughter)

It's wonderful to be here; so you can see, the Vatican did me a great favor. This is city number nine in my eighteen city tour. And, up to two years ago, I was a fairly insignificant little priest in the west of Ireland that nobody in America had ever heard of. So there you go! Things work in strange ways. It is wonderful to be here and it's wonderful to see. This is the biggest crowd I have had so far. So that's one up for Detroit. (applause) Does that mean there are more heretics in Detroit? (laughter) I hope you can hear me all right. One of the places I was in - they are all mixed up in my mind at this stage - but I was chatting around with people before we began. And there was one woman up at the front; and she called me over; and she said, "Father, told me," she said, "I didn't come to hear what you have to say; I just came to hear your brogue." (laughter)

And I want to clear just one other thing up before I get serious. About two days before I left Ireland. a journalist, from probably the most widely read newspaper - but actually it's a bit of a rag - but anyway, rang me up, asking me about my tour of America, and various questions; and then he said to me, "Does the Vatican know about you going to America and what you are doing?" And so I gave sort of a flippant answer. I said something like, "The Vatican would know an awful lot less!" And I mentioned the fact I have a blog of my own; and I am keeping an account of the tour; and I check sometimes, you know, if you are into blogging, you can check where your blog is being read. And, after Ireland and the United States, the next most popular place where my blog was read was: Rome. (laughter) So I mentioned that to him. And about two days after I arrived in this country, I looked up the Irish papers, and there was this article, and the heading was *A Rebel Priest: The Vatican Will Spy on Me in the United States*. (laughter) So, can we just clarify now, straight away: will the Vatican spy please stand up? (much laughter)

I have spent my life as a preacher of missions, as Tom said, and novenas, and that sort of thing; and I'm not an academic; so when you are coming to the stage of asking me questions, please don't expect intelligent answers, because I have always been a populist preacher and populist writer. I have very few academic qualifications to my name. So just try to be clear on that, because I know, here in Detroit for the Elephants, you have had some very distinguished people speaking to you.

What I want to do is fill out a little bit on the story that you have already heard; and that's in the book. Incidentally I didn't bring copies with me, it would have been impossible. It's available on Amazon, either the hard copy version of *A Question of Conscience*, if you wanted to get it. I'll just fill out a little bit on the story, because I want to draw some conclusions from it that I think are central to what's happening in the Church at the moment. We are living through an incredibly interesting time in the Church right now; also, I believe, an incredibly critical time. What happens in the next four to five years in the Catholic Church, I think, is going to have massive significance for the future of the Church. Somebody asked me about two years ago, before Francis came in, or before Benedict retired, "What's the future of the Church? What will the Church be like in 20 years time?" And the answer I gave, rightly or wrongly, I said, "In 20 years' time, the way things are going, the Catholic Church will be a small reactionary sect." Now, I'd give a different answer now, because now there is hope that it will be something very different; that there will be a new energy, and a new vitality, that will bring about a new Church. But the next four to five years will tell the difference. So I'll talk about the so-called hot issues which you are familiar with and I'll have views and what I'm working about. What I want to do is touch on what I see as fundamental things that need to change in the next couple of years. So, I'll use my own story as an illustration of how these things operate.

It was February 2012 I got first notification; and I got it in a phone call from the General Superior of the Redemptorists, based in Rome. He is a Canadian, my *confre*. I have hardly ever spoken to the General Superior of the Redemptorist in all my life! I didn't intend to be involved at that level, for good or for bad, but I got this phone call. And, basically, the phone call told me that I was in trouble with the Vatican, and to get to Rome to meet him as soon as I possibly could - and by as soon as I possibly could, he meant tomorrow. (laughter) And, of course, that was impossible. But the thing about it was, in that phone call, he stressed at least on three occasions, that this was to be regarded as totally secretive, that I wasn't to tell anybody - and he stressed anybody - about this.

Now, a lot that has happened between me and the Church in the last few years has been so crazy that you just end up laughing at it. It is so ridiculous. Can you imagine, I was 65 at the time, getting a phone call, totally out of the blue, unexpected, without being given any details, you knew that it was going to turn your life upside down; and you weren't to tell anybody? Now it was about a week before I eventually organized myself to go there. He had said to me that I could bring somebody with me; and I suppose, in these situations, traditionally, priests, in dealing with the Vatican, tend to bring canon lawyers with them. Now, from the beginning, for better or for worse, I decided that wasn't the way I was going to go. And I ended up actually bringing a brother of mine with me: Frank; not a priest, not a theologian, a businessman, had recently retired - he's a little older than me - but also a man who all his life had on a voluntary level in what you would call political strategy: working with a political party, planning elections, planning policy, all that sort of stuff. So Frank came along with me. So I rang my *confreere* when I had my arrangements made, that I am coming on such a such a day, bringing my brother Frank with me and my *confreere* said to me, "Now that Frank is going with you, maybe you better tell him what this is about." (laughter) Now Michael Brehl is a lovely man; and he is not in the Vatican. He's a Redemptorist; and he's the head of the Redemptorists. But did he really believe that I was going to go five days without telling my own family and the people close to me that I was in deep trouble? I mean, it is so ridiculous.

