

We are an ad hoc group of very concerned United Methodist. The focus of our cooperating with one another is to encourage the **DEFEAT** of:

Amendment # IV  
Amendment # X  
Amendment # XIII  
Amendment # XXIII  
Amendment # XXVI

The following members and delegates of our annual conference encourage you to vote **AGAINST** the Worldwide Church Amendments:

Leon Jouromon	Richard A. Hunter	Betty Whitten
Jane Finley	Jasper Russell	Jamie Jenkins
Joe Whittemore	Leon Matthews	Jonathan Holston
Jeff Jernigan	David Jones	Joe W. Kilpatrick
Alvin J. Rowe, Jr.	Jane Brooks	Yooeui Sohn
Debby Stikes	Richard Winn	Richard Williamson
Dianne Traynham	Gary T. Fuller	Henry M. Huckaby
John A. Simmons	Sharma Lewis	Marjorie Kimbrough
Sondra R. Jones	Diane Parish	Bill Britt
D.B. Shelnutt, Jr.	Byron Thomas	Jasper Russell
Ed Tomlinson	Cathy White	Mike Long
Lyn Powell	Jacqui Rose Tucker	Dianne Spencer
Tom Jackson	Clay Jacobs	Charles D. Miller
James C. Cantrell	Karen Vaughan	Mike Cavin
B. Wiley Stephens	E. Parks Davis	Matthew Pinson
Charles W. Savage		

Join Us In  
Preserving our Connection and  
Opposing The Worldwide  
Church  
Constitutional Amendments

---

Please Vote

**NO**

On Amendments:

# IV

# X

# XIII

# XXIII

#XXVI

## Why Oppose the Five Regional Church Amendments with Distinctive Substance?

- They are sure to add expense to our apportionments (e.g., another Council of Bishops and Judicial Courts at the Regional level).
- We are making a decision before the Task Force formed to study and make recommendations on the structure makes its report.
- The Judicial Council said in a recent ruling on Constitutional Amendment IV, “Further study is needed...” and that nothing is done to “harmonize its content with remaining provisions of the *Discipline*.”
- Another level of administration is added between the General Conference and the local church.
- The voice of the local church is diminished when the structure and provisions undergirding the “Worldwide Nature of the Church” are currently unknown and could be passed by a 50% + 1 vote of the General Conference (i.e., not with the constitutional protections of a 2/3 vote of all Annual Conference voting members).
- The five amendments move us away from connectionalism.
- The more issues in which we can have differing stances in the denominational, the less connectional we are.
- We are urged to alter the constitution prior to full disclosure of *Discipline* changes.
- After full disclosure in 2012, warranted changes should be able to prevail at the 2/3 level and thereby follow due process.

## Rationale

The United Methodist Church has a distinctive polity that promotes a unity of purpose throughout the denomination. Connectionalism is our vehicle for ministry. In these proposed changes to the constitution we are voting on the nature of our denomination, we must carefully protect those things that make us uniquely United Methodist.

**We believe these amendments fundamentally harm our classic connectional polity.**

It is important to defeat these five amendments to our United Methodist Constitution and allow the recently appointed Worldwide Nature of the UMC Study Committee to make its recommendations to the 2012 General Conference and clarify how the proposal will harmonize its content with the remaining provisions of the Discipline. Then, if so inclined and connectional polity is protected, the 2012 General Conference would recommend that we should change the constitution.

**We are simply moving too fast without clarity about the impact of these decisions.**