

In what ways do you think God has called you to this role?

I have a strong and settled sense that the Holy Spirit has 'nudged' me towards standing for election to Synod, despite an initial reluctance on my part. I recognised that my long experience in senior leadership in the police and law enforcement agencies have prepared me, in a God-given way, to be able to make a serious impact in discussions at Synod. I have been pleasantly surprised at the number of folk who have encouraged me to stand. I also think it is important to redress the current imbalance of representation in Guildford Diocese which has been heavily loaded with a non-inclusive conservative agenda for far too long. However, I do want to emphasise that, despite my ambition to encourage full inclusivity in the CofE (see q.18-20 below), I am NOT A SINGLE-ISSUE candidate. There are many other important issues facing the Church that I relate to, some covered below, and others in my "Election Address" which I hope voters will take time to read. I feel the Holy Spirit is prodding me to proclaim, through Synod, that the CofE should strive towards being **a Christ-centred, Spirit filled, fully inclusive, eco-friendly church which is also a safe place for all.**

What is your personal hope for the Church of England?

That it will thrive and flourish and become relevant in a society that has largely abandoned the Christian message. Our society is so much in need of the salvation and joy offered through Christ and we must seek God and the empowerment of the Holy Spirit to enable that to change. We must do everything we can to promote unity and avoid division inside the church through mature discussion (see q.23), because a lack of unity disastrously compromises the credibility of the church, along with abuse issues and apparent hypocrisy that just turns people away. I hope we can do much better at attracting children, youth and younger people (see q.13 below), but never neglect the older generation (of which I am one!) as they and their witness are such a valuable asset to our churches. My other main hope is that we can work hard towards developing true disciples in our churches, and help them to then move on to becoming 'disciple makers', so more and more can fully grow in discipleship, holiness, and following closely the model that Jesus so clearly demonstrated for us, ensuring the gospel is deeply rooted in the lives of those who hear it.

What do you consider the three top priorities of the Church of England over the next five years?

I would love to say, "inclusivity, inclusivity, inclusivity"! I believe that would make great strides into other important priorities around growth and attracting Gen Zs into the church with all the benefits that would bring. Also it would help with safeguarding, recognising the stress and strain churches can sometimes place on "the other". The case of Lizzie Lowe, a young Christian who committed suicide because of pressures around her sexuality, and Vicky Beeching (see my response to q.17). In my view the church's failure to follow the model of Jesus on inclusivity, mainly due to poor interpretations, a lack of deep bible study, and a misguided attempt to follow 'tradition' has caused so much damage, and a loss of any resonance with young people. But as I must name three priorities, I would state 'inclusivity'; 'saving the parish'; and 'tackling mental-health inside the church – seeing that as a mission priority, and one that recognises the needs of over-burdened clergy. I totally believe that "healthy leaders lead healthy churches". I know I'm not allowed a fourth priority – so please forgive me as I've strayed – I would prioritise efforts to promote children's work, youth work and outreach to young adults and families.

What do you feel are the main safeguarding topics for discussion at the General Synod? How would you rate your own understanding of those topics?

One of the difficulties I find in my Parish Safeguarding role is convincing folk in the congregation that "abuse, sexual, of children, domestic etc. **can happen here**". Too many feel that is unthinkable, and does not happen in our churches – we need to disabuse them of

that as they have all to be our eyes and ears when it comes to uncovering safeguarding issues ("See It, Hear It, Report It"). I think Synod should place a genuine emphasis on publicising this. More widely, we need to recognise there is a complicated structure of national oversight of safeguarding – a problem that needs to be addressed. In 2025 the General Synod discussed having a fully independent body in charge of safeguarding nationally. They ended up voting for something between full independence and the then-current situation. This was largely due to the persuasion of Jim Gamble, the lead auditor for INEQE Safeguarding Group and a person I know and greatly respect from my law enforcement days. He persuasively argued we should not lose the experience and suitability of Diocesan Safeguarding Teams – and I wholeheartedly agree. I think I have a good knowledge and understanding of a wide range of safeguarding topics.

Do you recognise the key structure of the parish and priest as the bedrock of local ministry and mission in the Guildford Diocese and the Church of England?