Anyway we went there. I've still the clearest memory: the table was about the size of that (pointing to a table near the lectern), and it t'was pine and it t'was shiny and it t'was bare and there were four chairs around it: two here and two the other side. I sat here, Michael Brehl opposite me; Frank was to my right and the Assistant General of the Redemptorists, a man called Enrique Lopez from Central America, was here. And after the niceties Michael Brehl passed two A4 sheets of paper across to me with typing on them. I saw straight away there was no identification on them, no heading, no signature. One of them contained a number of sentences that were taken from articles that I had written in the Redemptorist, in Ireland, a magazine called, *Reality*, I would write every month for the magazine, a column for *Donkey's Ears*; and the sentence was taken from some of those articles. So I glanced down through that and then the second sheet was a list of the penalties and sanctions that were to be imposed on me. Now Michael Brehl agreed with me afterwards that that wasn't a good way of going about it. I should have seen those two sheets of paper well before I went into any meeting because I was quite pruned by all of this - quite shocked, really - and was in no fit state to have any sense of a serious discussion about it.

Even in that state I became aware of a very funny thing happening, Michael Brehl and Frank got down to business; and within about two minutes, they had found shared language, the language of political specialty. Because, you see, you don' get to the top in any branch of the Church without being, fundamentally, a politician also, and knowing how to play the political game. So between them - and I was happy to let them at it - they worked out a strategy how we will deal with the Vatican, what way is best to go. So the next four months I had to go off on extended retreats, and the usual stuff, and silence, and all of that sort of thing; and what they were looking for was a statement that I would sign and publish to prove that I wasn't a heretic.

Now the issues, as Tom has already mentioned, the issues were about the origin of priesthood and the origins of Church. Now, do any of you lie awake at night wondering about the origins of the priesthood? (laughter) I don't either. You know, they weren't exactly major issues to lose your life over, or to lose your priesthood over. So, like I was willing to go along with it. I had written these articles in the height of the clerical sexual abuse thing in Ireland; and I know it was horrible to hear, and equally so in Ireland; and to be working as a priest through all those years, and in Ireland, we had four state investigations of different aspects of the Church to do with the abuse of children. And to be ousted as a priest through all of that, meeting people and trying to preach the gospel, it was, to say the least, difficult. And we were constantly engaged in discussion with people: "How could this have happened? What's gone wrong with the Church? Where has all this corruption come from? What's wrong with the priesthood that these sorts of things could happen, and then be covered up?" So, I'm sure, you all had the same type of discussions here. It was in that context that I wrote those articles. So, when I said in the article on the priesthood that "the priesthood, as we have it now, that I don't believe it was what Jesus intended," I thought I was saying the most obvious thing in the world.

But, take that sentence out of its context, and land it on a desk, by itself, in the Vatican, and suddenly it was heresy. And much the same with the Church, what I had said, again, was something like, "The Church, as it is today, is not as Jesus intended." I believed it wasn't. Now, happily, the whole other

question: "Did Jesus intend the Church at all?" But, happily, I hadn't gone into that. (laughter) So, like there it was! What we ended up doing - because a lot of this, when you are dealing with the Vatican, as I discovered, a lot of it is a game - and what we ended up doing is, we got one of my colleagues, who is a Redemptorist theologian, to write a statement on these two issues. And he did. He wrote quite a lengthy statement in theological language. When I read it, I couldn't understand it myself; but I could see that it was written in such a way that it was intended to mean whatever the reader wanted it to mean. (laughter)

So, with a bit of reluctance, I signed my name to it, and sent it back to Michael Brehl, the head of the Redemptorist; and he was due to go over to the CDF - incidentally, at that stage the head of the CDF was an American, William Levada; he is retired now, living on the West Coast - so he told me afterwards. I got a very excited phone call from Michael Brehl then about two days later. He said, "I think we have cracked it," he said. He said, "I went over and Cardinal Levada was there, with some underlings around him, and he said, "Father Brehl, have you got the statement?" And he said he had. "Will you read it for me?" So Father Brehl read the statement. I hope he was able to manage the big theological words; and Cardinal Levada said, "That is a very fine statement." Great excitement! We seemed to be solving the problem.

