

FORM 2 (Rule 17)

Clergy Discipline Measure 2003  
Respondent's answer to a Complaint

**IMPORTANT NOTICE: IF THIS ANSWER IS NOT RETURNED WITHIN 21 DAYS THE BISHOP /ARCHBISHOP MAY NONETHELESS PROCEED TO DETERMINE WHICH COURSE TO PURSUE UNDER THE MEASURE IN RESPECT OF THE COMPLAINT**

*\*Delete as appropriate.*

**To the Bishop of Guildford**

My full name is: Stephen Robert Sizer

My contact address is: Christ Church Vicarage  
Callow Hill, Virginia Water, GU25 4LD

My telephone number is: 07970 789549

*\*\*E-mail address is optional.*

My e-mail address is: stephen.sizer@btinternet.com

My place of ministry is: The parish of Virginia Water

*Enter the name of the complainant and the date the complaint was made.*

I have read the complaint of: Mr Jonathan Arkush  
dated: 26<sup>th</sup> October 2012

*Please tick **one** box only, and enter reasons where appropriate.*

**I admit the misconduct alleged in the complaint**

*Or*

*If you admit part but not all the alleged misconduct, please state here the misconduct which is admitted.*

**I admit the following misconduct alleged in the complaint:**

.....  
.....

**but deny the other alleged misconduct because:**

*Briefly summarise your reasons for denying the other alleged misconduct.*

.....  
.....

**I deny the misconduct alleged in the complaint because:**

---

*Briefly summarise your reasons for denying the alleged misconduct.*

Mr Arkush, on behalf of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, alleges “a clear and consistent pattern” of misconduct “unbecoming or inappropriate to the office and work of a clerk in Holy Orders”, between March 2011 and June 2012. Their complaint alleges:

1. I have made “antisemitic statements”.
2. I am an “avid reader and publicizer of websites that are openly and virulently antisemitic”, “trawling dark and extreme corners of the internet for material” to add to my website.
3. I regularly publish links on my website “to antisemitic websites, thereby re-publishing their anti-Semitism” to introduce readers to “racist and antisemitic websites”.
4. I knowingly delayed removing a link to an article on an antisemitic website for three months.

I have not made antisemitic statements. On the contrary, I repudiate anti-Semitism and racism of any kind.

I am not an “avid reader and publicizer of websites that are openly and virulently antisemitic” nor do I trawl “dark and extreme corners of the internet for material” to add to my website. The claim that I have done so is false.

I do not regularly publish links to racist and antisemitic websites, nor do I seek to introduce readers to such websites. I did not knowingly delay removing a link to an article on an antisemitic website for three months.

*Briefly summarise the facts of your case. The evidence which you send in support of your answer (see below) should go into greater detail.*

**A summary of my version of events is as follows:**

I repudiate anti-Semitism and have publically done so on many occasions. The Board of Deputies has mischaracterised a number of my statements, attributing to me views that I do not hold and have never expressed.

An analysis of the content of my website demonstrates that I am not an “avid reader and publicizer of websites that are openly and virulently antisemitic” nor that I “trawl dark and extreme corners of the internet for material”. I do not regularly publish links on my website to antisemitic material. In fact, I draw overwhelmingly from mainstream news stories.

I have never deliberately linked to a website that I consider to contain antisemitic material. On those rare occasions that I have discovered that a link may be problematic, I have acted to remove it as soon as possible as I have no wish to be associated with antisemitic material.

In the following response I will provide evidence to refute the allegation that I am antisemitic or have promoted anti-Semitism.

I repudiate anti-Semitism. I am committed to working for justice, peace and reconciliation in the Middle East based on the rule of international law.

I will submit that since I have only ever expressed lawful political opinions and since there is no evidence that I have engaged in unlawful activity, the matters complained of do not come within the jurisdiction of the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003.

**In mitigation for the misconduct which I admit, I wish to say:**

*If you admit the misconduct, or some of the alleged misconduct, then state here any factors you wish the bishop to bear in mind when deciding on the appropriate course of action.*

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**The written evidence in support of my answer is attached, and consists of the following statements and other documents:**

*You may provide evidence in support of your answer. This evidence could be your own signed statement, which can be set out in this form or be in a separate document attached to it. You can also attach signed statements from witnesses. All witness statements should be in form 3 of the Clergy Discipline Rules. Letters or other material such as photographs may be submitted if relevant.*

1. Response to the complaint
2. Statement of support from the Right Revd. Riah Abo El Assal
3. Statement of support from Canon Dr Mike Butterworth
4. Statement of support from David John Carter
5. Statement of support from Rabbi Professor Dan Cohn-Sherbok
6. Statement of support from Dr Martin Davie
7. Statement of support from Professor Scott Elias
8. Statement of support from Professor Mary Grey
9. Statement of support from Canon Garth Hewitt
10. Statement of support from Revd Philip Hill
11. Statement of support from Ghada Karmi
12. Statement of support from Venerable Michael Lawson
13. Statement of support from Jeremy Michael Moodey
14. Statement of support from Diana Neslen
15. Statement of support from Professor Ilan Pappé
16. Statement of support from Revd John Woodger

**I believe that the facts of my answer are true**

*You must sign your answer.*



**Signed:**

**Dated: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2013**