Yes! I am a member of the 'Save the Parish' group and proud of it. I am totally against clergy cuts that are part of 'pastoral reorganisation' schemes where churches are merged into large groups, that some describe as 'mega-parishes'. These mean clergy are too thinly spread to carry out their ministry effectively and puts them under a lot of stress that can damage their mental-wellbeing and effectiveness. I have a mantra that "Healthy Clergy lead Healthy Churches" and anything that undermines that must be resisted. In the 2014 report "From Anecdote to Evidence", the Church Growth Research Programme investigated the key factors which lead to church growth and decline. Their findings clearly demonstrate that the more clergy there are dedicated to one parish, the more successful it is. This is not an accident – in fact it is a blinding flash of the bloomin' obvious! Another CofE report led by Revd. Dr. Fiona Tweedie, "Going Deeper", analysed the data used in the "Anecdote" report to find an even stronger correlation between amalgamation and decline. The fact is parishes have become disempowered within the CofE and Synod needs to combat that, and I would love to play my part in that.

What is your view on maintaining a church in every parish when many are struggling financially?

The Civitas publication, "Restoring the Value of Parishes", starts from the premise that the quality of civil society matters deeply to us all. It argues the parish unit provides the historic foundations of welfare, community, and spiritual belonging, and is still a vital source of local identity and neighbourliness which goes far beyond providing a venue for worshipping communities as in many instances parishes offer foodbanks, warm spaces, and companionship. So why are many parishes struggling financially? It is often because funding and effective control have both moved over the years from parishes to diocese. Dioceses have grown larger and have demanded more from parishes with the constant increases in parish share. Parishes, meanwhile, have lost the income that they once had from glebe land, while the clergy have lost their freehold. Central Funds which were once set aside specifically for poorer parishes, are being sucked back to the centre. While mission-based initiatives are often funded lavishly, the poorer parishes have been merged, and this has harmed whole communities just at the time when other common ground, such as pubs and post offices, have been closed. This must be reversed and funding restored to parishes. And Synod should enable that.

Given the previous question, what thoughts or concerns do you have about the choice of central funding for limited focal projects or a model of funding towards the dioceses in support of all parishes?

I cover some of this above. Much more central funding needs to be directed towards parishes. The Church Commissioners are the custodians of endowments worth around £10billion, and its value increases through investments. In 1999 the Archbishops' Council

was formed and it now prioritises long-term mission projects, 'vision and strategy', and improving the state (and reputation) of the national Church. It also has allocated £100million to be spent on addressing historic links with slavery. There has been a significant shift of monies towards England's 42 dioceses, often funding an increasing number of staff, and, as stated in an article 'Church Parishes are on the verge of being lost for good' (Telegraph 20/07/23), they are described as "bloated, costly and duplicative bureaucracies" with many roles proliferating in recent years, including the rise of politicised roles in the dioceses. These priorities have come at the expense of parishes. I believe it is important to fund diocesan needs, but this needs to be very carefully monitored as it seems low-income families have become disproportionately affected by church closures (Church Action on Poverty report 2023). What would Jesus have to say about that? Funding emphasis needs to be more directed at parishes.

How would you solve the burden of expensive church building maintenance costs?

The Church Commissioners should contribute to the maintenance of parish buildings. Major contributions have been made by charities, including English Heritage and the National Churches Trust, who have given over £14million in grants for conservation and repairs. However, the NCT are only able to help 1 in 4 churches that apply and the National Lottery has withdrawn from funding religious buildings. So, supplementing the contributions of charities is therefore now a responsibility of the Church Commissioners. It can be helped at the diocesan level by cutting admin down to size. Charities of a comparable size and scope spend around 11% of their annual budget on office costs. The Church currently spends nearly twice that amount, at around 20%. It is estimated that reducing the current number of diocesan staff by even a quarter (and making better use of modern technology) could pay for a thousand new stipendiary priests in parishes. There is a need to improve investment strategies and to rethink parish share (see q.12 answer), much of which is spent on things of little value to parishes but could be spent on parish running costs and building maintenance. I would argue for these measures in General Synod if elected.

Should a candidate for General Synod who threatens to redirect parish share to the Ephesian Fund, withdraw their candidacy? Why or why not?