I was glad, but he retired about a month later, and was replaced by Cardinal Mueller, a different Hitler fish from Germany - I am sure you all know that - in September, he didn't think it was a very fine statement. He wanted additions to it. And the two additions you might be familiar with: And the first one was that I was to add to my statement that I accepted - and listen to this - "that I accept that women will never be ordained priests in the Catholic Church." Can you imagine anybody making a statement like that? And secondly, "That I accept all the moral teaching of the Catholic Church." Now that includes contraception. It includes what Joseph Ratzinger, as he was then, had said about homosexuality, lots of that sort of stuff.

So there it was! That was the breaking point, really; and OK, I've called my book *A Question of Conscience*; but, actually, when it came to the end, it wasn't even that. It was so straight forward, that there was no choice; like, how could I possibly have put my name to that statement? I was from a small country; and, I suppose, I had always been fairly well known, because I had been a traveling preacher; but, with the Association of Catholic Priests, myself and two others, I was getting quite a high profile. Everybody knew that for thirty years, I and most of my country's priests had called into question the teaching on contraception, and that we had also challenged stuff that was being said about homosexuality and other issues. So then, to come along, and to sign and publish a statement saying that I accepted all that! I mean, first of all it would have been a lie; secondly, it would have made a laughing stock of myself and the country, and would have no credibility at all. But totally, and by far most important, could I have looked at myself in the mirror from there on, and could I get any satisfaction out of my priestly ministry for the rest of my life, knowing what I had done to remain in it? So, it was as simple as that. I didn't give them that statement. This time, I wrote a statement myself, with the help of a couple of friends who weren't theologians, and we wrote it in the sort of style that I usually write: fairly simple, straight forward language; and, of course, as I expected, it didn't satisfy Mueller. So, from there on, I was supposed to be permanently silent, out of ministry, and out of my role in the leadership of the Association of Catholic Priests.

And a funny thing happened then - and I'll finish my story with this little bit - in November of that year, because this all played out through 2012, in November of that year the Association of Catholic Priests were having their Annual General Meeting. Now those of you who belong to religious orders will understand this better than others. As a religious, we take a vow of obedience; and the heaviest imposition of a vow of obedience is what is called a *formal precept of obedience*. Now, if you get that, it has to come in writing with the official stamp of the Congregation. Two weeks before the AGM didn't this letter from Michael Brehl end on my desk; and when I opened it: a formal precept of obedience not to attend the AGM of the Association of Catholic Priests. Now the Association of Catholic Priests in Ireland isn't exactly al Qaeda (loud laughter). We are a group of old men, for God's sake; most of us in our 60s and 70s and so many in the 80s, who had worked for 40 years as priests, and continued to do what they could to keep the whole show on the road. And here is what I meant when I say a good bit of this stuff is so crazy that you just have to laugh at it. I inquired with my colleagues in the Redemptorist, "Did anybody remember anyone before in the Irish Redemptorists ever having a formal precept of obedience imposed on them?" And nobody could. It had never happened in 70 years until I got it. And the letter went on to say that if I disobeyed this precept, I would put my position in the Redemptorists in great jeopardy. I went to the AGM; I did, of course, because it was ridiculous at this stage. That is roughly where it ended.

The following January I went public, because, at this point, Benedict was still in place, Cardinal Mueller was new in his job for Congregation of Doctrine in the Faith, he was a relatively young man. I didn't see any indications of a possible change. I reckoned that there was no way that I would ever get back into ministry again; so the choices I had: to remain silent and live a quiet life as a religious for the rest of my life, or do I go public? I was never very good at living a quiet life, to be honest with you, (laughter) and the reason I went public: I didn't object to the authorities in the Church calling me to order over such views. I think any institution is fully entitled to have an authority structure. But, what I objected to was the way in which they did it. If they had problems with what I had written, the least they should have done, the very least, was to talk to me, and to give me a chance to explain myself. But they didn't do any of that. At no stage did I have any direct contact with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. It all came through the Redemptorists; and it all came with a document with an informal page with no heading and no signature. So I am friendly with a few legal people in Dublin; and I met with them, and I went through it with them. They were, to use an Irish word, they were *godsmite*; and they said to me, "No institution of any reputation has behaved like this since the 16th century." And it's true.