No. While everything within me wants to say "Yes", as I believe their stance is disruptive and creates disunity and nobody who proposes that should sit in Synod, a body designed to further unity within the church. I believe their position to be divisive, perverse, and playing a disgraceful power game, and that if Jesus was here, in body, I think he would be turning over the tables in protest! But it is their right to stand even if I strongly disagree with them. My only caveat is the candidate must be totally transparent, open and honest about where they stand. In which case I put my trust in the voters to discern whether they should vote for such a candidate. I think that to request they withdraw their candidacy would be unnecessarily divisive in itself. Voters can show their distaste through the ballot. That's what democracy is all about and we shouldn't undermine that. However, my belief is we should, outside of (effectively) banning them from standing, constantly seize every opportunity to argue strongly, but graciously, against the whole Ephesian Fund concept and the thinking that lies behind it, and hope to high heaven that voters agree with that.

In what ways does the doctrine of original sin (as defined in article 9) influence your wider theology and ethics?

My understanding of 'original sin' (which falls within the article 9 definition) is that from birth we have a real and definite tendency towards covetousness and selfishness - we only have to watch the behaviour of babies to confirm that. As we grow older, we are constantly tempted by our desires, and even lust, for selfish pleasures and power. My wider theology and ethics for dealing with that are modelled by Jesus, who showed us clearly how we should deal with selfishness (the temptations in the wilderness and Jesus' biblical responses

are a wonderful resource). All three temptations the devil put to Jesus appeal to selfishness – bread to cure his hunger, a selfish activity of ‘testing’ God, and to have ‘all the kingdoms of the world’. But, Jesus never showed a selfish, or sinful bone in his body. I believe we live in a world where the enemy (Satan) is still very active, and the evil that surrounds us relates to the selfishness, covetousness and power hungry attitudes he promotes in individuals (including ourselves), organisations, countries and world leaders. Jesus’ Kingdom will come as we combat our own selfishness, and he will once and for all extinguish despicable original sin.

Thomas Aquinas defined love as "to love anything is nothing else but to will good to that thing." (Summa Theologica 1.20.2, c.f. Romans 12:9). Do you agree with this definition? If so, how would you define the word *good* (particularly but not only moral goodness), and practically what does it mean to will good when loving God or our neighbour?

“And God saw that it was good”. What is good is what God has created. To be ‘good’ will require a complete change of heart and mind and the reduction of selfishness (which is what repentance and knowing Jesus and following him is all about!) Good can only come through us if we “love God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind, and all our strength” and if we “love our neighbour as ourself.” So, in terms of what Aquinas wrote, this is a longer version of his definition. It is a pity that for much of church history the word ‘good’ has been defined in terms of “moral” goodness, and policing everyone’s morality. But that is too tight an approach – there are many areas of goodness that fall outside the moral norms of the day. I would include the following: Kindness; Caring for others; Caring for God’s creation; Showing empathy; Being respectful towards those we disagree with; Trying hard to promote unity; Resisting power games that can destroy unity. It is so much more than just “being nice”, and sometimes it can be incredibly demanding, and Jesus made that clear to us.

What is the most significant change to the structure/strategy of the Church of England that will allow more people to come to know Jesus?

My answers above to q.5-8 show to some extent where I stand on this. I believe the parish is the “bedrock of local ministry and mission”. That is how we attract more people to come to know Jesus, not through countless initiatives imposed from the centre. So, I believe the most significant change to the structure/strategy should be to revert back to the parish being that bedrock, and to fund that properly. That will require much closer scrutiny of the over-burdensome Parish Share. It will mean that a parish does not have to go through endless form-filling and bureaucratic nightmares in order to receive much needed financial support to enable them to properly manage their parish and buildings. At present, so much of the available money never seems to reach the parishes. I recently read the following, which has considerable merit: One way to relieve the Parish Share burden would be to revert to the time pre-1997 when the Church Commissioners were responsible for all clergy pensions, and they become responsible for that once more. This would mean parishes will no longer have to fund clergy pensions through a Pensions Board paid for (out of Parish Share) by the dioceses.

Why does it appear that other denominations are able to attract children and youth more than the Church of England?

Pentecostal and black churches do well because of vibrant contemporary worship and lively expressive faith. But what should the CofE do as well as those things? Well, recognise deep needs: youth value diversity, a lack of hypocrisy, and a concern for the environment and social issues. Children need engaging Sunday school structures led by enthusiastic children’s workers. Both youth and children need to sense the church wants to invest in them. They want to commit to relationships, not programmes. They want to see the impact of Jesus in the lives of churchgoers having a real and fulfilling relationship with Jesus and his

teachings. They want to hear about value not being dependent upon appearance, ability and status, and that they are unique, precious and loved by God. They need a safe place where they can ask difficult questions about scientific reality, contradictions in the text, and whether the truth of myths and legends can be as relevant as history and biography. They need to feel valued and have a voice. Designated youth leaders and schools work is essential. This is a big ask for churches, especially when coupled with secularisation, competing activities, changing family patterns and reduced familiarity with Christianity.

Care for Creation is part of the Church's marks of mission. How do you feel about the net-zero targets for 2030?

My church is 'eco-friendly' and awarded the 'A Rocha Gold Eco Church Award' to recognise its deep commitment to creation care and environmental sustainability. Wonderful! As for net zero targets for 2030, critics argue it imposes unmanageable economic burdens, especially on impoverished households. But green transition costs are widely misrepresented by flawed or inflated economic modelling, and also unchecked global warming will be vastly more expensive in the long term. Transitioning to renewables will make energy cheaper and more secure. The independent Climate Change Committee notes that the 2030 target remains achievable if the government maintains its current policy pace, and I support that aim. But let's not forget the actual commitment is to cut emissions significantly by 2030 endeavouring to reach net zero by 2050. Research shows that large majorities still back the 2050 target in order to avoid catastrophic climate change. The science could not be clearer: by the middle of this century the world has to reduce emissions to as close to zero as possible. If we can achieve this, global emissions of greenhouse gases will be 'net zero'. In the interim, the Church, the Government and philanthropic bodies must look to the needs of impoverished households.

What are your thoughts on encouraging more people to enter the church as trainee ordinands?

Potential ordinands are aware that the rise of multi-parishes means the Church is "in serious danger of creating impossible jobs where the ministry for the cure of souls becomes the ministry of managing a team". They want jobs that are manageable and life-giving, a vocation where they share and receive life. But what they see is clergy that are overstretched, with some suffering poor mental-health as a result. They notice that, with a reduction in stipendiary posts, it will be difficult for curates to move into a first incumbency. This means potential ordinands are not coming forward, and who can blame them? At an institutional level the Church must address these matters and stop sending out conflicting messages about the value and long-term security of stipendiary ministry; ensure ordinands can be confident they will be financially supported during their training, and stop the proliferation of multi-parishes. At the local level, a proactive effort is required: perhaps identifying individuals who exhibit leadership gifts, arranging an informal coffee to ask if they might consider ordained ministry; or host an 'exploring ministry' event evening with food where current ordinands and clergy share their stories and answer questions about the reality of the role.

Are you aware of the Racial Justice Covenant in place for the Guildford Diocese, and can you make a statement about your recognition of the aim of the covenant and your support? I fully support the Covenant, published by the diocese in 2023, and thoroughly recommend the use of the Racial Justice Covenant and Anti-Racism toolkit in parishes. I wholeheartedly agree with the recognition that diversity is fundamental to God's creation, a gift to be enjoyed and relished, and yet in so many of its dimensions, not least in regard to race, diversity is a gift that is challenging and complicated. We must rise to that challenge in parishes, the diocese and at General Synod – and part of my role if I am elected to Synod would be to argue for that. It is important to work towards a position in church congregations and their

leadership which ensures they reflect the racial diversity of their local communities. In 2020 the CofE report "From Lament to Action" highlighted that racism exists within our Church. As the wider society demonstrate high levels of racism, we need to combat any view that judges someone by the colour of their skin or their racial heritage. Synod must constantly stress that. I am so grateful that Guildford Diocese has taken a lead on this by publishing the Covenant and Toolkit.

How will you encourage a Church of England where each parish can foster a balanced and informed understanding of inclusivity, creating a culture where differing perspectives can be expressed openly, and where everyone feels genuinely heard, seen and valued?