And when I was in Washington - it was the first stop on this tour - and I did an interview with Maureen Fielder. Some of you might know, she does the religious hour on some radio station, I don't know which one. But, anyway, Maureen, in the course of the interview, she was throwing questions at me that people who didn't agree with me might ask. And one of the questions, she said, "Tony," she said, "you were a religious; and here you are now, and how do you explain the fact that you have taken a vow of obedience, and disobeyed your legitimate authority?" Now, I don't know if this ever happened to you. Sometimes in life you are struggling with something in your life, and you are trying to get your head around it, and trying to work out exactly where you stand on it. And, then, something happens, and it suddenly kicks into place. And, for me, in that interview two weeks ago with Maureen in Washington, when she asked me that question, "Why are you disobeying the legitimate authority?" The answer I gave her was: I said, and I surprised myself with the words I used, I said, "The key word in your question is the word legitimate." I said, "Any institution that tramples on the basic dignity and human rights of the members of that institution has long ago lost the right to call itself legitimate." (applause) So that's really why I decided to go public; and that is how I ended up here. And it's good to be here! And since then, of course, along comes Francis; and we have a whole different possibilities within the Church. But that is another story.

Now, let me take two things in particular from that whole experience, that I think are going to be central to whether or not the Church has a future out of its present crises. And the first one is this word magisterium. Magisterium, as you know, is the teaching authority of the Church. Okay? But the question is what is or what constitutes the magisterium in the Catholic Church. Now, the crowd I was dealing with, the CDF, had no doubt about that. They were the magisterium from stop; and everybody else's job was to obey. But me, and a lot of you being a child of the Second Vatican Council, my understanding of the magisterium was quite different. For me, and for the Vatican Council, and indeed for Francis, because he said at a very early stage in one of the interviews he gave after he became pope, the magisterium consists of, yes, the Vatican, as part of it, also the conferences of bishops around the world, the study, and reflection, and writing of theologians, and, very important too, what we call the *sensus fidelium*, the good sense of the Catholic believers. So, you actually have four legs to the stool of the magisterium. Now, look at what Francis has been trying to do in the last couple of weeks in the senate. He is clearly trying to open up this notion of magisterium. He is clearly trying to; and I know we'd all wish more of it happened, but we have to be, I think, a bit patient about this. He's clearly trying to get all these disparate voices to be heard and listened to. And he constantly uses - which is a great Jesuit word - discernment; because in order for this Vatican II idea of magisterium to work, you have to have the ability to speak fearlessly, as he said, but also, to listen respectfully, and to be willing to enter into a process of discernment, out of which the truth will come.

The thing about it is, as Cardinal Burke has clearly recognized, that exercise of magisterium is messy, and it's confusing, and it takes a lot of time; but it is the way that allows the Spirit to speak. And for me in the next four to five years, which notion of magisterium is going to prevail? When we revert back to the dominance of the CDF and the Vatican, or will Francis manage to open it up to the voices of these four different elements in the Catholic Church. There will be one hell of a struggle about it; and, please God, that notion will prevail.

And the second thing then is the - and its related to the exercise of authority - now again, in religious life, in the generation before me, in the Redemptorists, we live in community, and each community has a

superior; he's known a *vectra*. And the time before me, back in the 50s and 40s, the rector had total power in the community; he was, effectively, a little God. Some were very good; and some, inevitably, abused their power. And the stories the old Redemptorists used to tell me and my generation when we were young, some of them would make the hair stand up on your head, the way in which some superiors or rectors of communities behaved. As we know, power corrupts, and it's a dangerous thing to give to any human being. Only some can handle it properly.

But then, after the Second Vatican Council - I have lived in the Redemptorists; and I think in most religious orders, male and female, to a greater or lesser extent, because I think we religious took the teaching of Vatican II maybe more seriously than most - I have lived through an era in which all decision making in the community was made by the community, with the superior giving a leadership position, certainly, but in no way being dogmatic. There was opportunity for everybody's voice to be heard. It was often a long, sometimes a very painful process. You know the old joke, where they say hell is no longer fire and brimstone, hell is just eternal community meetings. (laughter) And, definitely, the worse thing about confusion would have reigned many a time; but, if you stick with the process, and if you try to exercise that great word again, discernment, in the end, you come out with a decision than can be owned by all.

In the dispute between the Vatican and the LCWR, you can see exactly that conflict going on: the two radically different understandings of how authority is exercised. And they are radically different; and that is why it is so hard for the religious sisters - and they are marvelous people in this country - to even find the language by which they can communicate on these issues with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. When your starting position is so totally different, your understanding of the processes is so totally different, how would you dialogue about it? It is very, very difficult. So, again, which of these two understandings of the exercise of authority is going to prevail in the next four to five years? It is, I think, clear that Francis favors the exercise of authority through dialogue and discernment, and listening to the voices of people. Will it prevail; or will the Vatican manage to grasp the power back to themselves again as they did after the Second Vatican Council? The future of the Church is going to depend on that too. So, somebody said to me the other day, "In a 100 years' time the story in the Catholic Church will have a few chapters on the era we are living through."