I would love to make Vicky Beeching's book 'Undivided' a compulsory read for anyone claiming to be Christian. Vicky was a Christian worship leader who headlined big music events and toured the world. 'Yesterday, Today and Forever' was one tune of hers you may know. She speaks openly about the shame she felt around her sexuality, especially in a church setting, and how it led her to contemplate suicide. Her story should bring a Christian to tears, recognising how damaging we have been to the health and well-being of those who are "other". That must change. All churches should question their position on sexuality and recognise the pastoral aspect of helping someone coming to terms with being 'different' to know they are loved by God, and evangelistic, as there is a whole community who would never consider coming through the doors of our churches while they hold a traditional approach to human sexuality, or maintain gender inequality, and therefore would never have the chance to respond to the gospel. We need to present biblical teaching on sexuality, relationships, gender (the equal role of women in the church) and gender identity that isn't hidebound by traditional and prejudiced faulty bible interpretation.

What do you think the Church of England needs to do differently if we are to engage those who have experienced the church to be abusive, homophobic or sexist?

Do what Jesus did: look for the fruit. The Bible tells us one of the best ways of discerning what the Holy Spirit is doing is to look where the fruit is. So many of us can testify to the fruit of LGBTQ+ inclusion, in terms of faithful, loving relationships, stable families and beautiful vocations realised within and beyond the church. It is a tragedy that these folk have often experienced the church to be abusive and homophobic and it is a testament to their faithfulness that they love Christ so much they hang on to it there. We need to listen to their stories and perhaps then quote one of my favourite verses from Hosea 2:23, 'I will say to those called "Not my people", "You are my people"; and they will say, "You are our God". We must recognise the well documented negative mental health outcomes for LGBTQ+ who have been exposed to conservative teaching. The church needs to accept that professional bodies in psychology and psychiatry have long accepted that homosexuality is not a disorder but a regularly occurring, non-pathological minority variant in the human condition, and all human-kind are made in the image of God.

How do you think the Church of England can ensure LGBTQI+ people are fully welcomed, valued and able to flourish in the life of the Church?

We must continue with the work started by the "Living in Love and Faith" project. That work never achieved its full potential, but started a process which must be built upon and not sidelined, as some would want. The "Pastoral Principles for Living and Learning Well Together", published by the CofE encourage the Church, within its membership, to address ignorance, pay attention to power, cast out fear, acknowledge prejudice, speak into silence and admit hypocrisy. Oh, how we can learn from that! I am an ally to LGBTQ+ folk and know some sections of the church remain ignorant in that they have never studied the issue but just been led by tradition and questionable interpretation. Some non-affirming Christians have consistently played 'power games' (see my answer to question 9), some have peddled fear around 'the other', and there is a lot of prejudice and hypocrisy. It is tragic. We need to

be fully welcoming to LGBTQ+ folk, recognising their fruitfulness and what they bring to the church. All roles in leadership, children's work and elsewhere within a church should be open to them without let or hindrance, otherwise they remain marginalised – the exact opposite of what Jesus taught us.

Given that faithful Christians interpret Scripture differently on difficult and contested questions, how would you seek to maintain unity within diversity when they disagree? Living with difference and navigating disagreement is part of life. In the church we need to hold together folk with a wide variety of views across the theological spectrum and try to build up trust and relationship, accepting we also have much common ground in our beliefs. We need each other in order to live out the unity that Jesus prayed for, and that means we need those with who we profoundly disagree. Contending for unity, defending unity, celebrating unity is every bit as much a biblical imperative as those doctrines over which some seek to separate. We should refuse to be anything other than one: That's what disciples of Jesus do. My inclusive evangelical stance recognises a need to embrace the many strands of evangelicalism in unity. Some evangelicals profoundly disagree with my views on sexuality, and see it as one that prevents unity, and even fellowship – but we should be building bridges, rather than burning them! I want to honour Jesus' prayer for unity, and wholeheartedly believe that a relational way forward is possible and preferable, and I must work hard in Synod and elsewhere to convince others of that, recognising that relationship can triumph over division.

Do you believe that women and men are treated equally in our churches? If you were elected to the General Synod, what changes would you like to see which would support women's ministry?

I totally believe they should be, for all sorts of good reasons, but essentially because that's what Jesus taught us. But the distrust of women's voices is hard-baked into many women's experiences of churches. By 'voice' I do not just mean the physical act of talking, but a recognition that within the situations a women encounters, it is her means of offering her wisdom and stating her needs. It is how she makes herself present and it contributes greatly to society, and to church life. Just like men, a woman may use her voice to do harm, but it can be an incredible tool in her work for goodness, justice and peace. But in the past, and in some places today, the church is not always a space in which she is encouraged to speak, be heard, listened to, and flourish for the benefit of others. That must change. I would like to see Synod making a genuine effort to unlearn the bad and unhelpful theology that has been internalised about women and I believe that inclusive evangelicals (of which I am proud to be one) have a lot to contribute in Synod towards the work to ensure full equality.