So, we Redemptorists have a terrible habit of speaking too long; so, if I can just move to my final point. On that notion of authority it's: for people like yourselves - and I think a lot of you are quite active in Church reform - if you haven't already gone into Church history, a bit it's very useful to do so, because most of the issues we are trying to deal with in the Church today have their origins way back in the history of the Church; like, for instance, the whole women's question. I think the question of women, and the question of sexuality in the Catholic Church, are intimately related; and an awful lot of the problems that we have in both of those areas to this day have their origins back around the time of St. Augustine and Duns Scotus, and those in the 5th and 6th century; and the fact that they were so immersed in the writings and the philosophy of the Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle.

So a good bit of the Catholic Church's perception of women, which is appalling for most of our history, obviously, didn't come from Jesus at all. It was the opposite of what Jesus taught and practiced in his life. But it was an accumulation of an accretion that came from Greek philosophy. So much of Church teaching has come from that way. The centralizing of power in the Church only really developed in the 11th and 12th centuries; and a couple of the church's I've spoken in, most places I've spoken in, were Protestant churches since I came here, which is extraordinary in its own way, but they were celebrating this last week the Reformation. And if you think about it, the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation was at least as much in need of reform as it is today. And if the Church leaders were willing to listen to the reformers in the early days, before politics got into it - because a lot of what the reformers were saying made perfect sense if only they were willing to sit down and listen to them, and talk to them, and discern with them, what a difference that could have made in the Church. But, by then, they had become too centralized and too powerful; and the more centralized your authority becomes, the less is your ability to listen.

And then, if you go forward three centuries to the First Vatican Council, and the definition of infallibility - now, please, at this state, Vatican spy, put your hands over your ears, because I'm definitely going to state heresy here - that has been a disaster for the Church, I think. The worst possible thing you could say to a human being, no matter who they are, or what they are, is that they have a special line to God

that nobody else has. Like, why would you listen to the ordinary *Joe Soap*, when God is telling you what the truth is? So it has added to the centralization and to the dogmatism of the Catholic Church.

And, of course, the other millstone it has produced was illustrated very well in Paul VI, in *Humanae Vitae*, the teaching on contraception. As I'm sure all of you know, he rejected the majority of the opinion of the commission, and he went with the minority opinion; and the scholars that I have read about it, suggest that the reason he did that was, because Pius XI in 1932 and the encyclical - I think was '32 - *Casti Connubii*, had condemned artificial contraception; and Paul the VI felt that he couldn't been seen to contradict a pope who went before him, because that would raise all sorts of questions about the infallibility of popes. So, it has really has become a major millstone around our necks, that teaching. The Vatican II again made an effort to redefine it, the notion of it, but John Paul prepared for that quickly.

The last thing I want to say is this: that, for you people who are involved, and I am very impressed with the number and range of reform movements in this country; and I'm also impressed with - I know there is conflict, and I know the very different approaches, and all that - but, by and large, it appears to me that you seem to be able to work with a fair degree of harmony together in the effort for reform in the Church. I would say to you that the next twelve months is very important, because Francis is clearly asking that the topics that were discussed over the last few weeks, that they now be brought to the Church at all levels, right down to local communities, to parishes, to dioceses, to reform groups, to whatever. And, that insofar as we possibly can, all of us have to try to feed our voices and our opinions back into the center for the final decisions this time next year.

The first few sessions I was at, I was accompanied by Jeanine Grammick, because Jeanine was driving me around; and when this type of thing would come up in the discussion after my talk Jeannine gave an example, that she was recently talking to Cardinal Dolan; and she suggested to Cardinal Dolan - and if you know Jeannine, and she would do it very sweetly, but very strongly - she suggested that maybe the sort of stuff Dolan and the Church had been saying about LGBT issues wasn't exactly what the people were really thinking and feeling. And Dolan's answer was, "When the people who speak to me, that's the way they are feeling." (laughter) Now you can interpret that too as maybe Dolan is just hearing what he wants to hear; but the other thing is that maybe people of our mentality aren't doing enough to make sure that the bishops have to hear what we are saying and thinking. So, the next twelve months is a time for renewed energy in the work for reform, and all sorts of different ways in which we can make sure that our voices are heard right up to the center of the Church. Thanks very much. (Applause)

Transcribed by
Bev Parker
20141124