Marriage laws in the UK are being reformed, with the proposed change moving the system from licensed buildings to licensed officiants. Should clergy be permitted to conduct weddings in any dignified and safe location?

Few days matter more than a person's wedding day when two people make a lifelong commitment to one another before their family, friends and community. It should be joyful, personal and a reflection of who they are, what they believe and the life they want to build together. So I welcome a reform that fully recognises that. The church shouldn't be troubled by this as many people still love the idea of a church wedding. The reform means weddings can take place in a wider array of locations provided they are deemed "safe and dignified" (and a church personifies that) and not a setting that would trivialise the serious spiritual and legal permanence of marriage, and the reforms must fully protect that. Allowing clergy to conduct marriages in secular venues can act as a vital community outreach. I personally believe such marriages will be blessed by having a clergy member officiating. My son was married in a non-church location (in the beautiful Eilean Donan Castle in Scotland) and his

marriage was conducted by a Church of Scotland minister, and it was lovely. We had the best of both worlds, and I wouldn't want to deny that to anyone.

How do we resolve the apparent conflict between making all people feel included and welcome whilst holding firm to the Bible's and CofE's historic position on marriage, and so allow the CofE to move on from endless debates about sexuality?

There have been many issues over the centuries that prove we must review 'historic' or 'traditional' positions (slavery, the role of women, and many more). A number of times Jesus said, "You have heard... but I say..." and he showed us that man-made traditions often needed to change to better reflect God's ways. He also said there is much more to learn and we should rely on the Holy Spirit's leading about the need for change. If we don't acknowledge Christ's teachings on this, and respond wisely, we will forever be unable to move on. So, we need to consider whether the historic position on marriage is one of those things that needs to be addressed. My studies reveal we should look to the bible to truly discover it's actual 'take' on marriage – and I found it so much different from the traditional view. It is interesting that in the whole bible there are only four examples of marriage in the sense we have traditionally believed (one man, one woman, and total faithfulness)! There are also eleven different 'types' of marriage described in the bible – we need to learn our traditions are often quite different from the word of God.

If you were an Incumbent, would you allow an assistant priest or curate in your parish to use the Prayers of Love and Faith if, in conscience, they felt able to do so?

Very much so – PLF are designed to pray with, and for, same-sex couples to give thanks for their commitment and love – how can that be wrong? PLF are already commended and in use, but of course not all agree that they should be used at all, especially as we are still in a time when the church is highly conflicted over same-sex relationships. But we should note that not all the prayers are controversial, and they can be used selectively as agreed by a church's ministry team. We should also note that no minister is ever forced or obliged to use these prayers, and they can choose not to do so, or to use some prayers, avoid others, or offer them only in private rather than in public. An assistant priest or curate can only use them, in public worship or private prayer, provided they have the agreement and authority of the Incumbent. The CofE general pastoral guidance specifies that local agreement – often involving the PCC – guides whether a church opts in to allow these prayers locally. If I were an Incumbent, I would hope to convince the PCC that it is perfectly reasonable, right and proper to opt in.

Would you support a member of your congregation who was in a same sex marriage being on your PCC, or leading worship or children's/youth work in your church?

Let me be unambiguously clear on this – yes I would. Firstly, because the bible does not, despite what many say, provide us with what a model that justifies the traditional view of marriage (see my answer to q.23 above), and secondly, because there is no reason (danger, fear, safeguarding, 'tainting' the gospel message or anything else) to suggest they shouldn't be in those positions – even if fear-mongers (i.e. those who intentionally act to scare people or make them anxious about something when it is not necessary or reasonable - usually to manipulate their choices) try to convince us otherwise. Of course, some objectors will quote the bible as being against my thinking – but I believe they are engaging in false teaching. The thing that actually does need to change are any views that this would be somehow 'wrong'. Why do people think that? My answer would be a lack of serious study, a fear of the 'other', being a slave to tradition despite Jesus's teaching against that, faulty and prejudiced interpretation practices, and not fully realising that our saviour who ate and drank with tax collectors (the 'other' of those times) has demonstrated the way we really should act.